

Hegemony Of Saudi Arabia's Kafala System In The Relationship Between Employer And Indonesian Female Domestic Migrant Workers 2018-2020

Karin Caroline Kelly¹

Student of Governance Studies, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,
Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Serang, Indonesia
karincarolina123@gmail.com

Uliviana Restu²

Department of Communication Studies, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,
Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Serang, Indonesia
uliviana.restu@untirta.ac.id

Ika Arinia Indriyany³

Department of Governance Studies, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,
Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Serang, Indonesia
ikaarinia@fisip-untirta.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study describes the hegemony produced by the Saudi Arabian state through the kafala system in the relationship between employers and female migrant domestic workers from Indonesia. The kafala system creates many problems due to the structural dependence between domestic migrant workers and their employers, ranging from heavy workloads and irregular wages to restrictions on access to mobility. Employers as individual sponsors have a large dominance of power so that the working conditions for domestic migrant workers become unbalanced. This study is analyzed using Antonio Gramsci's hegemonic perspective with three indicators of understanding, namely the ruling class, defense of the domination of the ruling class, and the crisis of ruling class hegemony. This study was dissected using a qualitative critical approach. This study indicates that the hegemony in this research phenomenon belongs to a declining level of hegemony characterized by the potential for disintegration hidden beneath the surface. Various restrictive Saudi Arabian regulations hamper the awareness of civil society, which has been gradually awakened. The limitations of civil society on access to participatory democracy have resulted in mass resistance to the Kafala system not coming to the surface

Keywords: Hegemony, Kafala System, Women Migrant Domestic Workers

Background

Hegemony can be exercised by anyone, anywhere, and anytime without exception, including in the working relations of employers and migrant workers. In Gramsci's sense, hegemony is a consensus in which submission is obtained by accepting class ideology fattened by the fattest class. Hegemony occurs when the lower society, including the proletariat, has accepted and imitated the elite groups' way of life, thinking, and views that dominate and exploit them.

The network of hegemony at the practice level exposes migrant workers as objects of hegemony before the employer. This is based on the full power that the employer has over migrant workers through a product of legitimacy in employment contracts. Some countries impose a system of employment contracts to regulate the working patterns of migrant workers, both formal and informal sectors working in their countries. The system implemented by each country can be based on policies made at the national level or adopting the policies of an international regime.

Countries that are members of the Cooperation Council for the Gulf States or better known as the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), namely Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Oman, Qatar, Kuwait, Lebanon, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE), impose an employment contract system called the Kafala System. The Kafala system is also known as the sponsorship/support system that requires migrant workers who want to work in GCC countries to have a sponsor that is an employer who will be fully responsible for migrant workers. According to the Migrant Forum in Asia, the Kafala system makes migrant workers legally bound to an employer or sponsor or employer (kafeel) for their contract period.

Saudi Arabia has the third-highest number of migrant workers after the United States and Germany, one GCC member state implementing the Kafala system. (United Nations, 2021) In other words, Saudi Arabia is the main destination for sending migrant workers to the Asian region. According to data compiled by the United Nations: Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), in 2020, as many as 13.5 million migrant workers were employed in Saudi Arabia. About 15% of migrant workers in Saudi Arabia are employed in the domestic sector, most of whom are women. (International Migration Organization, 2020)

Saudi Arabia is also one of the main destination countries for women migrant workers from Indonesia, especially in the domestic sector. Saudi Arabia became the 5th highest country in the placement of Indonesian migrant workers after Malaysia, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore. (United Nations, 2021) Saudi Arabia also has the highest number of domestic migrant workers from Indonesia among other Gulf countries (International Migration Organization, 2020). In 2018-2020, as many as 14,705 female migrant workers from Indonesia worked in the domestic sector in Saudi Arabia.

There are at least two factors in consideration as to why Saudi Arabia is one of the main destinations for most Indonesian migrant workers. First, Saudi Arabia is a country that has risen and squirmed in the economic sector, which certainly requires a lot of labor, thus encouraging and providing a place for many women to work in the formal sector. This creates

a vacancy in the domestic or household work sector, so there is a need for labor services to take care of household chores. (Azmy, 2012)

Second, Saudi Arabia's economic condition makes existing wages higher than working in Indonesia, especially in needed and at-risk sectors, namely domestic workers (Azmy, 2012). This is evidenced by the value of Indonesian labor remittances in Saudi Arabia is the highest among Indonesian migrant workers placement countries in other regions. In 2018 the remittance value of Indonesian migrant workers in Saudi Arabia reached USD 3.887 million or IDR 54.7 billion. Furthermore, in 2019 the value of remittances reached USD 3,803 million or IDR 53.5 billion. While in 2020 reached USD 2,990 million or worth Rp 42.1 billion. (Bank Indonesia and BP2MI, 2020)

