

Examining Social Solidarity among Generation Z Christian Students in Bandung, West Java, and Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara amid the Covid-19 Pandemic: Exploring Educational Challenges within Religious Institutions

Chandra Han^{1*}, Amos Sukanto², Rudy Pramono³

¹Department of Christian Religion Education, Faculty of Education Science, Pelita Harapan University, Tangerang, Indonesia

²Vice Rector, INTI Theological Seminary, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia

³Corresponding Author, Department of Hospitality, Faculty of Tourism, Pelita Harapan University, Tangerang, Indonesia

Received: 20- June -2023

Revised: 25- July -2023

Accepted: 19- August -2023

Abstract

This article is based on the research of solidarity on generation Z Christian students in Bandung, West Java, and Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara. The research involved 349 male and female students from Christian and public schools. This research utilized Lindenberg's theory of solidarity and tailored accordingly to the context of the respondents. The research method employed quantitative descriptive method. Total forty questions were answered by the respondents. Thirty questions are on solidarity and ten questions on religiosity. The aim of this research to figure out the factors that influence the solidarity among generation Z Christian students and its challenge for education in schools and churches. The data was processed by using SPSS statistic software, chi-square test and contingency table or cross tabulation analysis of all variables. The result of the research demonstrates that the background of the respondents did not have correlation with solidarity, but solidarity did have correlation with religiosity, school, ethnicity, and church. The result disclosed challenges for the schools to design a curriculum of solidarity to be taught in all levels of education, and also the church to develop a theology and the teaching of solidarity in all categories of fellowship to maintain the church's role as the light of the world for the goodness of society.

Keywords: Social Solidarity, Generation Z, Bandung, Kupang, Christian School, Church, Education, Christian Students.

1 Introduction

Indonesia is a great nation with the population of five biggest in the world, large number of tribes, ethnics, cultures, and religions. Indonesia even acknowledges legally six religions. To unite a great nation with such a diverse of tribes, ethnics, cultures and religions is a big challenge. The founding fathers of Indonesia has put the spirit of unity in the slogan "Bhinneka Tunggal Ika" (Diversity yet Unity) mentioned under the state symbol *Garuda*. Indonesia national solidarity is indeed the most prominent factor to unite such diversity. Many research on solidarity in Indonesia have been done but only several related to Indonesia national solidarity and on Generation Z student such as Saidang who did research on Patterns of Formation of Social Solidarity in Social Groups Between Students (Saidang and Suparman, 2019), and Munadhil Abdul Muqsith who focused on Social solidarity movement to prevent the spread of COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia (Muqsith *et al.*, 2021), while Siswanto presented Pancasila as a Guard of Nation Solidarity (Siswanto, 2019), and Rudolf Yuniarto focused Solidarity Formation of Indonesian Migrants in Taiwan (Yuniarto, 2021), and Agus Suwignyo provided *Gotong Royong* as Social Citizenship in Indonesia, 1940s to 1990s (Suwignyo, 2019), also Yaspis Edgar N. Funay with the research of Indonesia in the Vortex of the Pandemic Period: Social Solidarity Strategy Based on Local Tradition Values.

It is obvious that the specific research focused on Generation Z Christian has been undermined whatsoever the reason could be. This article can be a new and yet pioneer in research of Indonesia national solidarity among Generation Z Christian students. It is highly important to figure out Indonesia national solidarity among Christian students during the covid-19 pandemic, as these youth will be the future leaders. The context of Bandung and Kupang is also significant to conduct this research. The research question of this article is how then the church and school respond to the research result of social solidarity among Generation Z Christian students particularly in Bandung and Kupang? The aim of this article is to demonstrate the solidarity among Generation Z Christian in Bandung and Kupang for proposing education of solidarity in Churches and schools.

The result of this research demonstrates that there is a no correlation between respondent background and solidarity but there is a correlation between religiosity and solidarity, Church and solidarity, ethnicity and solidarity, and between school and solidarity. Thus, the analysis will focus on the correlated variables, between solidarity and religiosity, school, ethnicity, and church.

