

---

# **SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE PEDAGOGY OF SHALOM AND SHARED CHRISTIAN FAITH AS A SYNERGETIC PARTNERSHIP A CRITICAL REFLECTION ON NEOLIBERAL PEDAGOGY**

**Ferdinant Alexander<sup>1\*</sup>, Sance Mariana Tameon<sup>2</sup>,  
Leryani Mince Maria Manuain<sup>1</sup> and Zummy Anselmus Dami<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> *Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Kupang, Department of Christian Religious Education, East Nusa Tenggara, 85142, Indonesia*

<sup>2</sup> *Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Kupang, Department of Pastoral Counseling, East Nusa Tenggara, 85228, Indonesia*

<sup>3</sup> *Universitas Persatuan Guru 1945 NTT, Faculty of Education, East Nusa Tenggara, 85119, Indonesia*

(Received 28 July 2020, revised 5 January 2021)

---

## **Abstract**

This research aimed to investigate the similarity between the pedagogy of shalom and the pedagogy of shared Christian faith in the effort of criticizing the neoliberal pedagogy within the framework of a synergetic partnership. The method which is used in this research is qualitative with a dialectical approach in Groome praxis construction. The results suggest that the purpose of education is reconciliation for the Kingdom of God. The content of education is contextualized into the situation and background of students (a movement from Christian story and vision into the story and vision of the students). The target of education is the transformation of students' lives holistically including cognitive, affective and behavioural. The method of education is including discovery learning (inquiry), cooperative learning and dialectics. The teacher carries the responsibilities as missional leaders and the witnesses of Christ to their students, and the role of students is perceived as discoverer, constructor and transformer who have been called to become history makers.

*Keywords:* shalom, Christian, faith, neoliberal, critical

---

## **1. Introduction**

Christian Religious Education (CRE) was established as a mandatory subject in Indonesia's national curriculum in the 1950s [1]. Since then, differentiating between the curriculum of religious education taught in schools

---

\*E-mail: nand.soinbala@gmail.com

versus that which taught in church has been thoughtfully considered. Changes have been made, especially following changes made to the national curriculum.

Sutarno explained that in the context of the congregation, CRE focuses on establishing a solid foundation and bolstering the faith of the congregation, while in the school context, the emphasis is on the practical living out of the faith in the wider community [2].

This framework provides hope for the presence of CRE learning in schools, which can lead to a transformation of knowledge, values and behaviour. Student can adopt values based on the Christian faith which manifest not only in their faithfulness to God but also their allegiance to the country, thus portraying nationalism as imbedded Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution [3]. To meet both these goals, CRE teachers should not only focus on building the faith of the students through the teaching about God and the way God works, but also guide them in understanding, internalizing and putting into practice their knowledge of God.

However, the reality does not meet this expectation. CRE teachers may be tempted to abandon their role of helping students live out their faith in day-to-day life [4] by using conventional teaching practices in CRE. These teaching practices emphasize lecturing, giving repetitive assignments and having final tests, which is an integral part of this activity [5]. It has been found that teachers often do not explore the integration of students' prior knowledge with the new information taught in CRE. Furthermore, students are often not seen as subjects within the learning process and as a result, they are not engaged in the classroom.

Similarly, the synergy between students' cognitive abilities and their skills, values, behaviours as well as their personhood, which are parallel to the primary aim of education, has not been maximized [6]. As a result, the learning process only reflects intellectual competition through memorization, which often obstructs learners' freedom and creativity. Focusing on rote memorization has shaped CRE activities in schools as nothing more than indoctrination [7].

The indoctrination approach to learning promotes a dogmatic-exclusive attitude [8]. Consequently, there is a fear among educators that the Christian faith may create an 'alien' community within Indonesia's diverse society.

A research conducted by Sterkens and Yusuf found that although there is contact in Indonesia among students from various religious backgrounds, that contact often is forced [9]. Inclusivity has not been intentionally promoted and interaction among learners from diverse religious backgrounds often takes place simply because it is unavoidable. CRE teachers can fight exclusivity by promoting an inclusive approach [10]. By being inclusive rather than exclusive, the primary aim of CRE of uniting learners and introducing them to God through the life and teaching of Jesus Christ becomes attainable. As such, CRE can help to teach students to live in the love of Christ while being agents of social transformation. In doing so, learners can live out the love of Christ through their participation in fighting injustice, dehumanization, fundamentalism, fanaticism and radicalism to create a peaceful Indonesia.

