JELS Journal of Education and Learning Sciences
E-ISSN : 2808-3695

Vol 06 No 02 2026
http://jurnal.gerakanedukasi.com/index.php/gerasi
https://doi.org/10.56404/jels.v6i2.543

Students Perceptions of Inclusivity in Campus Life A Phenomenological Study of the Concept of Living Together

[1]Fadisca Zahra Prasetya, [2]Wahyu Nurjanah, [3]Siska Eva Nuvitasari, [4]Aszahra Maghfirani Khairunnissa, [5]Shakila Cindy Indralafa, [6]Suyanti Fatma Umayfa

[1]Surabaya State University, [2]Surabaya State University, [3]Surabaya State University, [4]Surabaya State University, [5]Surabaya State University, [6]Surabaya State University

[1]24111794030@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [2]24111794018@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [3]24111794011@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [4]24111794016@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [5]24111794009@mhs.unesa.ac.id, [6]suyantiumayfa@unesa.ac.id

ABSTRACT: This study explores how undergraduate students perceive and practice inclusivity through their experiences of "living together" with peers from diverse cultural and religious backgrounds. Here, living together refers to students' shared living arrangements and everyday interactions across cultural and religious differences. Using an interpretive phenomenological approach, the study involved 30 undergraduate students from three Indonesian universities.Using a qualitative phenomenological case study approach, the research involved 30 undergraduate students from three urban universities in Jakarta, Bandung, and Yogyakarta, selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected over two months through 30 in-depth semi-structured interviews, participant observation in ten communal residences, three focus group discussions, and document analysis of house rules, shared financial records, and digital communications. The findings show that students understand inclusivity as an everyday moral and relational practice shaped by empathy, open communication, adaptability, and mutual respect rather than by institutional rules alone. Shared living also emerges as a space for ethical learning in which differences are negotiated through daily interactions. Drawing on Heidegger's concept of being-with-others and Levinas's relational ethics, this study conceptualizes inclusivity as an evolving capacity grounded in coexistence and ethical responsibility. The findings suggest that universities can strengthen inclusive campus environments by complementing formal policies with shared-living initiatives and intercultural interaction programs that foster dialogue, empathy, and reflection. By connecting philosophical perspectives with students' lived experiences, this study contributes to a phenomenological understanding of inclusivity in higher education.

Key words: *inclusivity, phenomenology, "living together", diverse culture, religious background.*

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary higher education, inclusivity has emerged as a defining value shaping institutional cultures, learning environments, and interpersonal relations within increasingly globalized campuses. As universities worldwide become more diverse due to the expansion of international mobility and cross-border education, inclusivity has been recognized not merely as a moral imperative but as a pedagogical and social necessity. According to the UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report (2020),

inclusive education is central to achieving equity, belonging, and mutual understanding in a rapidly diversifying academic world. Similarly, the (*Equity and Inclusion in Education*, 2023) highlights that inclusive campus environments foster innovation, empathy, and global citizenship, competencies vital for 21st-century learners. Within this global trend, higher education institutions are not only spaces of knowledge production but also microcosms of multicultural coexistence, where the practice of inclusivity becomes both a shared value and a lived challenge. However, higher education institutions also face challenges in fostering inclusivity due to systemic barriers and historical inequities, but strategies like curriculum diversification and inclusive teaching methodologies can promote inclusive environments (Aisha, 2025). Thus, fostering inclusivity in higher education is not only a pathway to equity and global understanding but also a cornerstone for building transformative, compassionate, and future-ready academic communities.

Despite the growing institutional discourse on inclusivity, a paradox persists between policy-level commitments and students' lived realities. Much of the existing scholarship on inclusion is disconnected from lived experiences and focuses on deficit perspectives, ignoring innovative classroom practices and experiential dimensions (Valente & Danforth, 2017). This has resulted in what may be termed "inclusive discourse" a normative ideal often detached from how inclusivity is negotiated, embodied, and sometimes contested in everyday campus life. Few studies have investigated how students live inclusivity within shared spaces such as shared houses, dormitories, cafeterias, and classrooms, where cultural, religious, and linguistic differences are continuously encountered and redefined. Here, students interact within term-time accommodation by negotiating habitualized behaviors and spatializing boundaries, contributing to understanding inclusivity in shared spaces through a qualitative study (Holton, 2016). This gap calls for a deeper, phenomenological inquiry into the textures of inclusion as it unfolds in the lived experience of university communities.