Bandung is the capital city of West Java with Muslims are majority and Christians are minority. Though the religious tolerance index is categorized as high (Hermawati, Paskarina and Runiawati, 2016), the conflict of religions particularly Christian and Muslim is obvious as demonstrated by (Rahmana, 2018) and (Damayanti, 2017). The context of Bandung is different with Kupang where Christians are majority and Muslim is minority in Kupang. With such a different context of religion It is then intriguing to understand the solidarity among Gen Z Christian student in both cities, in order to figure out the challenge and the need of education whether in the church or school.

2 Research Method

This research on solidarity among Christian Z generation are conducted during the Covid-19 Pandemic which was in July until November 2021. The research surveyed 349 Christian students from various Christian schools and public schools in Bandung and Kupang. The survey covered the family background of the respondents which are: their gender, age, ethnic, the education and income of their parents, and included also the aspect of religiosity, school, ethnic, and church. There are There were forty questions in total answered by the respondents. There were forty questions asked in this research, thirty questions of solidarity were based on Lindenberg's theory of solidarity that consist of Cooperation, Sharing, Helping, Effort to understand and be understood, Trustworthiness, and Considerateness, with modification accordingly to be relevant to the respondents and ten additional questions on religiosity. The research data was processed with SPSS statistic software, the Chi-Square Test, and the Contingency or Cross Tabulation / Crosstab analysis.

3 Discussion

Solidarity itself is a social cohesion whatsoever is the bond. Solidarity is one prominent concept that can be employed to unite the diversity in Indonesia. The research on solidarity varied from philosophical as demonstrated by Benedictus Hasan who tried to redefining Solidarity in the Era of the Pandemic (Hasan and Ardhiatama, 2020) to phenomenological as presented by Daniela Gimenez-Jimenez in "An Intergeneration Solidarity Perspective on Succession Intentions in Family Firms" (Gimenez-Jimenez *et al.*, 2021) and several also mentioned in introduction.

Durkheim has been acknowledged as the pioneer of introducing social solidarity with the term of mechanic and organic solidarity in his "Divisions of Labour in Society" (Durkheim, 1984), while Arto Laitinen and Anne Birgitta Pessi (Laitinen and Pessi, 2014) provide theory and practice of solidarity, and Siegwart Lindenberg with his "Solidarity: Unpacking the Social Brain (Lindenberg, 2014). Aafke E. Komter correlated social solidarity with the gift (Komter, 2005). This research employs the theory of Lindenberg with contextual modification of his six solidarity norms, Cooperation, Sharing, Helping, Effort to understand and be understood, Trustworthiness, and Considerateness.

There are several reasons to conduct research on solidarity among the generation Z particularly Christian students in Bandung and Kupang. First, The lack of research of solidarity in generation Z Christian. Second, Christian teaching is universal, transcends partiality and race or ethnic. Third, as the future leaders in a global and complex world, the youth must comprehend the understanding of solidarity which is so prominent in integrating all aspect of life. Solidarity among the youth is significant because it will be also useful to propose a good and relevant education for the goodness of family as presented by (Montoro-Gurich and Garcia-Vivar, 2019), also to unite the diverse society or diverse state as presented by Ike Fari Fadila Sumual in "Efforts to Grow the Taste of Early Childhood Nation's Solidarity through Bakiak Game" (Sumual, Sularso and Budiyo, 2019). Fifth, in Bandung, Christians are minority among the Moslem, thus it is important to figure out the solidarity of Christians youth in such context for the improvement of education in both Christian and public schools. In Kupang Christians are majority, therefore in this both cities the data collected has covered the complexity of religious context.

The survey involved total 349 respondents consist of 180 respondents in Bandung (52%) and 169 respondents in Kupang (48%). The number male gender is 142 (40,7%) and 207 are female (59,3%) students. The age of the respondents in both Bandung and Kupang showed that aged 14 was the most with 131 respondents

(37.5%), followed by 13 years old with 103 (29.5%), then, 12 years old with 88 (25.2%), and then age 15 with 18 respondents (5.2%), 8 respondents aged 11 (2.3%), and 1 respondent aged 16 (0.3%). The highest number of respondents was within the age range of 12-14 which are 322 (92.2%).

The distribution of respondent schools involves both public and Christian schools. The number of respondents from Christian schools was 232 (66.5%) compared to the 111 from public/state schools (31.8%), while 6 respondents (1, 7%) answered otherwise.