Wattimena found that Indonesia has experienced an uptake in neoliberal thinking in various spheres of life, including education. Quoting Giroux, Wattimena stated that pedagogy of neoliberalism has killed education by turning student into zombies, humans who have lost their humanity though they have not completely died [11]. The paradigm of neoliberal education emphasizes the ability to only beat the competition. As per Wattimena the process of education is determined by three things namely the systematization of learning, absolute memorization and mandatory testing. Learners are seen as machines that must comply with their teacher's orders.

This pattern is killing the culture of critical thinking, systematic, and involvement in social change that is precisely necessary for the development of a democratic society. Learners who cannot run this process are considered foolish and need to undergo some special therapeutic procedures [11]. In line with this, Dami refers to the neoliberal pedagogy as universal, omitting democracy and emphasizing privatization, while upholding competition, compliance and interpreting the roles and functions of the teacher as technicians or machines. Pedagogy tends to favour political and economical rulers in order to achieve the desired goals, such as free-market fundamentalism, which eventually leads to the dehumanization, the declining of education quality and the commercialization of education that merely oriented to dredging profit [12].

The creation of a pedagogy of shalom and a pedagogy of shared Christian faith brings hope by providing a new paradigm to oppose the spread of neoliberal pedagogical practices in the context of CRE in Indonesia. An earlier study related to the relevance of a pedagogy of shalom in Christian education was conducted, but it did not focus on CRE as a subject in the curriculum. In his study, Dami divides the pedagogy of shalom into four key ideas covering its purpose, content, methods and characteristics of teachers' competence [12].

The primary purpose of CRE in the pedagogy of shalom is reconciliation, both in vertical and horizontal relationships, that is the relationship with God, self, others and the Universe [12, 13]. Thus, the primary purpose of CRE is not merely to equip learners with the knowledge, skills and expertise needed to enter employment and service, but also to prepare them to be agents of reconciliation who bring shalom amid various social issues.

The content of learning is contextualized to the situation and the background of the students. Learning happen through an open process between educators and learners that involves investigations based upon questions that inspire curiosity, discovery exploration, as well as deeper application in finding out what is true, meaningful and legitimate. Therefore, teachers are seen as missional leaders who act and function to lead learners to grow through the involvement and dialogue on social and political issues. They do so by providing sufficient time and learning resources to help the students by modelling compassion, by recognizing talents and unique qualities of learners, that is, competence and by understanding that teaching is a calling from God. The roles, functions and characteristics of missional leaders are based on the act of agape love [12].

The pedagogy of shared Christian faith suggests the identification of the purpose of CRE within the Kingdom of God, Christian faith and in the context of human freedom [14]. Based on this theological belief, the process of education in the pedagogy of shared Christian faith is free from any form of coercion (both indoctrination and manipulation), while it promotes human emancipation. Faith and life are dialectically integrated through critical reflection activities [15], in that the implementation is done through the shared Christian praxis or “life to faith to life” [16]. The integration of faith and life involves the integration of head, heart and hand [15]. Astley calls it a cognitive, affective and behavioural decision [17, 18]. Learners are perceived as subjects rather than objects, in that they are entitled to be treated with respect and dignity as individuals and have the ability to respond to their own calling, while the teacher is a person who bears testimony (witnessing) without the intention to substitute Christ [14].

Different from the earlier study of the pedagogy of shalom conducted in its relation to the CRE in Indonesia, a comprehensive study of the pedagogy of shared Christian faith in its relation to the CRE as a subject within the National Curriculum has not been conducted [19-22]. Coming out from the awareness that there is no perfect Christian praxis approach, the need for synergies between the pedagogy of shalom and the pedagogy of shared Christian faith can be a significant contribution to fight against the ideology and practice of neoliberal pedagogy in the context of Christian religious education in Indonesia as well as to layout a new paradigm for the praxis of CRE that fits the context of Indonesia. As the first study to examine this, the purpose of this research is to investigate the similarity between the pedagogy of shalom and the pedagogy of shared Christian faith in an attempt to criticize neoliberal pedagogy within the frame of a synergetic partnership.