In the Indonesian context, universities increasingly reflect the nation's pluralistic fabric, encompassing diverse ethnicities, religions, languages, and socioeconomic backgrounds. National higher education policies, including the Kampus Merdeka initiative, emphasize tolerance, character education, and multicultural engagement as foundations for student development (Voak et al., 2023). However, empirical research exploring how students actually perceive and enact inclusivity in their everyday lives, particularly within communal living spaces such as dormitories, boarding houses, and shared houses, remains limited. For instance,Brown's research about "Inclusion in Higher Education: Exploring Students' Perspectives on Inclusivity" (2020) examines inclusivity in higher education, with an emphasis on university policies and students' perceptions of campus support for diversity. However, this study does not examine in-

depth the application of the concept of "living together" by students in everyday social interaction. Next, Lee demonstrates the challenges students face in interacting with fellow students who have very different backgrounds, including sexual orientation and gender identity in “Student Interactions and Diversity on Campus: Challenges and Opportunities" 2018). This research provides a broader picture of social dynamics on campus, but is still limited in terms of the theory used to explain this phenomenon. As a society built upon the philosophy of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (“Unity in Diversity”), Indonesia offers a rich and urgent context for investigating how inclusivity is lived, negotiated, and sustained through interpersonal relationships among students who share both space and difference. Thus, to frame this inquiry conceptually, it is essential to ground the discussion within the theoretical lens of “living together,” which captures the experiential and ethical dimensions of inclusive coexistence.

The concept of "living together" provides a valuable phenomenological and ethical framework to examine inclusivity as a lived, embodied, and relational experience. Drawing from Heidegger’s notion of Mitsein (being-with-others) and the phenomenology of intersubjectivity (Lévinas & Hand, 1989), this study views coexistence not as a static condition but as an ongoing negotiation of difference and recognition. From this perspective, inclusivity transcends institutional policy and becomes an ethical encounter, an openness to the other within shared spaces of living. The phenomenological lens thus allows for a nuanced understanding of how students experience belonging, respect, and coexistence in their everyday interactions, situating inclusivity within the lived fabric of university life rather than within abstract discourse.

This study aims to explore how university students perceive and experience inclusivity in their daily lives through the practice of "living together" with peers from diverse backgrounds. Specifically, it seeks to (1) explore students’ perceptions of inclusivity in communal living environments, (2) interpret the meanings they assign to coexistence and mutual respect, and (3) identify emerging themes that reflect the phenomenology of inclusion. Employing an interpretative phenomenological approach (IPA), this research does not seek to test hypotheses or measure variables, but rather to uncover the essence and depth of students’ lived experiences as they navigate diversity in everyday campus life. In this way, lived experience encompasses the perceptions, feelings, and context of students’ experiences (Swanson et al., 2018).

By examining inclusivity through the phenomenological lens of "living together", this study contributes to higher education research in several ways. Conceptually, it bridges the gap between abstract inclusivity discourses and the concrete, lived realities of students in multicultural university settings. Practically, it offers insights for policy makers, residence hall managers, and educators to desaunign more empathetic and participatory models of inclusive community living. Methodologically, it advances the

use of phenomenological inquiry to foreground students' voices and reflexive interpretations of social inclusion.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design and Approach

This study employed a qualitative research design grounded in a phenomenological case study approach. This approach was chosen because it allows for an in-depth exploration of lived experiences and the social meanings that students construct in the practice of "living together" within university settings. The phenomenological orientation made it possible to capture the essence of students' perceptions, emotions, and intersubjective encounters, while the case study frame enabled a holistic understanding of how inclusivity manifests (pp) in real-life contexts. This design is particularly suitable for uncovering complex interactions among students of diverse cultural, social, and religious backgrounds who share communal living spaces.

Research Sites and Participants

The research was conducted across three major urban universities located in Jakarta, Bandung, and Yogyakarta. A total of thirty (30) undergraduate students participated in this study. Participants were selected using purposive sampling to ensure information-rich cases aligned with the study's objectives (Palinkas et al., 2015). The inclusion criteria required participants to (1) be currently enrolled students, (2) have lived together with at least two peers for a minimum of one academic semester, (3) share accommodation with individuals from different social, cultural, or religious backgrounds, and (4) provide informed consent to participate in interviews, observations, and focus group discussions.