The ethnicity of the respondent is diverse with majority of respondents are from East Nusa Tenggara, 132 (37.8%), followed by the Javanese 76 (21.8%), Sumatra 74 (21.2), then the Chinese 54 (15.5%), and Sulawesi 4 (1.1%), and 9 respondents (2.3%) answered otherwise. The participation of the respondent's ethnicity is crucial since this will serve as the decisive factor to the solidarity.

The church denomination or origin of the respondents with the largest number is from the Protestant church with 166 respondents (47.6%), followed by Pentecostalism with 104 respondents (29.8%), then 41 (11.7%) answered others, Catholic 33 (8.5%), and 5 respondents (1.4%) from other religions. The data of "others" indicates that some respondents may not know or are less sensitive to the origin / denomination of their church.

The **education** background of the respondents' fathers is good with 165 (47.3%) graduated from Higher Education, followed 137 (39.3%) from by Senior High School, 30 (8.6 %) from Middle School, and 17 (4.9%) from Elementary School. The data of whose fathers last education level was Elementary and Junior High School implied the fathers' awareness of the importance of a higher education for their children.

In terms of the father's **occupation** of the respondents, the self-employment is the highest type of work with 137 respondents (39.7%), followed by private employees as much as 93 respondents (27%), state civil apparatus with 60 respondents (17.4%). The profession of teachers, lecturers or pastors as much as 18 respondents (5.2%). There are 28 respondents (8.1%) who answered other jobs, and 9 respondents' father (2.6%) do not work. Data on the work of the respondents' fathers indicates the awareness and the importance of their children's education from various professional circles, even from those who do not work.

The **education** of the respondents' mother is quite similar with the education of the respondents' father. The number of mothers who have education up to university is the majority as many as 161 (46.1%), with high school education as many as 158 (45.3%), 17 (4.9%) junior high school education, and 13 elementary school education (3.7%). Educational data from parents, both fathers and mothers, is certainly expected to be an example and encouragement for Generation Z to take the highest possible education.

Regarding the **job** of the respondents' mothers, the highest number is as housewives 241 respondents (69.3%), followed by self-employed 47 respondents (13.5%), then employees 40 respondents (11.5%), then teachers or lecturers and pastors as many as 14 respondents (4%), not working 4 respondents (1.1%), and other jobs as many as 2 respondents (0.6%). The majority as housewives can indicate the importance of the role of mothers both in terms of the household and children's education.

In terms of the number of **close friends**, majority of respondents, 305 (87.4%) have 3-5 close friends, followed by 29 respondents (8.3%) who have less than 2 close friends, and the last is 13 respondents (4.3%) have 6-8 close friends. This data may indicate that although Generation Z teenagers may interact a lot through social media, the number of close friends is only around 3-5 friends. The possible influence of 3-5 close friends certainly deserves an important consideration in this study.

The below table 1 presents the correlation between solidarity and all variables in this research which are gender, age, parent's education and occupation, close friends, religiosity, and the component of ethnic, school, and church.

Table 1 Correlation Between Variables

Variable	Correlation	Social Solidarity	Religiosity
Gender	Correlation Coefficient	.053	.013
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.234	.773
	N	349	349
Age	Correlation Coefficient	.066	-.028
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.110	.507
	N	349	349
Location	Correlation Coefficient	.044	.068
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.323	.136
	N	349	349
School	Correlation Coefficient	-.112*	-.081
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.073
	N	349	349
Ethnic	Correlation Coefficient	-.033	.007
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.424	.874
	N	349	349
Church	Correlation Coefficient	-.015	-.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.724	.715
	N	349	349
Father's Education	Correlation Coefficient	.015	-.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.721	.594
	N	349	349
Father's Occupation	Correlation Coefficient	.034	.049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.407	.242
	N	345	345
Mother's Education	Correlation Coefficient	.047	-.014
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.273	.750
	N	349	349
Mother's Job	Correlation Coefficient	.000	-.010
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.996	.812
	N	348	348
Close Friends	Correlation Coefficient	.038	-.030
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.394	.500
	N	349	349
Social Solidarity	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.364**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	349	349
Religiosity	Correlation Coefficient	.364**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	349	349

Based on Table 1 above, it can be concluded that the background of the respondents does not have a significant relationship with social solidarity or religiosity; however, there is a significant correlation of 0.364 between social solidarity and their religiosity. The correlation between solidarity and religiosity indicates that religiosity must be considered as an important aspect when promoting solidarity. Religiosity is presumable contained universal values of respect for others transcend geographical border, identity, gender, and status.