## **2. Methods**

The study was conducted using a qualitative method with a dialectical approach in Groome praxis construction [14, 23]. Three moments of Hegel’s dialectic were used as three different stages of the research. First, the positing of an idea. At this stage, the authors formulate the main ideas of the pedagogy of shalom, the pedagogy of shared Christian faith, and neoliberal pedagogy in term of their educational components such as objective, content, outcomes/targets, methods, competence and teacher characteristics, as well as student characteristics. A review of literature on each pedagogy will be conducted to understand their main ideas and components. The study of the pedagogy of shalom is obtained from the literature originating from the writings of Lee & Kaak as the initiators of the emergence of shalom pedagogy [13, 24, 25], the pedagogy of shared Christian faith is based on Groome’s work which gave rise to the term share Christian faith [14-16, 18], while the study material on neoliberal pedagogy refers to the literature by Giroux and Shahsavari-googhari [26, 27].

**Table 1.** The comparison of the pedagogy of shalom, the pedagogy of shared Christian faith, and neoliberal pedagogy.

<b>The essence question</b>	<b>Meaning of questions</b>	<b>Key ideas of neoliberal pedagogy</b>	<b>The key idea of the pedagogy of shalom</b>	<b>The key idea of the pedagogy of shared Christian faith</b>
Why to teach?	Purpose of education	Free market fundamentalism	reconciliation	The Kingdom of God, Christian faith and human freedoms
What is being taught?	Content of education	universal	contextualize (multicultural)	From the story and the Christian vision to the story and the student vision (contextual-multicultural)
What outcomes of teaching?	Target of education	Business and economic profit	The integration of hearts and behaviours and life transformation through the implementation of learning	Engaging head, heart & hand
How to teach?	Education methods	Individual centred, competitions, memorization and blind obedience	Discovery (Inquiry-based) Learning, cooperative learning, community centred & relations-oriented (heart-to-heart)	Dialectical (dialogue and critical reflection)  Share Christian praxis/ share faith/ life to faith to life
Who is the teacher?	Teacher of characteristics and competencies	Technicians and machines	A missional leader	Teachers witnessing (testifies)
Who is the student?	Student of characteristics	Robot	Discoverer, constructor & transformer	Subject history maker

Secondly, the stage of negation from contradictions arising from within and inherent to the idea. At this stage, the study compares the three types of pedagogy based on the main ideas that have been formed, through a dialogical process, in order to find similarities and differences between the three through critical reflection. To facilitate the comparison process the authors formulate

these ideas comprehensively (Table 1). In line with Groome's praxis construction, the study does not see differences as an inevitable negation 'but as an alternative perspective', through which dialogue can become a moment of peace rather than conflict. The study puts emphasis on the potential of dialectics, as a creative resolution through dialogue, rather than on the negative and contradictory aspects. Therefore, at this stage the critical reflection is carried out on on-going educational practices from the results of theoretical studies of neoliberal pedagogy which need to be criticized by the pedagogy of shalom and the pedagogy of shared Christian faith which theoretically proposes constructive practices for CRE in Schools.

Third, the stage of the incorporation of the insights of the first and the second moments into a synthesis. Based on the results of the comparisons, the authors synthesize the pedagogy of shalom and shared Christian faith because they both share fundamental ideas in a synergistic partnership framework, then build a conceptual framework to criticize neoliberal pedagogy. In the end, we will demonstrate the need for argumentative implementation of the fundamental ideas of the pedagogy of shalom and shared Christian faith compared to neoliberal pedagogy in the context of CRE in Schools to bring about reconciliation for the Kingdom of God.

### **3. Similarities between the pedagogy of shalom and shared Christian faith - a critical reflection on neoliberal pedagogy**

The similarities between the key ideas of the pedagogy of shalom and the pedagogy of shared Christian faith are described in six dimensions, namely education purpose, educational content, outcomes, teaching methods, teacher of characteristics and competencies, and student of characteristics (Table 1).

