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Currently, the expenditures for higher education by the Dominican government are at record highs (OECD, 2012; MESCYT, 2018). Yet, nationwide, student attrition rates in universities average a challenging 50% (OECD, 2012). This percentage climbs to 80% in Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo (UASD). UASD is the oldest public university and the largest higher education institution in the Dominican Republic, hosting 44% of all undergraduate students enrolled in the country (OECD, 2012; UASD, 2018). The institution’s attrition levels suggest that while the Dominican government’s investment in higher education is high, the return on that investment is low.

Although domestic plans and international reports highlight strategies to improve the system (MESCYT, 2018; OECD, 2012; World Bank, 2006), so far no lines of action aim proactively at understanding and informing how people regard public higher education, especially after a recent past of deep social struggle. Hence, new ways to research and address attrition must be considered in connection to social beliefs. Present social perspectives are rooted in the collective memory of the recent past and how this recollection is spread along individuals and populations (Bandura, 2001; Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998).
From 1966 to 1978 several cohorts of UASD students experienced unprecedented levels of repression and violence as they attended classes amid battle between the –then- right-wing government and left-wing militants inside the university (Bethell, 1990; Franco, 2007; Pimentel, 2002; Kryzanek, 1977).

Considering this historic context, the aim of this study was to explore the effects that social perspectives -informed by collective memory- have over the individuals, specially over their notion of UASD as the default representative of public higher education in the DR. To this end, through a phenomenological method, this study probed into UASD’s recent past of violence, how it is remembered, and what meaning is made out of it. Twelve former UASD students, enrolled during the conflict, were interviewed and their accounts analyzed. The study revealed that most participants considered that current challenges of public higher education have a link to the conflict. In addition, most participants convey a negative perspective or frame of reference of public higher education. This frame of reference has been observed to be predominantly trans temporal, having a link to their experience regardless of the time passed from their years of difficulty until the present day.

Most participants showed no overarching sense of institutional loyalty, making generational continuity questionable while also transmitting discouraging and often incomplete messages about the worth of public higher education. Interestingly, participants acknowledge, however, that UASD has improved significantly during recent years. National plans need to contemplate actions to inform social perspectives about the importance of public HE.

Conclusions in this research contribute to inform educational leaders and policy makers. This is so, since within the sample it depicts the frames of reference and value systems transmitted to society by influential former generations about public higher education.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Currently, the expenditures for higher education by the Dominican government are at record highs. Although still low for international standards, for the first time since the mid 1980’s annual investment in higher education has reached 0.3% of the country’s GDP (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2012; Ministerio de Educación, Superior Ciencia y Tecnología [MESCYT], 2018). This is a result of the implementing of the goals of the 2008 Ten-Year Plan for Higher Education 2008-2018 (Secretaría de Estado de Educación Superior, Ciencia y Tecnología [SEESCYT], 2008) that aims at expanding the system’s outreach and improving its quality. In consequence, enrollment in post-secondary education is also at an all-time high. It comprises 29.1% of the Dominican population between 18 and 24 years old, where in 1990 the percentage or participation rate was 10% (OECD, 2012).

Yet, nationwide student completion rates in universities average a challenging 50% (OECD, 2012). This national mark is the fifth lowest among Latin American countries whose data is available (World Bank, 2017). Within the country, the rate of completion drops to 20% in Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo (UASD). UASD is the oldest public university and the largest higher education institution in the Dominican Republic, hosting 44% of all undergraduate students enrolled in the country (OECD, 2012; UASD, 2018). This 80% attrition crisis should be a concerning figure for government policy makers and the UASD administration. It suggests that while the Dominican government’s investment in higher education is high, the
return on that investment is low. In addition, the country’s strategic plan on higher education has the goal of improving and expanding the system, but this would not be possible having an attrition epidemic inside UASD, which holds nearly half of the enrolled population (SEESCOYT, 2008).