During the working contract period in Saudi Arabia, at least two years, the domestic migrant worker's visa and legal status are tied to the sponsor or kafeel. This means that the employer as a sponsor has overall responsibility towards domestic workers, including worker recruitment costs, health checks, and national identity cards (iqama). That way, the employer (kafeel) has full control over the mobility of workers so that workers make them completely dependent on sponsors from the beginning of becoming workers. Because they are under an employment contract, migrant workers cannot enter the country, move jobs, or leave the country for any reason without written permission from the employer (kafeel). (Bajracharya & Sijapati, 2012)

Given these circumstances, problems around low pay, long working hours, and physical, verbal, sexual, and psychological violence often characterize the situation of domestic workers in Saudi Arabia. Domestic migrant workers are considered members of the employer's family (kafeel), so labor laws do not cover them. Their employment is not legally recognized or classified as a form of employment. This is based on Saudi Arabia's labor law amendment through Royal Decree No.M/51 on September 27, 2005. Under its current implementation, Saudi Arabia excluded domestic workers from labor law, leaving them without protection guaranteed to other workers. These protections include limits on working hours and prohibitions on wage cuts, holidays, and dispute resolution mechanisms in labor. Because of this, an invisible working class was formed in Saudi Arabia. These invisible working conditions make it increasingly difficult for countries to research and regulate their working conditions. (Pande, 2013)

Literature Review

Hegemony Antio Gramsci

In Gramsci's sense, hegemony is a consensus in which submission is obtained by accepting class ideology fattened by the fattest class. Hegemony is not the relationship of domination by using power but the relationship of consent using political and ideological leadership. Hegemony is the victory of the ruling class, obtained through the consensus mechanism of various sociopolitical forces.

Hegemony occurs when the lower society, including the proletariat, has accepted and imitated the elite groups' way of life, thinking, and views that dominate and exploit them.

Hegemony, according to Gramsci, will give birth to obedience, an attitude of accepting circumstances without questioning them critically again, because the ideology exposed by the hegemonic class is only swallowed up.

A class group is said to be hegemonic when it gains the approval of other social forces and classes by creating and maintaining a system of alliances through political and ideological struggle. According to Gramsci, the working class can only become a hegemonic class by paying attention to the various interests of the class and other social forces and bringing them together with their interests. (Gramsci, 1992)

Gramsci, in discussing hegemony, gives three boundaries of conceptualization, namely the economy, political society (political society), and civil society (civil society). Economics is the limit used to define the most dominant mode of production in a society.

In his book entitled *Prison Notebooks*, Gramsci dissected the relationship between political society and civil society using hegemony, later referred to as civil and political hegemony. Then the theory put forward by Gramsci was simplified into several key indicators as follows:

a. The ruling class

Hegemony is the victory of the ruling class obtained through the consensus mechanism of various socio-political forces. When Gramsci talks about consensus, he attributes it to a psychological spontaneity that includes various acceptances of sociopolitical rules or other aspects of the rule. In this case, consensus can occur through the following:

- 1) Because of the fear of consequences if you do not adjust,
- 2) Because accustomed to following goals in certain ways,
- 3) Because of awareness or approval of certain elements.

Consensus, according to Gramsci, is a consensus created because of the basis of consent. For Gramsci, a consensus accepted by the working class is inherently passive, meaning that consensus occurs not because the working class regards the existing social structure as its desire but rather because they lack a conceptual basis to understand social reality effectively. Gramsci concluded that the character of a consensus in capitalist society is contradictory consciousness. Thus, the hegemony exercised by the bourgeois class is the result of vague consensus. (Suyanto & Amal, 2010)

b. Maintaining dominance

Domination is a part that exists in the practice of hegemony where there is an act of control by the stronger (dominant) party against the weaker side (subaltern). Dominance can be done with or without coercive forms so that the ideas emphasized by the dominant group against the dominated group are accepted as something natural.

A power can work well if dominance complements the hegemony in both groups with a higher position with a lower one. In maintaining the power and dominance possessed by the ruling class, they continue to develop continuous efforts to revise the consensus and subservience of the proletarian class, especially through education and institutional mechanisms.

c. Crisis of the hegemony of the ruling class

The crisis of hegemony in the ruling class can only give rise to action or resistance if the consciousness of the most unsustainable masses has been formed and is ready to take action. Gramsci stated that where there is power, there is resistance to it. In an advanced capitalist society, where civil society is already developing, a different strategy is needed to counter dominant power. Gramsci calls this strategy a position war.