The further step is the Crosstab analysis between solidarity and all other 3 aspects, Schools, Ethnicity, and Church (see table 2).

The Crosstab Analysis between Schools and Solidarity

Table 2 Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	206.499 ^a	130	.000
Likelihood Ratio	115.235	130	.819
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.735	1	.030
Mc Nemar-Bowker Test	.	.	. ^b
N of Valid Cases	349		

a. 184 cells (92.9%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

b. Computed only for a PxP table, where P must be greater than 1.

Table 3 Symmetric Measures

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient	.610			.000
Interval by Interval Pearson's R	-.117	.056	-2.188	.029 ^c
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correlation	-.135	.054	-2.542	.011 ^c
N of Valid Cases	349			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Chi-Square test is to observe whether there is a relationship between two variables (rows and columns). Hypothesis: Ho: There is no relationship between rows and columns, or between schools and solidarity. H1: There is a relationship between rows and columns, or between schools and solidarity (see table 3).

Decision Making Basis: Based on the comparison of the calculated Chi-Square with the Chi-Square table: If Chi-Square Count < Chi-Square Table then Ho is accepted. If Chi-Square Count > Chi-Square Table, then Ho is rejected.

Chi-Square Count –look at the SPSS output of the PEARSON CHI SQUARE– section is 206,499. At the significant level set at 5% and degrees of freedom (df) = 2, the Chi-Square table is 5.9915. Because Chi-Square Count > Chi-Square table (206.499 > 5.9915), then Ho is rejected. This means that there is a relationship between schools and solidarity.

The Crosstab Analysis Between Ethnicity and Solidarity

Table 4 Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	389.826 ^a	325	.008
Likelihood Ratio	292.505	325	.902
Linear-by-Linear Association	.093	1	.760
McNemar-Bowker Test	.	.	. ^b
N of Valid Cases	349		

a. 390 cells (98.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

b. Computed only for a PxP table, where P must be greater than 1.

Table 5 Symmetric Measures

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient	.726			.008
Interval by Interval Pearson's R	-.016	.052	-.305	.761 ^c
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correlation	-.042	.055	-.780	.436 ^c
N of Valid Cases	349			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Hypothesis: Ho: There is no relationship between rows and columns, or between tribes and solidarity. H1: There is a relationship between rows and columns, or between tribes and solidarity. Decision Making Basis: Based on the comparison of the calculated Chi-Square with the Chi-Square table: If Chi-Square Count < Chi-Square Table then Ho is accepted. If Chi-Square Count > Chi-Square Table, then Ho is rejected (see table 5).

Chi-Square Count –look at the SPSS output of the PEARSON CHI SQUARE– section is 389,826. At the significant level set at 5% and degrees of freedom (df) = 2, the Chi-Square table is 5.9915. Because Chi-Square Count > Chi-Square table (389,826 > 5.9915), then Ho is rejected. This means that there is a correlation between ethnicity and solidarity (see table 6).

The Crosstab Analysis Between Church and Solidarity

Table 6 Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	304.990 ^a	260	.029
Likelihood Ratio	227.882	260	.925
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.998
McNemar-Bowker Test	.	.	. ^b
N of Valid Cases	349		

a. 321 cells (97.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

b. Computed only for a PxP table, where P must be greater than 1.

Table 7 Symmetric Measures

	Value	Asymp. Std. Error ^a	Approx. T ^b	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal Contingency Coefficient	.683			.029
Interval by Interval Pearson's R	.000	.050	.002	.999 ^c
Ordinal by Ordinal Spearman Correlation	-.018	.052	-.329	.742 ^c
N of Valid Cases	349			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

Hypothesis: Ho: There is no relationship between rows and columns, or between churches and solidarity. H1: There is a relationship between rows and columns, or between churches and solidarity. Decision Making Basis: Based on the comparison of the calculated Chi-Square with the Chi-Square table: If Chi-Square Count < Chi-Square Table then Ho is accepted. If Chi-Square Count > Chi-Square Table, then Ho is rejected (see table 7).