To this regard, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the World Bank report the issue as a problem of teaching and learning efficiency, as well as of funding (OECD, 2012; World Bank, 2006). The OECD report of 2012 defines a set of 15 recommendations, of which the first four are meant to address the attrition problem. They focus on the improvement of access through diversification of programs and qualifications, improvement of teacher education, increase of “higher education progression and completion” (p. 22), collection of data to analyze causes of attrition, expansion of counseling services, and the development of a more effective admission policy in UASD. The World Bank asserted prior to 2012 that poor performance in education in the DR is caused by insufficient investment in education, ineffective management, poor quality teaching and “bottlenecks in the supply of secondary schools” (World Bank, 2006, p. ii). Seemingly, the national education strategy Ten-Year Plan for Higher Education 2008-2018 addresses the improvement of results through the improvement of teaching quality, program content and infrastructure.

As expected, the above studies and plans minding specifically the improvement of the installed capacity have traditionally informed public expenditure. To date, no study to address attrition focuses on the social perspectives of UASD students and those of their families about higher education and the institution. Present social perspectives are rooted in the collective memory of the recent past and how this recollection is spread along individuals and populations (Bandura, 2001; Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998). Social memory or collective memory are the
terms most commonly used to refer to the perspectives and narratives built within human groups about their past (Bandura, 2001). Dessi (2008) asserted that:

In every society… the collective memory transmitted to the young by the older generation, through a variety of channels influences their perception of their cultural identity and values, and their willingness to invest in them with major economic as well as political and social consequences. (p. 109)

Thus, to improve the Dominican higher education system, it is necessary to explore how/if this dynamic of conveyance of collective memory has passed on a precarious or overly biased understanding on the potential of education for empowering individuals and societies. This is crucial to explore how these biases influence the students’ decision for either dropping out of college or enduring until graduation.

In the recent past, several cohorts of UASD students experienced repression and violence over a period of twelve years –either directly or tangentially- as they attended classes amid a battle between the right-wing government and left-wing militants inside the university (Franco, 2007; Bethell, 1990; Pimentel, 2002; Kryzanek, 1977). After the abrupt ending of Rafael Trujillo’s thirty-year dictatorship in 1961, the country’s first democratic elections were held in 1962. Socialist candidate and longtime political exiled professor Juan Bosch was elected by the majority of voters. In 1963, seven months after Bosch took office, the right-wing military carried out a coup d’état and established a military junta that lasted nearly two years. In 1965 the junta was challenged by a revolution that broke out. Bosch followers, civilian and members of the military, took to the streets advocating for the reestablishment of Bosch as president as a constitutional duty. After four days, following the lead of American President Lyndon Johnson, a multinational military force assembled by the Organization of American States intervened in the
conflict. This intervention resulted into the setting of new elections to take place in 1966, where former CIA collaborator Joaquin Balaguer was elected. President Balaguer, who was committed to fight local communism, ruled the country uninterruptedly from 1966 to 1978, and again from 1986 to his retirement from politics in 1996. After the revolution of 1965, the right-wing outcome of the 1966 elections did not satisfy left-wing constitutionalist combaters. So the conflict continued, taking the shape of a resistance and guerrilla war, and migrated organically to the country’s largest higher education institution: UASD. The conflictive events during Balaguer’s first twelve years of rule inside and around UASD are of transcendent social weight and how they are remembered and interpreted is central to this study (Franco, 2007; Bethell, 1990; Cassa, 1982; Betances, 2005; Felten, 1995; Liberato, 2005; McClung, 1965; Vega, 2004).

This twelve-year event was held between leaders of antagonist ideological perspectives: A government of capitalist national conservative policies against UASD students of socialist and Marxism-Leninism ideology. The Dominican government exercised repression over student organizations inside UASD; and the latter would constantly retaliate. As it can be inferred, this period was sensibly marked by the geopolitical turmoil of Cold War and its proxy clashes around the world (Bethell, 1990; Harmer, 2011; Hendrickson, 2012). As Balaguer had been supported by American President Lyndon Johnson so the former would confront communism domestically (Rabe, 2006), communist student leaders were supported by the Soviet Union and Cuba so they would establish a resistance using UASD as headquarters (Brown-John & Brown-John, 1977).