In war positions, the working class must dismantle the defense system in favor of bourgeois hegemony by building alliances with all social movements trying to change civil society relations. The hegemonic power of the bourgeoisie through organizations in civil society must continue to be weakened by gathering power under the leadership of the working class.

Based on reality, Gramsci proposes three levels of hegemony, namely: (Gramsci 1992)

- 1) Total hegemony (integral), characterized by an affiliation of a mass close to total. Society shows a solid level of moral and intellectual unity, which is evident from the organ relations of the government and the governed. The relationship is not tinged with contradictions and antagonism both socially and ethically.
- 2) Decadent hegemony, characterized by the potential for disintegration or potential conflict hidden beneath the surface, means that although the existing system has achieved its needs and objectives, the mass mentality is not truly in harmony with the dominant thinking and subjects of hegemony.
- 3) Minimum hegemony rests on the ideological unity between economic, political, and intellectual elites, simultaneously with an aversion to any mass interference in state life. Hegemonic groups are unwilling to align their interests and aspirations with other classes in society.

Employers and Domestic Migrant Workers

Employer/Sponsor

In the kafala system, the term employer is referred to as kafeel or sponsor. Kafeel is a sponsor for migrant workers, be it individuals or companies, and only gulf citizens can legally obtain permission to sponsor migrant workers. In Arabic, kafeel means "responsible." Nevertheless, the term "sponsor" (*kāfil*) means a person responsible for another person or thing.

Sponsors can be governments, GCC citizens, or companies that grant entry and employment visas to foreign workers, liable to the authorities if the foreign worker moves residence or employment. The sponsorship system requires the sponsor to take full responsibility. economic and legal responsibilities for employees during the term of the contract. (Malaeb, 2015)

The legal definition of "sponsor" is clearly stated in Article (1) of Law No. 4 of 2009, which regulates the entry and entry of expatriates in Saudi Arabia along with their residences and sponsors. This law provides a detailed definition of sponsorship and distinguishes between residence sponsors and exit sponsors as follows: (Malaeb, 2015)

- 1) Residence sponsor means the employer or anyone who invites visitors to his sponsor. The sponsorship includes granting permission to sponsored persons to leave the country.

- 2) Exit sponsor means the person who promises to fulfill all obligations that expatriates have not fulfilled to leave the country. Exit sponsorship responsibilities will expire once expatriates re-enter the state
- 3)

Domestic Migrant Workers

Domestic sector migrant workers are a group that works in the domestic sector. Generally, work in this sector is called domestic workers (PRT). This type of work tends to be dominated by women due to a patriarchal system that creates a stigma that the domestic sector is the realm of women. The patriarch system divides jobs discriminatorily against women and men.

The limitations of aspects of education, economy, and employment resulted in many women accepting fate as domestic worker migrant workers in hopes of bringing change to the woman's economy and her family. To earn money for a better life, millions of women migrate to major cities or across borders to work as babysitters, caregivers for the elderly, and house cleaners.

For the most part, low-skilled female migrant workers from Asian countries such as Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Indonesia, and the Philippines migrate to Gulf States such as Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Jordan, and Lebanon. However, they face some exploitation in these countries. (Hariati Hussin, 2013) This dashed the hopes of female migrant workers, and they faced a vulnerable situation due to various forms of oppression.

Gurrowitz (2000) explained that as many as 75% of female migrant workers in Saudi Arabia are from Indonesia and placed in the domestic sector as domestic workers. The treatment received by women migrant workers are not directly proportional to even the opposite of their work. They often receive acts of violence in physical, psychological, sexual, or economic torture from the employer who hired them. In other words, Gurrowitz said that 'Saudi Arabia needs migrant workers but does not want them,' which means Saudi Arabia needs migrant workers to facilitate their daily activities but does not want their presence as human beings who deserve to be treated fairly. (Haryani, 2011)

Method

The research method used is a qualitative method with a critical approach. This research aims to explore, dismantle, and further elaborate on the issue of research on the hegemony of the kafala system concerning the relationship between employers and women domestic migrant workers in Saudi Arabia. The critical research approach believes that research should be able to directly solve social problems of society, especially social inequalities caused by the influence of hegemony of the power of the ruling groups (patriarchal groups, capitalist groups, etc.). (Muslim, 2016)

The data sources that will be qualitatively analyzed in this study are primary and secondary data by obtaining data through tracing literature studies and conducting interviews with the parties concerned in the research. Interviews were conducted with the Secretary-General of

SBMI, Coordinator of SBMI Jeddah, Deputy for Protection and Placement of Europe and Middle East BP2MI, Deputy Director of HRWG, and women Indonesian domestic migrant workers who are working in Saudi Arabia.