Chi-Square Count –look at the SPSS output of the PEARSON CHI SQUARE– section is 304,990. At the significant level set at 5% and degrees of freedom (df) = 2, the Chi-Square table is 5.9915. Because Chi-Square Count > Chi-Square table (304.990 > 5.9915), then Ho is rejected. This means that there is a correlation between the church and solidarity.

The result of the survey concerning the background of the respondents shows that there is no relationship between their background and solidarity. However, there are several significant notes on the background. First, the background demonstrated the awareness of the parents for education. Second, the family background did not promote the value of solidarity for the life. Third, the necessity of promoting solidarity within the family is then crucial and urgent.

Although the correlation between solidarity and all three aspects, religiosity, school, and church are good and expected but it is problematic with the ethnic. The correlation between solidarity and religiosity is expected since religiosity basically carries universal value (Gennerich and Huber, 2006). The universal value must be likely beyond race, ethnic, culture, national identity, and geographical boundary.

The correlation between school and solidarity should also be expected. Both Christian and public schools ought to deliver universal values for common good of people. School in the earliest stage should be the most conducive place to promote universal values beyond geographical, cultural, national dan ethnic boundaries. The curriculum in every school level from elementary, middle, until senior must promote the universal values admitted by all nations such as the respect of human dignity despite of the race, gender, occupation and other non-essential aspects, of human life and right to live. The correlation between solidarity and schools is then a necessity as shown in the result of this research. Therefore, the curriculum in the school is crucial and urgent to ensure that the solidarity is taught in all school level. The need to review school curriculum becomes very urgent so that solidarity can be introduced from an early school level and consistently promoted until the highest level of education.

The church is basically similar with the schools. The teaching in the church must bring common goodness for humanity beyond nationality, geographical boundary, race or ethnic. Both catholic and protestant teaching also covered solidarity (Bărbat, 2015), also Lemos CM, Gore RJ, Puga-Gonzalez I, Shults FLRon (Lemos *et al.*, 2019) The teaching of all four gospels in the New Testament focused on Jesus Christ who promoted salvation to all humanity without any partiality on gender, age or ethnicity. Particularly Luke’s Gospel, He demonstrated obviously the universality of Christian faith on several occasions. First, the genealogy of Jesus was originated in Adam the representation of all humanity. moreover, the proclamation of the angels to the shepherds obviously referred to all people with whom God is pleased (Luke 2:14), thus the reference beyond the gender, ethnic, and national boundary is evident.

Second, the parable of the good Samaritan was another demonstration of solidarity. The Samaritan's willingness to help an unknown and seriously injured Jew was a breakthrough in the belief values in the context

of the parable. The Samaritans has been under enmity with the Jews since the time of Ezra in the Old Testament. Samaritans were even categorized as gentile by the Jews thus the solidarity expressed by the Samaritans was a breakthrough teaching in its time. The ending phrases of this parable “those who have shown mercy” and “go and do likewise” indicated obviously that the solidarity act of the good Samaritan was indeed based on the belief beyond nationalism, race, and ethnic. Jesus’ point is clear show mercy is the foundation of doing good (Proctor, 2019). The solidarity shown by the good Samaritan is an act out of mercy, the mercy that beyond race, ethnic and national identity.

The third is Luke’s alignment with the marginalized such as women, gentiles, and God-fearers. It was Luke who recorded the praise of Elizabeth (Luke 1:42-45), Mary (Luke 1:46-55), and Hana (Luke 2:38). Luke also informed the role of women to support Jesus’ ministry (Luke 8:1-3), as the first witness of Jesus’ resurrection (Luke 24). Gentiles’ names were mentioned more often in Luke’s writings, the Gospel and Acts of the Apostles, than other New Testament writings. It is the Acts of the Apostle that recorded the God-fearers, the gentiles who fear of God and attach to Christianity. The live of the first believers in Acts 2:42-47 demonstrated obviously the solidarity among them in sharing the teaching of the apostles and their possessions for those who were in need. The result of such an apparent solidarity among first believers was favored by all people.