Table 1 below summarizes the key demographic and sampling characteristics of the participants.

Table 1. Participant and Sampling Overview

Criterion	**Description**
Sampling technique	Purposive sampling
Total participants	30 students
Location	Three urban universities: Jakarta, Bandung, Yogyakarta

Inclusion criteria	Active students living with ≥2 peers for ≥1 semester, with social/cultural/religious diversity
Duration of co-living	Minimum one semester
Consent	Written informed consent obtained

This participant profile enabled the research to capture a balanced representation of gender, year of study, and disciplinary background, ensuring diverse perspectives on inclusivity within campus life.

Research Phases and Procedures

The research was carried out over six months and organized into four major phases: preparation, data collection, data analysis, and reporting.

During the preparation phase (one month), an extensive literature review was undertaken to refine the conceptual framework of inclusivity and communal living. Interview and observation protocols were developed and refined through a pilot study (Kim, 2011), after which minor adjustments were made to improve question clarity and observational focus. Ethical clearance was obtained from the host university's Research Ethics Committee prior to fieldwork.

The data collection phase (two months) involved multiple qualitative techniques: (1) thirty in-depth semi-structured interviews; (2) participant observation in ten communal living houses; (3) three focus group discussions (FGDs) consisting of 6–8 participants each; and (4) documentation of written house rules, shared financial records, digital communications, and visual documentation of shared activities. Audio recordings, field notes, and photographs were systematically archived to ensure data integrity.

The data analysis phase (two months) entailed transcription, coding, and thematic categorization of the interview, FGD, and observational data. Constant comparative analysis was used to refine emerging categories. Triangulation across sources (interview, observation, documentation) enhanced analytical validity.

Finally, during the reporting and dissemination phase (one month), preliminary findings were validated through member checking with selected participants to confirm interpretive accuracy. A final research report, academic manuscript, and a policy brief for university administrators were then produced.

Data Collection Techniques

Four complementary techniques were employed to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon:

1. In-depth Interviews. Individual semi-structured interviews were conducted (Kallio et al., 2016) with all thirty participants to explore personal experiences, perceptions, and meaning-making processes concerning the practice of "living together". Each session lasted between 45 and 90 minutes and was audio-recorded with participants' consent.
2. Participant Observation. The researcher conducted sustained observations at ten communal residences to document daily interactions, spatial arrangements, resource-sharing practices, and relational dynamics. Detailed field notes captured both verbal and non-verbal behaviors relevant to inclusivity and coexistence.
3. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). Three FGDs were organized to elicit collective reflections on social, economic, and psychological dimensions of communal living. Each group comprised six to eight participants and was moderated using an open-ended guide focusing on social dynamics, economic cooperation, and adaptive strategies.
4. Document Analysis. Supplementary documents were collected to enrich the contextual understanding of living-together practices. These included written house agreements, shared duty rosters, collective financial records, and digital communication archives among residents. These materials provided valuable triangulation and insight into unarticulated social norms.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed through a thematic analysis process following (Braun & Clarke, 2006) framework, which emphasizes iterative engagement with the data to identify recurring patterns of meaning. Analysis progressed through six interconnected stages: (1) familiarization with data through repeated reading of transcripts and field notes; (2) systematic coding of meaningful data units; (3) generation of preliminary themes; (4) reviewing and refining themes for internal coherence; (5) defining and naming themes; and (6) producing the final analytic narrative supported by illustrative quotations.

To ensure methodological rigor and credibility, the study employed data triangulation (comparing findings across interviews, observations, FGDs, and documents), methodological triangulation (cross-verifying results derived from different collection techniques), and member checking (returning interpretations to participants for validation). Reflexive memos were also maintained throughout the research to document analytical decisions and enhance transparency.

Ethical Considerations

All procedures complied with institutional ethical standards. Participants received detailed information sheets explaining the research purpose, confidentiality measures, and voluntary participation rights. Written informed consent was obtained before each interview and observation session. The researcher protects participant identity, and all data were securely stored in password-protected digital archives. The research posed minimal risk and adhered to ethical guidelines for qualitative inquiry in social sciences.