#### **3.1. Purpose of Education**

The primary purpose of the pedagogy of shalom is reconciliation. The rationale is that all humanity has sinned. Sin has resulted in human relationships becoming corrupted, both vertically and horizontally. Reconciliation is present to restore the relationship. The concept of reconciliation does not originate from the human mind. Reconciliation is the idea of God; therefore, man must learn to understand and align with the thoughts and ideas of God so that reconciliation can be integrated into the life and become a lifestyle [28]. In relation to one's fellowman, reconciliation can be understood as exchanging places with 'the other', meaning that when someone is reconciled - someone exchanging places with 'the other' and is in solidarity rather than against 'the other'. Reconciliation is a process of overcoming alienation through the introduction of solidarity, creating peace, restoration of relationships, positive change, new frameworks, and meaningful togetherness both spiritually and politically amid the existence of cracks, dehumanization and polarisation [29, 30].

The idea of reconciliation in the pedagogy of shared Christian faith is contained in all the themes of the purpose of CRE, namely the Kingdom of God as ultimate purpose, Christian faith and human freedom as an immediate purpose [14]. The rationale, similar to the pedagogy of shalom is that all humans have sinned and are separated from God. Reconciliation in the pedagogy of shared Christian faith is interpreted as a response to repentance through and in Jesus Christ. There is no reconciliation without repentance [31]. Repentance leads to the God-man reconciliation but also allow every man to take place together with 'the other' in the relationship as of fellow members of the Kingdom [14]. Christ's death and resurrection are the source of power in which the Kingdom of God can be presented [32]. The presence of the Kingdom of God is expressed by faith in the reality of liberating life, which is freedom from sin and freedom for fellowship and service to others.

The study found that the suitability of the goals of pedagogy of shalom and the pedagogy of shared Christian faith could be simply formulated as 'reconciliation for the Kingdom of God'. Education based on reconciliation for the Kingdom of God leads to a complete renewal. The repentance or reconciliation experienced by each individual must be expressed in the community's efforts to change the structure of oppressive structures, promote justice, peace and freedom because all are promises of the Kingdom of God. The implications of the presence of the Kingdom of God personally lead to the call to promote the values of the Kingdom jointly in social, political, economic and cultural structures.

The response to the Kingdom call was to live a partnership with others [33]. Every individual who chooses to live according to the plan of the Kingdom of God participates in this social responsibility [34]. This is possible because the freedom that Jesus Christ has done is social and political freedom as well as spiritual and psychological freedom [M. Charlesworth SJ, Unpublished Draft, Written for BTh 1<sup>st</sup> Year T15 - Pastoral/Practical Theology I, 14 (n.d.) 1-11].

Education, with the intent of reconciliation for the Kingdom of God, should be a liberating education of all kinds of oppression [7]. Education should benefit the changing needs of the society with the characteristics and values of the Kingdom of God that have a real impact. Various social attributes (honesty, respect, tolerance and understanding, caring, inclusiveness and responsibility) must be reflected in the conduct of graduates, as described in this study [35].

In line with the case, quoting Groome, Nuhamara states that CRE's essence is *conation* (wisdom), which means learners know, love or want and do what is right. The truth can be understood as everything that humanizes the man and gives life [20]. This is what distinguishes it from neoliberal pedagogy tendency emphasizes on free-market fundamentalism with the primary goal of accumulating economic profit, thinking about self-safety and if it is necessary to sacrifice others for their salvation [12]. Educational institutions have become the main target of the marketization agenda. The educational essence has been transformed from the interests and joint activities of being an individual commodity traded [36]. Şahin and Acar define such an education as an

‘ideological tool’ to reproduce inequality. This kind of pattern will obviously not bring justice, peace and freedom as the promise of the Kingdom of God, but rather to create destructive competition, oppressive and vulnerable to injustice [37].

### **3.2. Content of Education**

In the full awareness that Education intends to bring about liberation, in its implementation, both the pedagogy of shalom and the pedagogy of shared Christian faith emphasize that teachers should understand that effective learning is formed by the context in and around the learning situation. Therefore, the key idea formulation of the content of the pedagogy of shalom is contextualizing, and the key idea of the content pedagogy of shared Christian faith is from the story and the Christian vision towards the story and vision of learners. These two different terms have the same meaning that the content of education should be contextualized based on the situation and background of the learners.

Christian stories and visions become content (material) learning that must be contextualized to become the student’s own story and vision [14]. Students are encouraged to use critical thinking and ask to consider whether the fundamental assumptions and beliefs they have learned about the real world are accurate and useful for their life and many people [38], who are then internalized into their own stories and vision. This description is in line with the tenth phase of the Mezirow transformative learning, which is reintegration into a person’s life based on conditions determined by one’s perspective [39].