Result and Discussion

In analyzing the hegemony of the kafala system in Saudi Arabia in the relations of employers and women of Indonesian domestic migrant workers, the author used three indicators of Antonio Gramsci's perspective hegemony as follows:

Ruling Class

Antonio Gramsci explained that hegemony could occur due to the victory of the ruling class obtained from the consensus mechanism of various socio-political forces. From the data findings, the socio-political power intended in this phenomenon can be seen in the system of government adopted by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in the form of an absolute monarchical system of government. Under this system of government, full power is in the hands of the king as the only ruler in Saudi Arabia. In the absolute monarchy system, the government does not involve public participation in the political and governmental spheres. The government strongly guarantees citizens' survival in Saudi Arabia by providing great access to social needs, education, health, housing, etc.

With the high delivery of migrant labor based on domestic service demand, Saudi Arabia needs to regulate migrant workers through labor regulations in the form of a kafala system. In implementing the kafala system, the state gives authority over implementing the system to Saudi nationals who serve as sponsors of migrant workers. The employer bears all mobility of migrant workers, including visas, accommodation costs, health, and even legal status as an individual sponsor of migrant workers. This makes the employer one of the ruling class elements under the kafala system due to the decrease in state authority over civil society. In addition, employers also have capital in fees paid to recruitment agencies as the cost of staying for domestic sector migrant workers. Employers often consider the initial costs to agents as the cost of "buying" domestic migrant workers. So many people consider that the kafala system is a modern system of slavery.

Suppose the state of Saudi Arabia becomes the ruling class based on the consensus of political forces in the form of an absolute monarchical system of government and sociopolitical rules in the form of a kafala system. In that case, the employer belongs to the elements of the ruling class based on the consensus that occurs through the following:

1. Fear of consequences if you don't adjust

The kafala system instills fear in domestic migrant workers if it violates the implementation of the system. Through the delegation of powers in the kafala system, the state authorizes local citizens to take responsibility for the supervision, policing, and control of migrant workers. The State also lowers responsibility directly to citizens who are sponsors of migrant workers in terms of regulation or enforcement of migrant workers.

Over this power, the employer controls the worker as an employer and representative of the state. So that if domestic migrant workers are considered to have violated kafala system regulations such as running away from the employer or transferring employers without the initial employer's permission, moving cities without the employer's permission, mobility without the employer's permission, and so on will be able to be legally acted upon when the employer reports it.

In addition, the fear of coercive actions that domestic migrant workers can experience if they do not implement this system further adds to their fear. If domestic migrant workers commit violations, employers to recruitment agencies do not hesitate to commit acts of violence against them. Therefore, domestic migrant workers are forced to submit to employers who have full power control under this kafala system.

2. Getting used to following goals in a certain way

Saudi Arabia imposed the kafala system for decades, so this system has become a culture for civil society there. Domestic migrant workers who have lived and worked in Saudi Arabia for a long time are certainly accustomed to implementing this system, so they unconsciously accept its existence and implementation of this system. The kafala system is so entrenched and has become a culture and custom for civil society in Saudi Arabia that its existence is difficult to abolish.

3. Awareness or approval of a particular element

Consciously migrant workers sign contracts or employment agreements granted by recruitment agencies and the employer as their sponsors. With the signing of this contract or employment agreement, explicitly, domestic migrant workers agree to the implementation of work based on the kafala system, whose implementation is carried out by the employer. The employer also controls domestic migrant workers with this contract or employment agreement. In its implementation, the employer holds the contract or employment agreement. In many cases, domestic migrant workers are not given knowledge about the content of the contract or employment agreement. So that the implementation of the employment contract depends on the employer's control. Domestic migrant workers who have signed an employment contract or employment agreement cannot move because the status of the contract is valid before the law.