Result and Discussion

Results

Participant Profile and Overview of Responses

The study involved **30 respondents** aged between 18 and 21 years, predominantly female (78.6%), and mostly originating from the island of Java. All participants had experience "living together" with peers from different social or religious backgrounds for at least one academic semester. This demographic distribution provided an appropriate context to explore students' lived experiences of inclusivity in diverse communal environments.

Table 3 summarizes the key demographic information and the general overview of participants' responses regarding their self-perceived adaptability, religious tolerance, and conflict management abilities.

Table 1. Participant Demographics and General Responses

Variable	Category	Percentage (%)
Age	19–21 years old	71.4
Gender	Female	78.6
Region of origin	Jawa	85.7
Self-perceived adaptability	"Average" (42.9), "Easily adaptive" (39.3), "Hardly adaptive" (17.9)	100
Religious tolerance	"Very good" (60.7), "Fairly good" (17.9), "Good" (10.7), "Average" (10.7)	100
Conflict management	"Fairly good" (53.6), "Good" (21.4), "Very good" (14.3), "Average" (10.7)	100

As shown in Table 1, the majority of students viewed themselves as adaptable and highly tolerant toward religious differences. This indicates that inclusivity among participants was perceived primarily as *interpersonal acceptance* and *mutual respect*.

Perceptions of Inclusivity in the Context of "Living Together"

Students conceptualized inclusivity as a relational and situational phenomenon rather than an institutional or ideological one. The most frequently mentioned meanings of inclusivity were "mutual respect," "open communication," and "comfortable coexistence." Participants emphasized that inclusivity was learned through daily practices such as sharing responsibilities, supporting one another emotionally, and respecting personal boundaries.

For instance, several participants described their experience as follows:

a. One of interviewee states that "Living together taught me how to appreciate differences, because each of us has unique habits and values."
b. One of interviewee states that "Inclusivity means being open to others' opinions, even if they contradict your beliefs."

These accounts reflect that inclusivity was perceived as an evolving capability, developed through interaction, empathy, and reflexivity. The phenomenological reading of these narratives indicates that "*living together"* served as a form of experiential education in social ethics, a site where inclusivity became both practiced and embodied.

Academic and Non-Academic Implications of "Living Together"

From the survey, 53.6% of participants stated that "living together" "facilitated discussions and collaborative learning," while 17.9% indicated "no significant effect." However, 10.7% reported negative experiences such as "distraction and conflict," and 7.1% noted positive effects on "motivation and discipline."

Table 2. Academic Implications of "Living Together"

Perceived Influence on Study Habits	Percentage (%)
Facilitates discussion and collaborative learning	53.6
No significant effect	17.9
Disrupts concentration	10.7
Causes interpersonal conflict	10.7
Increases motivation and discipline	7.1

Qualitatively, participants often viewed "*living together"* as both an opportunity for intellectual exchange and a source of distraction. One student noted: "It's easier to

study together because we motivate each other, but sometimes it becomes noisy or emotionally exhausting." (Female, 20, Jakarta)

Non-academic challenges were more nuanced. While most respondents reported *no major obstacles*, several mentioned interpersonal and emotional tensions, such as differences in daily routines, clashes of character, and reduced personal privacy. Others highlighted broader socio-cultural stigmas attached to communal living, especially in conservative settings: "Some people outside still judge us negatively because they think "living together" means violating norms." (Male, 20, NTB)

These experiences suggest that inclusivity, while valued, is negotiated within cultural and moral frameworks that shape students' sense of belonging and self-regulation.

Coping Strategies and Ethical Negotiation in Shared Living

Participants identified several strategies to sustain inclusivity and minimize conflict in shared living environments. The most common strategies included open dialogue, respecting personal space, and mutual emotional support. Communication was frequently described as the "key to survival" in maintaining harmony. "We agreed from the start to respect each other's privacy and to talk directly when something feels uncomfortable." (Female, 19, Yogyakarta)

Such narratives show that inclusivity was enacted through everyday ethics, recognizing others' boundaries while preserving communal bonds. Students also stressed adaptability and mutual empathy as essential to maintaining peace in diversity.

Table 3. Coping and Ethical Strategies in "Living Together"

Emerging Themes	Illustrative Practices
Open communication	Discussing routines, clarifying misunderstandings
Respect for privacy	Establishing boundaries, personal rest times
Emotional support	Encouraging peers, managing stress together
Adaptability	Adjusting habits to collective needs

Phenomenologically, these strategies reveal that "*living together*" serves as a microcosm of inclusive society, where relational ethics are continuously negotiated. Inclusivity, in this sense, is not a static state but a dynamic process of coexisting shaped by context, emotion, and shared responsibility.