Although the conflict was most intense during the twelve-year period covered in this study, it lasted more than two decades. Consequently, UASD experienced a systematic deterioration as faculty members and students were persecuted, government and militant students constantly clashed and university budget cuts surged (Pimentel, 2002; Tilak, 2004). Most
importantly, it also caused a significant death toll, social and institutional instability, and significant faculty/student desertions (Betances, 2005).

Given this remarkable and unexplored precedent, a research of qualitative epistemological tradition might help inform leaders and policy makers about the frames of reference and value system of the people related to UASD during this critical period. Attrition however has normally been studied as exogenous or originated in the individual’s external circumstances like learning and teaching difficulties, student income, etc. But through a phenomenological lens, with this study I attempted to find endogenous factors by building a map of social memory pertaining to the UASD-centered political conflict during the period of 1966-1978 (Garagozov, 2016). This allowed me to explore its impact among individuals who lived the conflict. Considering the possible effects of these events, I paid special attention to how these individuals perceive their experience and how it might have an impact in their circles of influence. In particular, this study examined how individuals and groups affected by the conflict engage with the next generation of Dominicans around the notion of pursuing higher education (Dessi, 2008; Louie, 2006). In essence, this study explored how the participants make meaning of their experience and pass that meaning on to the next generation. Thus, seeing how this influence contributes to the next generation’s collective memory perspectives, attitudes about institutional leadership and perception about the role of higher education in the current Dominican context.

**Background**

Between 1930 and 1960, the Dominican Republic had been ruled directly or indirectly by dictator Rafael Trujillo. His reign of power lasted 31 years until his assassination in May of 1961. During this time, Trujillo had been a constant ally to the United States in the defense of its
interests in the island and the Latin America region. This involved combating the rise of communism and socialism, whose local leaders were already a threat to himself (Bethell, 1990; Casa, 1982). In 1947, a group of left-wing Dominican intellectuals working from neighboring Cuba had planned and attempted a guerrilla-like invasion known as *Cayo Confites* together with militants from diverse nationalities including Fidel Castro. The popular uprising aimed at ending the Dictator’s rule (Moulton, 2015; Murkland, 1950). Although *Cayo Confites* failed, the political and ideological climate would remain permanently tense due to underlying beliefs and ideals that fueled the conflict. The anti-dictatorship sentiments merged well with socialist and communist ideals brought to the continent from other locations. For example, the Spanish Civil War and General Francisco Franco’s victory caused the exile of a considerable number of ideology-minded Spaniards to the Dominican Republic and other countries of the region (Cassa, 1982; Betances, 2015; Bethell, 1990).

After Trujillo’s assassination in 1961, a period of sociopolitical turmoil, fear and persecutions dominated the Dominican scene. His former advisor and proxy president since 1960, Joaquin Balaguer, continued Trujillo’s presidential term until 1962. Under this new circumstance, Balaguer was pressed by the international community to grant some civil liberty concessions and soften press censorship. Although the latter pleased the Organization of American States, it gained him harsh criticism from powerful, local conservative circles still loyal to the Trujillo family. In January of 1962 he was forced out by the Military and exiled to New York. In December 1962, new democratic elections were held that resulted in the victory of left-wing candidate Juan Bosch. Bosch was a longtime exiled Dominican intellectual and one of the leaders of the failed *Cayo Confites* (Vega, 2004; Vega, 2006). Given his ideological inclination toward the left, his victory raised concerns in the United States government. The
United States had already experienced the turning of Cuba to communism in the hands of Fidel Castro. This caused the U.S. serious losses in investment and geopolitical influence, and made it vulnerable against The Soviet Union, its Cold War rival. Internally, many in the Dominican military leadership and the bourgeoisie were not keen on the new left-wing President. These circles of power were still influenced by the long lasting dictatorship of Trujillo and its right-wing policies. Bosch took office in February 1963, but the unstable and conflictive new power struggles resulted in his deposition by a right-wing military coup d’etat in September the same year. The military established a ruling junta and managed to endure in power for almost two years until a civil war broke out in April 1965. Aided by a military rebellion this civil war aimed at restoring Bosch’s constitutional presidency (Betances, 2015; Liberato, 2005; Rabe, 2006; Vega, 2006; Bethell, 1990). Four days after the civil war started, an international military coalition led by the United States invaded and rapidly put an end to it. As a result, a temporary government led by President Hector Garcia Godoy was formed to handle the country and call for new elections to take place next year. In 1966, Joaquin Balaguer, former proxy president during Trujillo’s era and FBI collaborator, presented himself as a candidate (Weiner, 2012). Balaguer was proclaimed to be the victor to the suspicion and disappointment of the electorate who had chosen Bosch four years before. According to Rabe (2006), President Balaguer had been supported by President Lyndon Johnson’s administration so he would combat communism at the local level. Rabe (2006) quotes Johnson about the Dominican conflict during a meeting in the Cabinet Room at the White House on April 30, 1965. At that time, President Johnson refers to Balaguer as a moderate dictator and as his favorite candidate for president. When predicting the outcome of the US military intervention Johnson stated: "...we will have one of 3 dictators: 1) U.S., 2) Moderate dictator, 3) Castro dictator” (p. 56). The multinational intervention and the
consequential installment of President Balaguer was a radical game changer for the leftist opposition as no open large-scale battles were possible from then on. This extension of the Cold War marked the ending of one chapter in Dominican history and the beginning of another area (Bethell, 1990; Kryzanek, 1977).