Defense of the Domination of the Ruling Class

Dominance is a part that exists in the practice of hegemony where there is an act of control by the stronger (dominant) side against the weaker side (subordinate). A power can work well if dominance complements hegemony in two groups with higher and lower positions. In this study, it has been explained earlier that the ruling group is the state of Saudi Arabia, with employers as individual sponsors whose position dominates domestic migrant workers. It can be described as the forms of dominance carried out by employers to subdue domestic migrant workers are as follows:

1. Excessive Work and Lack of Rest

Domestic migrant workers in this study admitted that their employers require them to a very long time of up to 16 hours a day by doing various excessive work demands ranging from giving a large and spacious house, preparing food, taking care of all family members, including taking care of parents and children. The task they do themselves without any other bandages in the house. The Human Rights Watch report said that there were cases where domestic migrant workers were required to take care of an employer's home of 22 family members.

There are many cases where their employers do not allow them to rest even if they are sick or injured. Another case also revealed that employers do not grant the right of weekly holidays and monthly leave. In the absence of this holiday, domestic migrant workers will continue to work non-stop for many years according to the working contract period, which can also be extended up to 4-5 times.

2. Wage Abuses

Based on the data found, cases of wage abuse such as untimely payments, wage detention, and even unpaid wages are one of the cases that are often complained about by domestic migrant workers. In one case, domestic migrant workers said that their employers did not pay wages for six months. Employers withhold domestic migrant workers' wages until the end of the contract or promise to pay them directly to their families at home.

As patrons of domestic migrant workers, employers often feel justified in withholding wages on "teaching" domestic migrant workers how to save money and not spend all the money on daily expenses. In fact, in many cases, these truncated wages never make it to the families of domestic migrant workers and are not paid at the end of the contract. This is done to force domestic migrant workers to stay.

3. Passport Confiscation, Restricted Mobilisation, and Communication

Domestic migrant workers in Saudi Arabia describe the most common practices of employer dominance as confiscating passports and residence visas (iqama) and strict restrictions on access to mobility and communication that separate them from sources of social support. Domestic migrant workers in the study stated that their employers had confiscated their passports. Passport confiscation is a key element in identifying forced labor situations. Domestic migrant workers also say that their employers do not allow them to leave the homes where they work and even lock them inside. Over these mobility restrictions, domestic migrant workers feel isolated, especially if they live outside the main city and away from their embassies.

The regulations in Saudi Arabia on access to the mobility of domestic migrant workers are very different compared to other countries. Some domestic migrant workers in Saudi Arabia are not permitted to do activities outside the home, including gathering with fellow PMI without being accompanied by an employer. Domestic migrant workers are also restricted to access to communication and the internet, so many cases where families of domestic migrant workers report complaints of breaking up or losing contact over the years with domestic migrant workers working in Saudi Arabia. These prohibitions and

restrictions fall under the employer's control over domestic migrant workers to remain subject to the power of employer domination.

4. Forced Labor and Slavery

The situation and conditions of domestic migrant workers in Saudi Arabia are described as abusive situations that can be forced labor. Domestic migrant workers revealed their employers confiscated and withheld their passports. Domestic migrant workers are also in a situation of not being able to get out of abusive and exploitative work environments because their status will soon become illegal in the country of Saudi Arabia. Migrant workers can escape the work situation by paying back the recruitment fees that employers have paid for their service needs during their stay in Saudi Arabia. The cost is about \$365, equivalent to 1,370 Saudi riyals per year. This figure is unaffordable for most migrant workers who have escaped their contracts.

Domestic migrant workers also describe various situations in which they work under the threat of punishment, an aspect of forced labor. This includes situations where the employer threatens to commit physical violence; physically confined at work; subject to financial sanctions, including arbitrary salary cuts; threatens or reports them to the authorities for having "escaped" or violated the kafala system; threatens them with deportation; or falsely accused them of a crime.

The study found a tendency for employers to behave as if they had domestic migrant workers. Employers claim that the recruitment fee they pay to obtain domestic migrant workers' services is the price to be paid to acquire domestic migrant workers as the employer's property or investment. The study also mentioned that some employers even tell domestic migrant workers that they have "bought" them. The employer will not allow them to leave their jobs unless domestic migrant workers pay the previously described recruitment fees.

Saudi Arabia's legal framework allows domestic migrant workers to be trapped in situations of slavery. Given some of the experiences described by domestic migrant workers and the publication of reports from related NGOs, Saudi Arabia's legal framework, coupled with weak enforcement by the government over the country's already inadequate legal protections, is very risky to give rise to a situation of slavery. Saudi Arabia's legal framework facilitates the abuse of domestic migrant workers allowing situations where domestic migrant workers are physically confined in the homes where they work, left unpaid, subjected to physical or emotional abuse, cut off from all outside contacts, and unable to gain respect for the rights of workers they must have.