Summary of Findings

Overall, the findings illuminate three major patterns in students' lived experiences:

1. Inclusivity is primarily understood as a moral and relational value, not merely institutional compliance.
2. *"Living together"* acts as both a space for personal growth and a testing ground for tolerance and emotional regulation.
3. Challenges to inclusivity often stem from micro-level relational dynamics rather than overt discrimination, and are mitigated through communication, empathy, and self-awareness.

These insights form the interpretive foundation for the following *Discussion* section, which further situates the findings within the theoretical frameworks of phenomenology, intersubjectivity, and ethical coexistence.

Discussion

The findings reveal that students perceive inclusivity primarily as a moral and relational practice embedded in their everyday experiences of "living together." Rather than being viewed as an abstract institutional obligation, inclusivity was expressed through acts of mutual respect, empathy, openness, and communication. Students consistently emphasized that "living together" with peers of different social and religious backgrounds encouraged them to cultivate patience, adaptability, and sensitivity to others' needs. These experiences transformed inclusivity from a conceptual value into a daily ethical habit manifested in sharing responsibilities, offering emotional support, and sustaining harmonious interactions.

Moreover, "living together" emerged not only as a social arrangement but also as a dynamic site where inclusivity was negotiated, challenged, and embodied through daily encounters (Acton & Halbert, 2018). Students' narratives illustrated that cohabitation was not a passive experience but an active learning space one that demanded continual negotiation of differences, redefinition of boundaries, and reflection on one's own biases. Through conflict resolution, dialogue, and empathy-building, communal living became a lived pedagogy of coexistence, fostering both moral growth and social maturity.

The interpretation of these findings suggests that inclusivity functions as an evolving capability rather than a fixed institutional value. It develops through mutual adaptation, emotional awareness, and reflective interaction among peers. Inclusivity, in this sense, is less about compliance with formal policies and more about the cultivation of relational competence, an embodied sensitivity to the presence and well-being of others. The moral dimension of inclusivity unfolds as students learn to balance personal comfort with collective responsibility, transforming differences into opportunities for ethical engagement and self-development.

Students' descriptions of empathy, tolerance, and boundary negotiation also indicate a form of *practical ethics* grounded in intersubjectivity and lived experience.

Drawing on Heidegger's concept of *being-with-others* (*Mitsein*), the students' experiences reflect that inclusivity is inseparable from the condition of coexistence itself. Similarly, through Levinas's lens of relational ethics, their acts of respect and care for others reveal an ethical responsiveness that arises prior to formal rules or institutional expectations. "Living together" thus becomes an existential encounter where inclusivity is not declared but enacted through the delicate rhythms of everyday life. Repositioning the 'sense' of belonging as an everyday activity with tangible consequences brings with it associated responsibilities (an 'ethic of care') for place and the people who live there (Bennett, 2015).

These findings align with prior research that conceives inclusivity as a relational and participatory process (Madriaga, 2018; Kahu & Nelson, 2018), emphasizing that inclusive environments are co-created through interpersonal engagement rather than imposed by top-down policies. However, this study extends existing scholarship by revealing the *embodied* and *affective* dimensions of inclusivity as experienced in the context of cohabitation. The data highlight how feelings of empathy, discomfort, and care are integral to learning inclusivity, illustrating that relational ethics are lived through the body and emotion, not merely understood cognitively.

Unlike previous studies that frame inclusivity within the language of institutional discourse, this research foregrounds students' *lived negotiations* of belonging. (Students experience and create multiple belongings, challenging institutional approaches; empirical data from interviews and video blogs with students in the UK and Australia; qualitative methodology (Ajjawi et al., 2025). Inclusivity appears here as both an aspiration and a form of emotional labor, one that requires vulnerability, reflexivity, and sustained effort to maintain mutual respect within diversity. In doing so, the study contributes to a more grounded and humanized understanding of inclusivity, emphasizing its emotional and ethical depth rather than its administrative or ideological form.