Solidarity in Paul’s epistles were also apparent as argued by Rachel Muers in her “Christ-Centered Solidarity in Time of Pandemic” (Muers, 2020). The necessity of solidarity among believers in Corinthians was argued by Ofelia Ortega also in his “Gospel of Solidarity” (Ortega, 1994). Paul even stated clearly in Colossians 3:11 that in Christ, there is neither Greek nor Jews, circumcised nor uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave or free. This means that any act out of Christian faith including act of solidarity must be beyond identity, race, tradition, and status.

The correlation between solidarity and ethnic is crucial issue not only in its own correlation but also ruin all the good correlation between solidarity and religiosity, school, and church. Several reasons and consequences behind this crucial issue are: First, Durkheim characterized Solidarity in two categories, mechanical and organic solidarity (Durkheim, 1984). Mechanical solidarity usually operated in small group society and is usually built on kinship ties within familial networks which included ethnic while organic solidarity is social cohesion found in a more advance and complex society because it is based on the dependence individual have on each other, namely the interdependence of component parts (Durkheim, 1984). The correlation of ethnic and solidarity in this research fits with Durkheim’s mechanical solidarity. This means that the solidarity among generation Z Christian student is still operated in small group namely ethnic or familial scale. The complexity of our world today is apparent in all aspect of our life such as, social relationship through technology, education, religiosity or spirituality, economy, and church, therefore, the solidarity built on ethnicity that occurred in the contemporary world where life is so complex must be contended toward organic solidarity.

Second, the correlation between solidarity and ethnicity will raise a serious issue on the good conclusion of the correlation between solidarity and religiosity, school, and church. Religiosity, school, and church is presumably carried and promoted universal values beyond gender, race and ethnicity while ethnicity is always understood as a small-scale social group, even usually only within the scope of the family, even though it is a large family. The broadest bond of ethnicity is also limited to kinship ties only. The serious issue that can be raised is the essential and universal values that transcends gender, age, race, ethnicity, geographical and national boundaries embodied in religiosity, school and church. It is plausible to assert that the basis of the correlation between solidarity and religiosity, schools and churches is ethnicity and not universal values that transcend race or ethnicity. Then ethnicity is the primary factor that determines the correlation between solidarity with religiosity, school and church.

Third, the ethnicity which was an identity in the category of mechanical solidarity should not be expected to have correlation with solidarity in a complex life context. The correlation between solidarity and ethnicity will lead to conclusion that the ethnicity is the determining factor in other three aspects of solidarity. Thus, the need to review education in church and school is urgent. It is also plausible to assume that the solidarity between religiosity, school, and even church was eventually built on ethnicity rather than universal values that it supposed to be. Therefore, the universal values taught in schools, as well as the values embodied in church teaching need to be seriously re-examined in order to be relevant and anticipate the challenges of a changing world. The life during and beyond the Covid-19 pandemic has drastically changed. The act of solidarity universally to overcome the Covid-19 pandemic is not merely inevitable, it is more urgent to be echoed and expressed throughout the world in all levels in society. The challenge of school and church is apparent that is to face the unpredictable life in the

future. Solidarity must be considered as a prominent subject in school curriculum from elementary to higher education, and in the teaching within the church in all kind of worship.

The next question is the “what and how” to promote solidarity. The task of promoting solidarity in schools particularly for the middle school can be done earlier and it is likely can be carried out smoothly. Several reason behind this optimism, first, school is assumed to have an order system of teaching and learning. Second, the interaction in school is usually conducive as all students are likely in the same age with the range of two or three years. Third, the role of teacher as a model is apparent thus, it should be smoother to promote solidarity. The first stage of promoting solidarity in school can be started by creating the lessons material of solidarity. The second step is to conduct the trial, followed by the assessment of the trial. The final step is the policy and the teacher to teach the solidarity.