Contextualize the content (material) of the learning expressed by this and the pedagogy of shared Christian faith is opposed to the idea of a universal neoliberal pedagogy learning material, which completely ignores the context of the situation and the student’s background. For neoliberal pedagogy, the uniqueness of students as individuals who learn does not need to be considered, which ultimately, students become passive and neutral. In fact, contextualising became a critical factor for Jesus’ teaching that reflects who his disciples, where they came from, and where they would go [24].

From Jesus, we can learn that even though identity is a sociological reality, it is not a purpose in himself to whom all things depend. Identity as members of the Kingdom of God is truly based on the works of faithfulness to God’s will for justice, truth and welfare [40]. Education is an act of love for others. Therefore, the foundations of learning should come from the needs of others, and the content of learning should be taken from their lives, so that learning can be based on the exchange of ideas and creative experiences, derived from the daily life content of students [14, 25, 41].

### **3.3. Target of Education**

The idea of the pedagogy of shalom and the pedagogy of shared Christian faith allows creating a full transformation of the students’ lives through the



application of learning. The similarity of ideas appears clearly in the outcome of learning. The heart and behaviour of the students integrated into learning is the key idea of a pedagogy of shalom. Meanwhile, Groome illustrates holistically as the integration of head, heart and hand [15] or cognitive, affective and behavioural decisions [17, 18]. The primary purpose of education is not a mere achievement and mastery of academic skills, but also the effort to achieve the full degree of human being determined by the presence of noble character. This is important because the academic ability is fundamental to behave. Education should lead students to the introduction of cognitive value, affective value, and ultimately to real-value practices (psychomotor) [6, 42].

Education is not merely the transfer of knowledge, but Education is required to improve human quality and embedded values as well as forming a perfect human person [43], unlike neoliberal pedagogy which only sees intellectuals as business tools, economic profit collectors and state ideology tools that secretly work to ensure ideological power. Consequently, students are immersed in pre-determined practices, according to ideologies. Students' ability is measured only through an increased percentage of test scores [12].

### **3.4. Education methods**

The pedagogy of shalom and shared Christian faith are free of all kinds of coercion, manipulation and indoctrination. Instead, it may well promote the emancipation of students, open space to dialogue that forms attitudes and critical thinking abilities. This same belief is described in the method used by both types of pedagogy. Discovery (inquiry-based) in the pedagogy of shalom and dialectics (critical dialogue and reflection) in the pedagogy of shared Christian faith has a relationship that can be explained as follows: learning is to build a critical reflection in the middle of society [38] and the learning process is often based on the inquiry of practices, which usually depends on formulating a question [44].

Questioning is a natural character owned by everyone [45] who can encourage students to engage in critical thinking [46]. Questioning means thinking, and thinking is manifested in the form of questions. The type of question that triggers another question is a critical question [47]. The appropriate question plays an essential role in promoting, extracting and bringing out different, creative and critical ideas [48]. In relationships with teaching in the classroom, questions are essential because questions motivate students, draw their attention to focus, create deeper information processing, tell students an excellent way to master the content of the material, and allow them to practice and repeat it [49, 50]. The significance of the question is also understood by Jesus, where He uses questions to review common principles and improve His audience's critical thinking skills [51].

Therefore, any approaches that tend to control the students or deprive their right to argue, as shown by neoliberal pedagogy counterproductive with the pedagogy of shalom and shared Christian faith. For neoliberal pedagogy,

knowledge is a certainty that must be memorized and mastered. Competitions in the learning process are only measured through memorization ability. Memorization tasks are rewarded higher than on analysis using critical thinking. Obedience is rewarded higher than creativity [26, p. 7-9]. Students are only viewed as robots who must obey their teaching orders. This pattern makes students have no initiative and kills a culture of critical thinking, investigation, and dialogue. Jesus never feeds truth to His disciples without any inquiry process with questions that stir up curiosity, discovery, exploration and deep application.

### ***3.5. Teacher of characteristics and competencies***

The pedagogy of shalom and shared Christian faith gives enlightenment to teachers that knowledge is not there to control and manipulate students for specific purposes but to make room for students to explore themselves in order to find meaning that will be the knowledge and grip for themselves. In relation to this, the pedagogy of shalom mentions teachers as missional leaders who are carrying out their roles and functions to lead learners to grow through active involvement and dialogue with them on various issues, whether it is a matter of faith and social issues, politics, economics and other issues relevant to the lives of students. Dialogue is built beyond the student's cognitive boundaries, to be internalized and manifested in real life situation in students' lives. Therefore, the model of missional leadership demands an exemplary ability.