**The Problem**

As an open confrontation, the 1965 Civil War concluded after the international military intervention took place the same year with no favorable results for leftist sympathizers and leaders. In 1966, right-wing President Balaguer started the first of three continuous presidential terms that would total 12 years. Theses years were marked by repression and persecution of opponents as well as by massive investment in national public works (Franco, 2007; Kryzanek, 1977; Liberato, 2005; Pimentel, 2002).

During this 12-year presidency of Joaquin Balaguer, the Cold War conflict did not fade in its intensity (Franco, 2007; Bethell, 1990; Kryzanek, 1977), but rather changed in two basic aspects: Its mode and its battleground. In the first place, it perpetuated in the new form of a guerrilla warfare, turning into a “long wave of anti-communist terrorism and the operations of leftist urban guerrilla groups” (Bethell, 1990, p. 528). Among many negative effects, Leslie Bethell documents that “more than four thousand Dominicans lost their lives in terrorist acts between 1966 and 1974” (Bethell, 1990, p. 528). This body count was mostly comprised of left-wing student militants and non-involved civilians.

What made this new stage of the conflict distinctive was the new battleground: *Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo* (UASD). UASD, the oldest higher education institution of The Americas (established in 1538), was turned into the epicenter of a major social conflict that lasted throughout Balaguer’s 12-year rule. This had a profound impact on the
country’s human development and economy due to the incomparable significance of UASD measured by its long history and the number of students enrolled in it (OECD, 2012). UASD was practically the only Dominican higher education institution at that time. *Pontificia Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra* (PUCMM) had opened only four years before, in 1962, and *Universidad Pedro Henríquez Ureña* was being inaugurated in 1966, at the beginning of the 12-year period (OECD, 2012). Part of the reason UASD became a battleground lay on one of the concessions carried out by President Balaguer after Trujillo’s death in 1961. He had granted governance autonomy to the state university (UASD) as stated in the Law 5778 of December 31st, 1961. Known previously as *Universidad de Santo Domingo*, the name was changed to *Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo* (UASD, 2018). Governance autonomy prevents the government, even today, from intervening into the administration and leadership of the university while guaranteeing state funding. In addition, it limits ordinary campus access to state forces and enforcement agencies. Under this circumstance, left-wing militants, mostly UASD students, found it strategically ideal to use the campus as stronghold (Betances, 2015) while also sharing their perspectives with the student community.