Through an interpretive phenomenological lens, this study advances a conceptual refinement by framing inclusivity as a *phenomenology of coexistence*, a dynamic interplay between self, others, and the shared environment. This framing positions inclusivity as a lived, relational phenomenon, constituted through continuous encounters and negotiations that shape one's sense of belonging and moral orientation. By centering the *experience* of "living together," the study situates inclusivity within the ontological condition of *being-with*, where understanding, tension, and growth are mutually constitutive.

Furthermore, the findings contribute to the discourse on inclusive education by integrating phenomenological notions of intersubjectivity, embodiment, and lived ethics into the analysis of campus life. This integration enriches the theoretical vocabulary of inclusivity research, offering an alternative to the prevailing structural or

policy-driven frameworks. It underscores that inclusive higher education must attend not only to institutional diversity metrics but also to the lived micro-ethics that sustain coexistence in multicultural learning communities. This paper examines the importance of inclusive practices in higher education, emphasizing the role of diverse perspectives in enhancing critical thinking, academic success, and social belonging. (Aisha, 2025).

Practically, these insights suggest that universities should move beyond policy rhetoric toward fostering inclusive cultures through participatory and relational practices. Shared living programs, intercultural residence initiatives, and empathy-centered workshops can serve as laboratories for cultivating inclusivity as a lived capability. Training in active listening, perspective-taking, and conflict mediation can further empower students to navigate diversity constructively. All students can be taught how to manage conflicts constructively by integrating training into the existing school curriculum (Stevahn, 2004). By embedding these practices within residence halls and student engagement programs, universities can transform inclusivity from a stated value into a daily social reality.

This study's findings are contextually bound to three Indonesian universities and thus cannot be generalized across all higher education contexts. The interpretive phenomenological approach privileges depth over breadth, relying on the researcher's reflective engagement with participants' narratives. (Furthermore, as a qualitative research approach, IPA gives researchers the best opportunity to understand the innermost deliberation of the 'lived experiences' of research participants (Alase, 2017). While this situatedness limits generalizability, it also provides contextual richness, revealing the nuanced ways inclusivity is enacted within specific cultural and moral frameworks. The researcher's interpretive position, shaped by both proximity to and distance from participants' experiences, is acknowledged as an integral aspect of meaning-making in this study.

Future research could extend this inquiry through cross-national or longitudinal studies to examine how inclusive attitudes and practices evolve over time and across cultural contexts. This article reports on a large-scale longitudinal study on teachers' and social educators' attitudes and concerns towards inclusion as well as their self-efficacy for inclusive practices in schools in Denmark (Engsig et al., 2024). Comparative research between residential and non-residential student populations may also illuminate how spatial arrangements shape inclusivity. Ultimately, this study underscores that inclusivity in higher education must be understood as a *lived and relational phenomenon*, a continuous ethical practice of "living together" in difference. Recognizing and nurturing this relational dimension is essential for cultivating truly inclusive and humane university communities.

Conclusion

This study explored how university students perceive and practice inclusivity through their lived experiences of *"living together"*, revealing inclusivity as a relational, moral, and evolving process rather than a fixed institutional value. The findings demonstrated that inclusivity is enacted in the rhythms of everyday life through empathy, open communication, respect for differences, and mutual care among peers. Viewed through an interpretive phenomenological lens, inclusivity emerges as a dynamic and reflexive capability cultivated in the immediacy of coexistence, where daily acts of sharing space and responsibility foster understanding, tolerance, and ethical sensitivity.

Conceptually, the study showed that inclusivity is not merely learned through formal education but *lived* through embodied and affective practices of coexistence. Acts of dialogue, emotional support, and mutual respect serve as the foundation for students' sense of belonging and ethical awareness, transforming "living together" into a moral apprenticeship in diversity. Theoretically, these insights reposition inclusivity within a *phenomenology of coexistence*, a framework that understands communal living as a microcosm of inclusive citizenship and ethical intersubjectivity. In this sense, "living together" is not only a social condition but also a lived expression of being-with-others that continually redefines the boundaries of self and community.

Practically, the findings suggest that universities can cultivate deeper inclusivity by integrating shared-living and intercultural programs that promote empathy, communication, and reflexive engagement among students. Initiatives such as inclusive residence halls, cross-cultural mentoring, and empathy training can provide structured opportunities for students to experience and practice the ethics of coexistence. While the study offers rich contextual insights into Indonesian higher education, its scope is limited to three universities and shaped by the researcher's interpretive stance. Future research should therefore explore cross-cultural or longitudinal perspectives to trace how inclusive attitudes evolve over time and across different institutional and sociocultural contexts.