The explanation certainly answers that employers have a large role of dominance due to Saudi Arabia's state power transfer to citizens responsible for migrant workers under the kafala system. Domestic migrant workers in Saudi Arabia face working conditions that result in their status as sponsored parties being in a state of dependence and subordination to employers. Then these forms of dominance are maintained by the state of Saudi Arabia as the ruling class through the following mechanisms:

1. Kafala System

Saudi Arabia manages a kafala sponsorship system in which the ability of migrant workers to enter, live and work legally depends on one employer also serving as the worker's visa sponsor. The system gives employers excessive control over migrant workers and severely limits workers' ability to escape harsh working conditions. The Royal Police, which also acts as Saudi Arabia's immigration authority, imposed a kafala system and the Ministry of Manpower.

The policies and rules contained in the kafala system certainly strengthen the restrictive aspects of this system. Under the kafala system, it is stipulated that domestic workers are not allowed to work for other employers until their current employer terminates their sponsorship and all other required procedures have been followed. The labor law, which applies to other migrant workers, is also rooted in the kafala system and provides additional penalties for migrant workers who violate its restrictions.

Until now, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has not desired to take action in abolishing the kafala system as a labor regulation in Saudi Arabia. International forums have presented allegations surrounding exploitative actions produced by the kafala system and proposed to eliminate this system completely. In the absence of a policy of eliminating the kafala system that is very exploitative of domestic migrant workers, the situation and conditions of abuse will continue to occur to domestic migrant workers.

2. Exclusion of Domestic Migrant Workers from the Law

Saudi Arabia amended labor law through Royal Decree No. M/51 on September 27, 2005. Under its current implementation, Saudi Arabia excluded domestic workers from labor law, leaving them without protection guaranteed to other workers. These protections include limits on working hours and prohibitions on wage cuts, holidays, and dispute resolution mechanisms in labor. This happens because Saudi Arabia considers that workers who work in the domestic sector or domestic workers are not classified as a form of work. Domestic workers who live and work in the employer's home privately are considered family members of the employer, so their status does not need to be included in regulations or laws.

Crisis of Hegemony of the Ruling Class

The crisis of hegemony in the ruling class can only give rise to action or resistance if the consciousness of the displaced masses has been formed. This study found some obstacles to the crisis process of the hegemony of the ruling class or the process of strengthening mass resistance. These obstacles can be explained as follows:

1. Prohibition of the Establishment of Civil Organizations in Saudi Arabia

Saudi Arabia bans trade union activities for all labor sectors, including domestic sector migrant workers. Saudi Arabia does not allow any organization or trade union because of the form of absolute monarchical government that prohibits all forms of opposition and public involvement in elements of government. Through the system of absolute monarchical government, the state makes civil society depends on all aspects of social and economic life so that they become politically impotent. Civil society is not encouraged to criticize the state or engage in participatory democratic processes.

Although the right to freedom of association is a major human right and one of the basic principles of the ILO, it is also outlined in Domestic Workers Convention No. 189. However, this cannot be used as a legal basis in Saudi Arabia because the kingdom does not participate in ratifying the convention. The only recognized legal basis or basis in Saudi Arabia is Islamic sharia law under absolute monarchical rule.

The absence of organizations or trade unions in Saudi Arabia has resulted in a vacuum of civil society's role in contributing to policies, especially in this context regarding the kafala system. Civil society, including domestic migrant workers, cannot voice their exploitative situation and conditions before the state. Suppose it continues to insist on doing so. In that case, it will be considered a violation by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and punishable under the applicable law in Saudi Arabia. Public awareness to voice their fate as if buried by this policy.

2. Difficult Access to Mass Awareness by NGOs

The form of government of Saudi Arabia, whose absolute monarchy opposes the existence of any other existence other than the kingdom. The king fully held power without involving civil society participation. This condition makes it difficult for Indonesian NGOs who want to expand branches in placement countries such as Saudi Arabia to facilitate the adoption of troubled Indonesian migrant workers.

Advocacy issues and the difficulty of building awareness of Indonesian domestic migrant workers working in Saudi Arabia are also problems for NGOs engaged in human rights. It is very difficult to build awareness of Indonesian domestic migrant workers during Saudi Arabia's regulatory situation. The wiggle room of domestic migrant workers is increasingly limited by employers and the scope of countries that do not allow migrant workers to join trade unions. Moreover, migrant workers work within the scope of the employer's house, which is very isolated and closed, so it is increasingly difficult to supervise the movements of domestic migrant workers. Other barriers to organizing that domestic workers face include lack of rest time, low levels of education, and unsafe immigration status.