In the pedagogy of share Christian faith, a teacher is instrumental in presenting and echoing the testimony of Christ through his or her example of life. The teacher comes as the representation of the living Christ for his or her students. The teacher's roles and responsibilities are seen as the one who testifies (witnessing) of Christ through real life and the ministry of the Word done not by preaching (although there is a news element through Catechesis), but a ministry that is "manifest" [14]. The incarnation of Christ is the primary basis for teachers to present themselves as witnesses. God presents Himself, in the same principle, that teachers must represent Jesus Christ through their lives.

For the pedagogy of shalom and shared Christian faith, Jesus is the only model of ideal teachers for exemplary, in not only His love but also a clear vision and mission of the Kingdom of God [25, 52]. Based on this, the teacher must see themselves in love while teaching. Love in educational contexts is a political force (love as a political force), a human power and a proper calling to echo God's love to see others as seeing oneself [53]. The love discussed in this study is Agape Love (unconditional love). This love does not depend on human action, but the act of God as the cause and source of that love. Teacher's role is to educate, teach, create a dialogue room with learners in love so that students become agents of love for the realization of social transformation, moral, economics, politics and democracy that is not anarchist.

CRE' teachers have important roles and responsibilities in witnessing the presence of Christ by contributing to humanity, the development of the nation, serving the community, and producing humble leaders of the future and who prioritize social justice and welfare for many people [54]. To achieve that intent the teacher must first experience the love of God by reconciling him or herself with God, him or herself, others and nature. This representation of love is not taught and performed by neoliberal pedagogy that understands and perceiving teachers only as 'technicians' (knowledge workers) who are responsible for preparing the students to be able to cope with the tests, as well as the machines that bind, regulate and control the practices of neoliberal productivity agenda [27, p. 22].

If we see this problem deeper, one of the most important problems in the world of education is that teachers are not being involved in the duties and responsibilities of education in the real sense, but only to teach formalities. The transformation that occurs only for knowledge transfer - only involves the role of teacher knowledge and ignorance of students. In such a teaching process, the teacher does not give understanding to the students, but only moves some formulas or arguments to the student to memorize, which will then be issued if it is necessary. As a reconciliation agent, teachers must teach the spiritual values, norms, moral, ethics, and habituation of the positive character [52]. Therefore, CRE' teacher should: 1) love his or her students as God loves, 2) keep the holiness of the life of the students as God's partners in carrying out the teacher's duties, 3) do his or her duty as God's calling, and 4) be an example for students [10, 55].

### ***3.6. Student of characteristics***

Interactions between teachers and students on the pedagogy of shalom and the pedagogy of shared Christian faith are dynamic and collaborative. This means that learning interactions are a mutual relationship that affects teachers and students. This allows the creation of a dimension to exchange ideas, articulating problems from a shared perspective and constructs meaning to be understood together. Thus learning will be a creative process, not boring and exhausting [25], because students really experience their own learning process. Therefore, in view of the pedagogy of shalom, students are seen as discoverers, constructors, even transformers. In line with the idea, the pedagogy of shared Christian faith sees students as a subject that has a call to be a history marker, and not just as robots that are forced to obey his or her teacher's orders as the view of neoliberal pedagogy [14].

Synergistic pedagogy of shalom and pedagogy of the shared Christian faith not only criticize the practice of neoliberal pedagogy but contributes significantly to understand the purpose of CRE, CRE' content, CRE' target, CRE' method and characteristic teacher of CRE and student. It is intended for the understanding, passion and practice of Christian values in the study of CRE that is worth reconciliation for the Kingdom of God can be realized. The

practical application of ideas systematically in CRE' learning needs to be further developed. This study is limited to the discovery of constructive pedagogy ideas for CRE' learning, while its practical application has not been implemented. Thus, this study provides opportunities for the following researchers, namely the practical application of ideas from the pedagogy of shalom and shared Christian faith in CRE' learning in the classroom.