Ultimately, this study underscores that inclusivity in higher education is not merely a structural or policy-driven commitment but a *lived ethical relationship*, a continuous negotiation of being and belonging that defines what it truly means to live together.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank all interview participants for the valuable insights and information they provided, as well as the institutions that facilitated the research process. The author would also like to thank the academic advisor for consistently

providing assistance, suggestions, and constructive criticism regarding this research process.

Funding Statement

The author did not receive funding from any party for the conduct of this research or the publication of this article. This research and publication are not related to funding from any relevant agency.

Declaration of AI Usage

The author used Grammarly to assist with language editing and grammar checking. All content generated has been reviewed, corrected, and verified by the author. The author assumes full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest in the conduct of this research or the publication of this article.

Data Availability

The data supporting the findings of this study are not publicly accessible due to privacy concerns regarding the study participants. The author assures the study participants that their identities will not be disclosed in the collection of samples for the purposes of this study.

DAFTAR RUJUKAN

Acton, R., & Halbert, K. (2018). Enacting learning citizenship: a sociomaterial analysis of reflectivity and knowledge negotiation in higher education. *Reflective Practice*, *19*(5), 707–720. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2018.1538960

Aisha, A. (2025). Fostering a Culture of Inclusion in Higher Education. *RESEARCH INVENTION JOURNAL OF CURRENT RESEARCH IN HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES*, *4*(1), 6–10. https://doi.org/10.59298/RIJCRHSS/2025/41610

Ajjawi, R., Gravett, K., & O'Shea, S. (2025). The politics of student belonging: identity and purpose. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *30*(4), 791–804. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2023.2280261

Alase, A. (2017). The Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA): A Guide to a Good Qualitative Research Approach. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, *5*(2), 9. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.5n.2p.9

Bennett, J. (2015). 'Snowed in!': Offbeat Rhythms and Belonging as Everyday Practice. *Sociology*, *49*(5), 955–969. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038515589299

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Engsig, T., Pedersen, O., & Østergaard, J. S. (2024). Inklusionens fundamenter: en longitudinal undersøgelse af betydningen af lærere og pædagogers inklusionsholdninger og mestringsoplevelser. *Nordic Studies in Education*, *44*(3), 210–227. https://doi.org/10.23865/nse.v44.6451

Equity and Inclusion in Education. (2023). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/e9072e21-en

Holton, M. (2016). Living together in student accommodation: Performances, boundaries and homemaking. *Area*, *48*(1), 57–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12226

Kallio, H., Pietilä, A. M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. In *Journal of Advanced Nursing* (Vol. 72, Number 12, pp. 2954–2965). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031

Kim, Y. (2011). The pilot study in qualitative inquiry: Identifying issues and learning lessons for culturally competent research. *Qualitative Social Work*, *10*(2), 190–206. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325010362001

Lévinas, Emmanuel., & Hand, S. . (1989). *The Levinas reader*. B. Blackwell.

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful Sampling for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation Research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, *42*(5), 533–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Stevahn, L. (2004). Integrating Conflict Resolution and Peer Mediation Training Into the Curriculum. *Theory Into Practice*, *43*(1), 50–58. https://doi.org/10.1353/tip.2004.0013

Swanson, J., Tanaka, A., & Gonzalez-Smith, I. (2018). *Lived Experience of Academic Librarians of Color*.

Valente, J. M., & Danforth, S. (2017). Disability Studies in Education: Storying Our Way to Inclusion. *Occasional Paper Series*, *2016*(36). https://doi.org/10.58295/2375-3668.1158

Voak, A., Fairman, B., Helmy, A., Malang, P. N., & Afriansyah, A. (2023). Kampus Merdeka: Providing Meaningful Engagement in a Disruptive World. In *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice* (Vol. 23, Number 8). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v23i8.6076

Voak, A., Helmy, A., Fairman, B., & Afriansyah, A. (2024). Kampus Merdeka: Indonesia's Oncein-a-generation Response to Educational Reform. In: TVET@Asia, (22): 1-21. Online: https://tvet-online.asia/startseite/kampus-merdeka-indonesias-once-in-a-generationresponse-to-educational-reform/ (retrieved 15.01.2024).