Inside the university, *Partido Revolucionario Dominicano* (PRD) was the organization that consolidated the diverse array of left-wing groups. Balaguer had been successful countering PRD rival groups through a leadership strategy of reward or confrontation. However, UASD remained the most important challenge for his government. As Kryzanek (1977, p. 95) writes, Balaguer had “yet to break the hold of the PRD and the left at the Autonomous University of Santo Domingo (UASD). UASD remains the stronghold of anti-Balaguer activity” (p. 95). During the 12-year period, the government carried out the persecution and, in some cases, execution of students and faculty. The Balaguer government also implemented budget cuts and
permitted damage to the university infrastructure (Pimentel, 2002; Kryzanek, 1977; Liberato, 2005; Bethell, 1990). Left-wing militants responded with similar energy and radicalism. They organized as “urban guerrilla groups made up of members of the old constitutionalist commandos who were still in possession of weapons and who believed it possible to make the revolution from the streets by killing police and soldiers” (Bethell, 1990, p. 528). Kryzanek (1977) further elaborates upon the conflict while describing a clash in March 1977 between leftist students and police: “…students criticizing a budget cut took to the streets in a bloody confrontation with the police. Fifteen students were wounded and over one hundred arrests were made” (p.96). Kryzanek again describes UASD as paramount territory of this nation-wide turmoil as “Balaguer was reminded that the university remains a key opposition sector in the country” (p. 96). The PRD at the time had a major influence and “made great strides in recruiting large numbers of students to party membership roles” (p. 96).

Since this period of constant and violent exchanges fueled by state repression in UASD lasted more than a decade, various generations of students and their families experienced this conflict either directly or indirectly. This type of social trauma is known to have enduring effects over the sub consciousness of human groups (Bandura, 2001; Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998).

In the academic narrative, the word trauma is used to define those social or individual memories that people are not willing to revisit; these memories are connected to events that inflicted profound distress (Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998). Meal (1998) describes sudden and large-scale changes compromising the welfare of a group as a melting pot for trauma: "Many of the more severe traumas grow out of abrupt changes in the qualities of social relationships. Previous feeling of safety and security are replaced by perceptions of danger, chaos, and a crisis of meaning" (p. 3). This social dynamic suggests that present social perspectives are rooted in
the collective memory of the recent past and how it is spread among individuals and populations (Bandura, 2001; Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998). Therefore, social trauma lays inside the commonly shared memory of groups. This set of held interpretations of the past influencing a group’s perspective and narrative is called social memory or collective memory (Bandura, 2001).

As it can also be inferred, subjects exposed to traumatic repression and stress are not the only affected parties, their perspectives transcend onto their offspring and their broad circle of influence, this process is called socio-cognition (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 2001). Dessi (2008) asserts that:

…the collective memory transmitted to the young by the older generation, through a variety of channels influences their perception of their cultural identity and values, and their willingness to invest in them with major economic as well as political and social consequences. (p. 109)

Hence, a precarious or overly biased understanding on the potential of education for empowering individuals and societies has a certain weight on the students’ appraisal of higher education (Freire, 1977). The extent to which students are willing to go and sacrifice for completing their undergraduate programs is directly informed by their learned perspectives on the comparative worth of education (Freire, 1977), against other means of upwards social mobility or self/social development.

**Attrition Rate in UASD**

By 2012, UASD held 44% of all national enrolments and its rate of attrition or student dropout was a concerning 80% (OECD, 2012; UASD, 2018). These numbers indicate that in UASD the completion rate nears 20%. Considering that UASD hosts nearly half of the enrolled college-age population, its low completion rate weighs significantly on the country’s average
rate which is already low itself at 50% (OECD, 2012). With such a completion rate, it should be noted that the Dominican Republic has the fifth lowest completion rate among Latin American countries whose data is available (World Bank, 2017). In the United States, the four-year programs of public universities have their completion rate ranging from 62.4 to 64.7% (Indiana University, 2017). This means that while the Dominican government’s investment in higher education is high, the return on that investment is low, particularly in UASD.

Following the years of conflict, the Dominican Republic invested considerably in public education, particularly higher education. Although still low for international standards, for the first time since the mid-1980s state investment in higher education comprises 0.3% of the country’s GDP (OECD, 2012; MESCYT, 2018). As a result of the goals of the 2008 Ten-Year Plan for Higher Education 2008-2018 (SEESCYT, 2008) that aims at expanding the system’s outreach and improving its quality, enrollment and investment in higher education is now at record highs. Enrollment in post-secondary education comprises 29.1% of the Dominican population between 18 and 24 years old, where in 1990 the percentage or participation rate was 10% (OECD, 2012).