#### 4. Conclusions

The results of studies have shown that there is a similarity between the pedagogy of shalom and shared Christian faith in the frame of a synergetic partnership in criticizing the neoliberal pedagogy. The similarities between the two types of pedagogy include: (1) the primary purpose of education is reconciliation for the Kingdom of God, not free-market fundamentalism. Driven by this purpose, education will lead to the renewal of oppressive structures and the promotion of values such as justice, peace, and freedom from sin and freedom for communing and serving the Lord and others (student, family, community and nation). (2) By the content of education, teachers must understand that the content of education is contextualized based on the situation and background of the student (from the story and the Christian vision to the story and the student vision). This indicates that the content of education is not universal and neutral. (3) The target of education - the life transformation of students holistically through the implementation of learning includes cognitive, affective and behavioural transformations (head, heart and hand integration) instead of business and economic profit. (4) Education methods - questions have an important role in learning that is designed through discovery learning (inquiry), cooperative learning and dialectics instead of individual-centred, and, memorization and blind obedience. (5) Teacher's characteristics and competence - teachers are not to be perceived as technicians or machines (knowledge workers), but rather as missional leaders who have an important role of presenting and echoing the testimony of Christ through his or her exemplary life, and should be able to lead learners to grow through involvement and dialogue on various issues such as faith, social, political, economic and other issues relevant to student life. (6) Student's characteristics - students are understood as discoverers, constructors, and transformers who are called to be the history makers rather than robots that are forced to obey their teacher's orders.

#### References

- [1] R.R. Boehlke, *Sejarah Perkembangan Pikiran dan Praktek Pendidikan Agama Kristen: Dari Yohanes Amos Comenius sampai Perkembangan PAK di Indonesia*, BPK Gunung Mulia, Jakarta, 2001, 807.
- [2] S. Sutarno. *Jurnal Pelita Zaman*, 4(1) (1989) 1-5.
- [3] J.B. Non-Serrano and S. Suleeman, *Buku Guru Pendidikan Agama Kristen dan Budi Pekerti Kelas 10 SMA/SMK*, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia, Jakarta, 2017, 14.

- [4] R. Samosir, *Jurnal Pionir LPPM Universitas Asahan*, **5(3)** (2019) 64-68.
- [5] D. Yulianingsih and S.M.M. Lumban Gaol, *Jurnal FIDEI*, **2(1)** (2019) 100-119.
- [6] E.R. Intarti, *Regula Fidei*, **1(2)** (2016) 260-272.
- [7] D. Sianipar, *Shanan: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Kristen*, **1(1)** (2017) 136-157.
- [8] W. Sairwona, *Shanan: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Kristen*, **1(1)** (2017) 83-92.
- [9] C. Sterkens and M. Yusuf, *Journal of Empirical Theology*, **28(1)** (2015) 49-89.
- [10] J. Messakh, *Sikip*, **1(1)** (2020) 47-59.
- [11] R.A.A. Wattimena, *Jurnal Filsafat*, **28(2)** (2018) 180-199.
- [12] Z.A. Dami, *Jurnal Filsafat*, **29(1)** (2019) 134-165.
- [13] H. Lee and P. Kaak, *The Pedagogy of Shalom: Theory and Contemporary Issues of a Faith-based Education*, Springer, Singapore, 2017, 1-30.
- [14] T.H. Groome, *Christian Religious Education: Berbagi Cerita & Visi Kita*, BPK Gunung Mulia, Jakarta, 2010, 49-394.
- [15] T.H. Groome, *Compass: A Review of Topical Theology*, **4(3)** (2006) 17-24.
- [16] T.H. Groome, *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, **8(1)** (2011) 8-23.
- [17] J. Astley and L. Bowman, *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, **9(1)** (2012) 94-99.
- [18] T.H. Groome, *Relig. Educ.*, **113(2)** (2018) 147-155.
- [19] O.R. Hutabarat, *Voice of Wesley: Jurnal Ilmiah Musik Dan Agama*, **2(1)** (2018) 61-78.
- [20] D. Nuhamara, *Jurnal Jaffray*, **16(1)** (2018) 93-115.
- [21] S. Harjanto, *Indonesian Journal of Theology*, **4(1)** (2016) 127-164.
- [22] D. Sianipar, *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Kristen Shanan*, **3(2)** (2019) 115-127.
- [23] N.B. Woodbridge, *Conspectus: The Journal of the South African Theological Seminary*, **10(1)** (2010) 115-132.
- [24] H. Lee, *Christian Educators Journal*, **54(2)** (2014) 21-24.
- [25] H. Lee, *The Pedagogy of Shalom: What, How, Why, and Who of Faith-Based*, Springer Nature, Singapore, 2017, 5-210.
- [26] H.A. Giroux, *On Critical Pedagogy*, The Continuum International Publishing Group, New York, 2011, 3-180.
- [27] R. Shahsavari-googhari, *How Do Teachers Challenge Neoliberalism Through Critical Pedagogy Within and Outside of the Classroom?*, The University of Western Ontario, Ontario, 2017.
- [28] C.P. De Young, *Biblical Reconciliation as 'God's One-Item Agenda: Broad Reflections on The Doctrine and Practice*, Anderson University, Anderson (IN), 2012, xxii.
- [29] J.W. De Gruchy, *Reconciliation: Restoring Justice*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 2002, 51.
- [30] S.G. Hines, *The Theme of My Life*, in *Beyond Rhetoric: Reconciliation as a Way of Life*, Wipf & Stock, Eugene, 2011, xxi.
- [31] E. Katongole and C. Rice, *Reconciling All Things: A Christian Vision for Justice, Peace and Healing*, InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, 2008, 147-151.
- [32] R. Kerovec, *Kairos: Evangelical Journal of Theology*, **2(2)** (2008) 189-208.
- [33] T. Beaudoin, *Relig. Educ.*, **100(2)** (2005) 127-138.
- [34] W. Pannenberg, *Theology and The Kingdom of God*, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1969, 80
- [35] G. Cross, G. Campbell-Evans and J. Gray, *International Journal of Christianity & Education*, **22(1)** (2018) 23-38.
- [36] S. Marginson, *High. Educ. Q.*, **65(4)** (2011) 411-433.