The church is also a complex society just as school but in many ways the church does not have an order system like the school. The teaching in the church found in many categories such as teens, youth ministry, Sunday service which can be two or three services, Sunday school for kids and adult, bible study, praying fellowship, married couple fellowship, and senior fellowship. With such a diverse program in church ministry, the flexible arrangement is inevitable. This will in turn raise challenges such as church denomination, coordination within one church and with other denominations, the teaching of each church denomination in the Sunday service and all categories of fellowship. Though the task is far more difficult than the school, the need is even more urgent because Christians believe that the Bible as the word of God will always be relevant to every era of human life.

As the challenge of the church in term of the result of this research is so serious, the change must begin with the leaders, the pastor and the presbyters. At the first stage, the church should seriously address the social issue and specifically solidarity. The church needs to make a breakthrough by starting to create a theology of solidarity which seems to be undermined. Though many studies of solidarity related to Christian faith have been published however a comprehensive theology of solidarity has not yet been introduced seriously. It is also the aim of this research to encourage the church to develop, introduce, and encourage the congregation to reveal solidarity as a manifestation of the Christian faith. The second stage is to deliver the theology of solidarity in all categories of fellowship. The third stage is to share the act of solidarity to make a change in the broader society. Then the church can continue to stand as a light and a witness of the essential truths that transcend ethnic identity, race, ethnicity, class, and social status in society. The more church denominations are sensible of this theology of solidarity starting from the teenagers the more the church can proclaim the word of God that set people free from uncertainty and adversaries of life.

4 Conclusion

The are several conclusions of this research of solidarity among generation Z Christian students in Bandung, West Java and Kupang, East Nusa Tenggara in relation to religiosity, school, ethnicity, and church. First, there are no correlation between the background and solidarity. Second, there is a correlation between solidarity and religiosity with 0.364 correlation coefficient. Third, there is also a correlation between solidarity and schools Because Chi-Square Count > Chi-Square table (206.499 > 5.9915). Forth, the Chi-Square Count > Chi-Square table (389,826 > 5.9915) thus the correlation between solidarity and ethnicity is apparent. Fifth, the correlation between solidarity and church is also evident since the Chi-Square Count > Chi-Square table (304.990 > 5.9915).

The correlation between solidarity and ethnicity is problematic and yet challenging. The problem raises from such a correlation is at the same time the challenge for schools and churches. The schools need to consider solidarity seriously during and after the Covid-19 pandemic to be part of the teaching and learning process. It is necessary for schools to design a curriculum of solidarity, promote, and moreover express the act of solidarity to anticipate the complexity of life.

Just like the schools, the churches are also facing the same challenge to be relevant to the complex life in the contemporary world and beyond. The churches need to make a reformation in the teaching in all categories of worship and fellowship. Introducing a comprehensive study on the theology of solidarity is inevitable followed by preaching, studying, and performing the act of solidarity for the good of the society is imperative. Solidarity as a virtue in Christianity has been undermined. The act of solidarity out of the comprehensive understanding of the theology of solidarity should make the church once again to be light of the contemporary world where life will be so unpredictable, and the Covid-19 pandemic is one of the real examples.

Acknowledgements

This manuscript is the result of research funded by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Research of the Republic of Indonesia with the agreement number 069/E5/PG.02.00.PT/2022 and LPPM Pelita Harapan University number 123/LPPM-UPH/VI/2022.