Investment in capacity building and improving the quality of education has indubitably brought more students to the system. However, numbers suggest these strategies have not succeeded in having them complete their programs of choice at a sustainable rate. Endurance in programs is directly related to the individual’s conviction that education is worth the sacrifice. So far, the strategies focus on the system’s deficits leaving aside how the population think in connection to social believes rooted in the recent past.
Literature Deficiency

This study probes into how former Dominican higher education students make meaning of their traumatic memories of the past; and how such memories feed their perspectives of the present. The study concerns consequently on how these perspectives are spread to younger generations. Unfortunately, no previous works around this subject have been found so far conducted in the DR or elsewhere. The academic literature currently lacks information on two main streams related to this study: (1) The influence of UASD’s recent past of conflict over current day social perspectives about higher education and (2) the influence of current social perspectives over attrition. The latter deals with a non-technical and non-economic dimension of attrition.

OECD (2012), MESCYT (2011) and World Bank (2006) are the only sources located that discuss higher education attrition in the Dominican Republic. MESCYT (2011) suggests the country’s dropout rate of college-enrolled students is approximately 50%, acknowledging this is still a domestic challenge together with low efficiency in education and course repetition. OECD (2012) makes estimations on attrition rates asserting that UASD hold an 80% rate. The report also suggests a set of 15 recommendations in order to improve the general set of problems within the HE system. In general, they focus on the improvement of access through diversification of programs and qualifications, improvement of teacher preparation, increase student progression and completion of higher education, collection of data to analyze causes of attrition, expansion of counseling services, and the development of a more effective admission policy in UASD (OECD 2012, p. 22). Recommendations 3 and 4 address the issue of student attrition and retention by suggesting that special help must be provided to students during their first year, and that entrance requirements and exams need to be improved. The latter is expected to help prospects better
understand what their potential is, helping them make an informed choice for a career. The World Bank asserted in a 2006 report that poor performance in education in the DR is caused by insufficient investment in education, ineffective management, poor quality teaching and “bottlenecks in the supply of secondary schools” (p. ii). Seemingly, the national education strategy Ten-Year Plan for Higher Education 2008-2018 addresses the improvement of the installed capacity.

However, the above mentioned studies do not assess the impact of perspectives and collective memories held by students, those that weigh on their will to complete undergraduate programs. These perspectives on what education is and its potential can influence drop out decisions and are acquired from the current values of their social context. These studies do not address understanding and working on informing these collective memory perspectives so attrition levels can decrease (Bandura, 2001; Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998).

On the other hand, there is a noticeable lack of academic narrative on the DR’s recent past regarding the conflict between the State and UASD as a proxy war between the United States and the Soviet Union. Specifically, authors have not gathered specific information about the people’s experience inside UASD between 1966 and 1978 and how it affected their perception of higher education (Brown-John & Brown-John, 1977; Liberato, 2005; Pimentel, 2002).

Available accounts superficially explain the role of the State in the violent and repressive struggle against students and teachers that lasted decades (Dessi, 2008; Pimentel, 2002; Bethell, 1990; Kryzanek, 1977). Liberato (2005) builds a narrative out of a set of interviews with Dominicans focusing on their regard for President Balaguer. This narrative study discovered a significant sense of dislike of his rule. In Liberato (2005), Balaguer is portrayed as an
authoritarian and manipulative figure. Pimentel (2002) briefly mentions a massive faculty exodus from UASD during the Balaguer years as a result of his policy of repression toward teachers and students of that institution.

However, hints of how social memory might be acting upon younger generations can be learned in Louie (2006). It records a generational transference of perspective from middle age Dominicans migrating to the US to their descendants. Having compared second generation Chinese living in the US to their piers of Dominican origin, the work registered that Dominicans are more enthusiastic about their higher education experience in the United States since they compare themselves to their nationals living in the DR who, in their perception, either do not enroll into universities or will not take advantage of a fair academic climate. In doing so, college students of Dominican origin used transnational frames of reference as opposed to students of Chinese origin. The latter in turn used pan-ethnic frames as they compared themselves to other Americans of Chinese origin who they perceive are in a higher socio-economic status.