- [37] S. Şahin and M. Acar, Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, **16(3)** (2018) 101-136.
- [38] E. Tambunan, Edulead, **1(1)** (2020) 56-76.
- [39] J. Mezirow, *Fostering Critical Reflection in Adulthood*, Jossey Bass, San Fransisco, 1990, 168-169.
- [40] H.S. Antone, *Pendidikan Kristiani Kontekstual*, BPK Gunung Mulia, Jakarta, 2010, 1-187.
- [41] N. Clement, Australian EJournal of Theology, **10(1)** (2007) 1-12.
- [42] M. Marzuki, Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar, **2(1)** (2012) 33-44.
- [43] S. Sunhaji. Jurnal Ilmiah Lingua Idea, **9(2)** (2018) 165-178.
- [44] T. Kerry, *Explaining and questioning: Mastering teaching skills*, Nelson Thornes, Cheltenham, 2002, 1-142.
- [45] T. Santoso, L. Yuanita and E. Erman, J. Phys. Conf. Ser., **953(1)** (2018) 1-6.
- [46] C. Chin and J. Osborne, Stud. Sci. Educ., **44(1)** (2008) 1-39.
- [47] E.M. Nussbaum and O.V. Edwards, J. Learn. Sci., **20(3)** (2011) 443-488.
- [48] W. Bibi, M.N. Butt and A. Reba, FWU Journal of Social Science, **14(1)** (2020) 111-119.
- [49] A. Etemadzadeh, S. Seifi and H.R. Far, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, **70(1)** (2013) 1024-1031.
- [50] I. Hannel, Phi Delta Kappan, **91(3)** (2009) 65-69.
- [51] H. Lee and C.G. Roso, *Jesus and Bloom: How Effective Was Jesus in Requiring People to Think Critically*, in *Faith-based Education that Constructs*, H. Lee (ed.), Wipf and Stock, Eugene (OR), 2010, 103-123.
- [52] B.S. Utomo, Dunamis: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristiani, **1(2)** (2017) 1-15.
- [53] T.B. Sales, *An Emancipatory Pedagogy of Jesus Christ: Toward a Decolonizing Epistemology of Education and Theology*, Dissertation thesis, Loyola Marymount University, Los angles, 2017, 1-159.
- [54] C.Y. Hoon, South East Asia Res., **22(4)** (2014) 505-524.
- [55] A. Telaumbanua, Jurnal Fidei, **1(2)** (2018) 219-231.