Although mass resistance is met with obstacles, domestic migrant workers, NGOs, and other civil societies realize that the kafala system provides poor and exploitative work experience for domestic migrant workers. So it can be said that mass awareness of the problems of the kafala system has been built, but there is still a limited system of government that applies in the country of Saudi Arabia. As a result, the resistance born by the masses has not been maximized to produce a crisis of hegemony for the ruling class.

The above discussion can refer to the conclusion of what kind of hegemony occurs in the phenomenon of the kafala system in the relationship of employers and women, Indonesian migrant workers. As explained in the previous section, Antonio Gramsci divides hegemony into total hegemony (integral), degenerate (decadent), and minimum hegemony.

Based on the reality awakened from the three indicators that have been described in this study, namely the ruling class, the defense of the dominance of the ruling class, and the crisis of hegemony of the ruling class, the hegemony that occurs in this research phenomenon belongs to the level of hegemony that declines (decadent). The level of decadent hegemony is characterized by potential disintegration or potential conflict hidden beneath the surface. The mentality of the masses is not really in harmony with the superiority of the class or the subject of hegemony. This can certainly be seen from the awareness of civil society that has been awakened in seeing the problems of the kafala system in Saudi Arabia but is hindered by Saudi Arabia's state policies and regulations that restrict civil society from accessing participatory democracy.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the discussion in the previous section, it can be concluded that the hegemony that occurs in the phenomenon of the Saudi Arabia kafala system in the relations between Indonesian domestic employers and migrant workers is included in the merosost hegemony (decadent). This conclusion is based on Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony which analyzes the relationship between political society and civil society through indicators of the ruling class, the defense of the dominance of the ruling class, and the crisis of hegemony of the ruling class.

Departing from the discussion, the ruling class in this research phenomenon is the Government of Saudi Arabia and the employer as the sponsor of individuals who rule through the consensus of socio-political forces (absolute monarchical system of government) and acceptance of sociopolitical rules (kafala system). Then the ruling class performs forms of domination as a tool to maintain the hegemony of power it has. The forms of dominance that employers do to women domestic migrant workers can be seen in various actions that make them dependent on employers, such as heavy and long workloads, wage abuses, confiscation of passports, and access to mobility and communication restrictions. The Government of Saudi Arabia maintains this form of dominance by implementing the kafala system and excluding domestic migrant workers from Saudi law. Then the resistance that occurred has

not been able to cause a crisis of hegemony in the ruling class due to resistance suppressed by various regulations in Saudi Arabia so that it does not surface.

The level of decadent hegemony is characterized by potential disintegration or potential conflict hidden beneath the surface. The mentality of the masses is not really in harmony with the dominant class thinking or the subject of hegemony. This can certainly be seen from the awareness of civil society that has been built up in seeing the problems of the kafala system in Saudi Arabia but still has not appeared to the surface due to being hindered by Saudi state policies and regulations that restrict civil society to access participatory democracy.

References

Journals and Previous Research:

- Al Shehabi, O. H. (2019). Policing labour in empire: the modern origins of the Kafala sponsorship system in the Gulf Arab States. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 00(00), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13530194.2019.1580183>
- Asriani, D. D., & Amalia, E. (2016). Jejak Perempuan Pekerja Migran dalam Masyarakat ASEAN 2015. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 18(2), 147. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.13129>
- Hariati Hussin, M. (2013). Factors Influencing Indonesian Women Becomes Migrant Workers. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, 2(1), 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.18196/hi.2013.0028.65-74>
- Haryani, R. N. (2011). Tinjauan Kriminologi Kritis Terhadap Kebijakan Negara Dalam Melindungi Perempuan Pekerja Migran Pekerja Rumah Tangga. *Indonesian Journal of Criminology*, 7(2), 174–192.
- Jureidini, R. (2010). Trafficking and contract migrant workers in the middle east. *International Migration*, 48(4), 142–163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2010.00614.x>
- Khan, A., & Harroff-Tavel, H. (2011). Reforming the Kafala: Challenges and opportunities in moving forward. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 20(3–4), 293–313. <https://doi.org/10.1177/011719681102000303>
- Malaeb, H. N. (2015). The “kafala” System and Human Rights: Time for a Decision. *Arab Law Quarterly*, 29(4), 307–342. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15730255-12341307>
- Pande, A. (2013). “The paper that you have in your hand is my freedom”: Migrant domestic work and the sponsorship (Kafala) system in Lebanon. *International Migration Review*, 47(2), 414–441. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imre.12025>
- Pithaloka, A. K. (2017). Analisis Relasi Kuasa Antara Majikan dan Pekerja Migran Domestik Perempuan dalam Sistem Kafala di Uni Emirat Arab. *Hubungan Internasional*, 1–22.
- Pratama, R. (2019). Menyoal Relasi Asisten Rumah Tangga dan Majikan. *Jurnal ANUVA*, 3(3), 241–245.
- Rachmawati, I. N. (2007). Pengumpulan Data dalam Penelitian Kualitatif: Wawancara. *Jurnal Keperawatan Indonesia* Volume 11 No 1, 35–40.
- Silvey, R., & Parreñas, R. (2019). Precarity chains : cycles of domestic worker migration from Southeast Asia to the Middle East Precarity chains : cycles of domestic worker migration from Southeast Asia to the Middle East. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 0(0), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1592398>
- Siswati, E. (2018). Anatomi Teori Hegemoni Antonio Gramsci. *Translitera : Jurnal Kajian Komunikasi Dan Studi Media*, 5(1), 11–33. <https://doi.org/10.35457/translitera.v5i1.355>
- Sultana, H., & Fatima, A. (2017). Factors influencing migration of female workers: a case of Bangladesh. *IZA Journal of Development and Migration*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40176-017-0090-6>