REFERENCES

1. Bărbat, C. (2015) 'A Catholic View of the Ethic Principle of Solidarity. Consequences at the Ethic-social Level', *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 183(6), pp. 135–140. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.856.
2. Damayanti, A. (2017) 'Muslim-Christian Relationships in Indonesian Reform Era Within The Framework of Democracy: Case Study of Bandung, Bekasi and Bogor (1998-2015)', in *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Social and Political Sciences (ICSPS 2017)*. Atlantis Pers, pp. 9–18. doi: 10.2991/icsps-17.2018.3.
3. Durkheim, E. (1984) *The Division of Labour in Society*, *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*. London: The Macmillan Press LTD.
4. Gennerich, C. and Huber, S. (2006) 'Value priorities and content of religiosity-new research perspectives', *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, 28(1), pp. 253–267. doi: 10.1163/008467206777832508.
5. Gimenez-Jimenez, D. *et al.* (2021) 'An Intergeneration Solidarity Perspective on Succession Intentions in Family Firms', *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 45(4), pp. 740–766. doi: 10.1177/1042258720956384.
6. Hasan, B. and Ardhiatama, W. F. D. (2020) 'Redefinisi Solidaritas di Era Pandemi: Usaha Pemaknaan Solidaritas Masyarakat "Hari Ini"', *BALAIRUNG: Jurnal Multidisipliner Mahasiswa Indonesia*, 2(2), pp. 192–209. Available at: <https://jurnal.ugm.ac.id/balairung/article/view/58029/31208>.
7. Hermawati, R., Paskarina, C. and Runiawati, N. (2016) 'Toleransi Antar Umat Beragama di Kota Bandung', *Umbara: Indonesian Journal of Anthropology*, 1(2), pp. 105–124. doi: <https://doi.org/10.24198/umbara.v1i2.10341>.
8. Komter, A. (2005) *Solidarity and the Gift*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
9. Laitinen, A. and Pessi, A. B. (2014) *Solidarity: Theory and Practice*. New York: Lexington Books.
10. Lemos, C. M. *et al.* (2019) *Dimensionality and factorial invariance of religiosity among Christians and the religiously unaffiliated: A cross-cultural analysis based on the International Social Survey Programme, PLoS ONE*. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0216352.
11. Lindenberg, S. (2014) 'Solidarity: Unpacking the Social Brain', in *Solidarity: Theory and Practice*. New York: Lexington Books, pp. 30–54.
12. Montoro-Gurich, C. and Garcia-Vivar, C. (2019) 'The Family in Europe: Structure, Intergenerational Solidarity, and New Challenges to Family Health', *Journal of Family Nursing*, 25(2), pp. 170–189. doi: 10.1177/1074840719841404.
13. Muers, R. (2020) 'Christ-Centred Solidarity in a Time of Pandemic: The Theological Challenge to Contemporary Performances of Human Solidarity', *The Ecumenical Review*, 72(4), pp. 527–537. doi: 10.1111/erev.12543.
14. Muqsith, M. A. *et al.* (2021) 'Social solidarity movement to prevent the spread of COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia', *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan dan Politik*, 34(2), p. 147. doi: 10.20473/mkp.v34i22021.147-158.
15. Ortega, O. (1994) 'The Gospel of Solidarity', *The Ecumenical Review*, 46(2), pp. 135–141. doi: 10.1111/j.1758-6623.1994.tb02918.x.
16. Proctor, M. A. (2019) "'Who is my neighbor?'" Recontextualizing Luke's good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37)', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 138(1), pp. 203–219. doi: 10.1353/jbl.2019.0011.
17. Rahmana, Z. S. (2018) 'Resolusi Konflik Sosial Keagamaan Di Kota Bandung', *Religious: Jurnal Studi Agama-Agama dan Lintas Budaya*, 2(2), pp. 162–173. doi: 10.15575/rjsalb.v2i2.3105.
18. Saidang, S. and Suparman, S. (2019) 'Pola Pembentukan Solidaritas Sosial dalam Kelompok Sosial Antara Pelajar', *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 3(2), pp. 122–126. doi: 10.33487/edumaspul.v3i2.140.
19. Siswanto, S. (2019) 'Pancasila Sebagai Pengawal Solidaritas Kebangsaan', *Jurnal Pertahanan & Bela Negara*, 9(1), p. 109. doi: 10.33172/jpbh.v9i1.502.
20. Sumual, I. F. F., Sularso, P. and Budiyo (2019) 'Upaya Menumbuhkan Rasa Solidaritas Kebangsaan Anak Usia Dini Melalui Permainan Bakiak', *Citizenship Jurnal Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, 7(2), pp. 117–124. Available at: <http://e-journal.unipma.ac.id/index.php/citizenship/article/view/5922>.

21. Suwignyo, A. (2019) 'Gotong royong as social citizenship in Indonesia, 1940s to 1990s', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 50(3), pp. 1–22. doi: 10.1017/S0022463419000407.
22. Yuniarto, R. (2021) "'Beyond Ethnic Economy": Religiosity, Social Entrepreneurship, and Solidarity Formation of Indonesian Migrants in Taiwan', *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, 20(1), pp. 1–14. doi: 10.7454/mssh.v20i1.3482.