Ternandez, B. (2011). Household help? ethiopian women domestic workers' labor migration to the Gulf Countries. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 20(3-4), 433-457. <https://doi.org/10.1177/011719681102000309>

Book Source:

Azmy, A. S. (2012). *Negara dan Pekerja Migran Perempuan*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia

Bajracharya, R., & Sijapati, B. (2012). *The Kafala System and Its Implications*. Centre for the Study of Labour and Mobility, 1, 1-16. <https://soscbaha.org/ebook/the-kafala-system-and-its-implications-for-nepali-domestic-workers/>

Carlucci, A. (2013). Gramsci and Languages Unification, Diversity, Hegemony. In *Historical Materialism Book Vol 59*. BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047413257_011

Human Right Watch (2020). "Lebanon: Abolish Kafala (Sponsorship) System". Beirut: Human Right Watch.

Human Right Watch. (2008). "Seolah Saya Bukan Manusia" Kesewenang-wenangan terhadap Pekerja Rumah Tangga". New York: Human Right Watch.

Human Right Watch. (2013). "Claiming Rights: Domestic Workers Movement and Global Advances for Labor Reform". New York: Human Right Watch.

Human Right Watch (2014). "I Already Bought You: Abuse and Exploitation of Female Migrant Domestic Workers in the United Arab Emirates". New York. Human Right Watch.

International Labour Organization Jakarta. (2018). *Buku Saku Perlindungan dan Pencegahan untuk Pekerja Migran Indonesia*. Jakarta: ILO.

IOM INDONESIA. (2010). *Migrasi Tenaga Kerja Dari Indonesia*. IOM International Organization for Migration OIM Organisasi Internasional Untuk Migrasi, 1-96.

Ives, P. (2004). *Language & Hegemony in Gramsci*. In Pluto Press & Fenwood Publishing (Vol. 53).

Komnas Perempuan. (2020). *CATAHU 2020: KEKERASAN MENINGKAT: KEBIJAKAN PENGHAPUSAN KEKERASAN SEKSUALUNTUK MEMBANGUN RUANG AMAN BAGI PEREMPUAN DAN ANAK PEREMPUAN*. Jakarta: Komnas Perempuan.

Patria, N., & Arief, A. (2015). *Antonio Gramsci, Negara dan Hegemoni*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

SBMI. (2020). *Mengungkap Realita Ketidakadilan Pekerja Migran Indonesia dalam Proses Migrasi Ketenagakerjaan*. Jakarta: SBMI/Tifa Foundation.

Shah, N. (2010). *The Current Labor Force Structure of Nationals and Non-nationals in Kuwait and the Likely Impact of Recent Policies*. Cambridge, UK.: Gulf Research Meeting

Simon, R. (2004). *Gagasan-Gagasan Politik Gramsci*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Thomas, P. D. (2009). *The Gramscian Moment (Philosophy, Hegemony, and Marxism)*. In *Historical Materialism Book Series (Vol. 24, Issue 9)*. Brill.

Varia, N. (2007). *Globalization Comes Home: Protecting Migrant Domestic Workers' Rights*. Human Rights Watch World Report