In summary, two main streams of academic literature are lacking relevant studies around this study’s subject, the first has to do with the influence of the recent past of conflict at UASD over current day perspectives about higher education, where the other deals with the influence of these perspectives over student attrition.

**Significance of the Study**

This study informs educational leaders and public policy makers about the influence people’s perspectives on higher education have on their performance and endurance as students. It provides an innovative approach that probes current perspectives forged in the people's image of their conflictive past. Through an in-depth analysis of a group’s collective memory and memory transference behaviors, this study can aid leaders on suggesting how to most effectively
reach the college-age population through the informing of their collective memory. The latter is important since the improvement of the education system has a strong component of informing the population about the numerous benefits of higher education.

In addition, complementing the technical and economic implications of attrition, the study considers the student’s willingness of enduring and completing their programs of choice based on their learned values. In other words, attrition was studied as a behavior of choosing, over which the student has a certain degree of freedom acting combined to economic and learning/teaching difficulties.

**Purpose Statement**

The goal of the study was to probe into the impact of trauma coming from memories of the recent past of violent conflict within UASD on the perspectives and actions of those who underwent it. Also concerning how that generation estimates that their beliefs and values are transmitted to those around them.

I explored how the violent political conflict between UASD faculty and students and the State that played out on the campus of UASD between 1966 and 1978 impacted the meaning making perspectives and behavior of people who were students at the time (Dessi, 2008). Specifically, the study explored how subjects remember their experiences as students during the conflict and developed perspectives about higher education and/or the leadership of higher education institutions based on those experiences. The participants were middle age citizens, and I explored how they have formed, and could be transmitting, perspectives and attitudes about higher education, educational leadership, and leaders to subsequent generations based on their experiences as students at UASD during the most intense period of the political conflict.
The findings from this study can inform government and higher institution leaders on approaches to transmit and build memory on the Dominican social fabric in relation to higher education. Social memory can be influenced by social leaders or agencies to introduce new perspectives. This involves the identification of effective message narratives on one side, and the identification of effective channels on the other (Dessi, 2008).

**Research Questions**

In the course of exploring my research interests, I probed the answer to the overarching question: How does a sample of Dominican citizens who attended UASD between 1966 and 1978 remember their personal experiences as students at that time and how have those memories influenced their attitudes toward and beliefs about higher education and the leaders who promote higher education or lead higher education institutions? Additionally, how do these former UASD students contribute to the collective memory of that time in their families and communities and/or transmit their attitudes and beliefs about higher education to subsequent generations?

To support the broader focusing questions for this study, I organized my inquiry with study participants around the following research sub-questions:

1. How do Balaguer era UASD students describe their experience of violence and persecution between 1966 and 1978?

2. How do Balaguer era UASD students interpret what they experienced and believe about those interpretations?

3. How have any attitudes held by the Balaguer era UASD students influenced their attitudes about higher education and those leaders who either promote or serve in leadership positions for higher education?
4. How do Balaguer era UASD students influence and share their experiences, attitudes, and beliefs about higher education with others in their families and community?

**Narrative of Conceptual Framework**

Using the perspective of the socio-cognitive and collective memory theories to inform the research (Bandura, 2001), my investigation explored the long term consequences (Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998; Siegert, 2016) of the UASD-government conflict over Dominican college students attending *Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo* (UASD) between 1966 and 1978. Students enrolled in UASD during that period faced repression and persecution due to a conflict between the government, ruled then by right-wing President Joaquin Balaguer, and communist militants led by members of the faculty, students and university leaders inside UASD (Bethell, 1990; Liberato, 2005).

Each side was supported by a major outside party: Balaguer counted on the support of the US government in order to confront communism locally (Rabe, 2006), while at the same time communist leaders were supported by the Soviet Union and Cuba. Since at the time communist groups located themselves inside UASD, its campus was a battle ground for this conflict (Brown-John & Brown-John, 1977). Although the harshest part lasted from 1966 to 1978, the conflict lasted more than two decades and resulted in a systematic deterioration of UASD by military incursions, persecution of faculty and students, and funding cuts (Betances, 2015; Pimentel 2002; Kryzanek, 1977; Tilak, 2004). The conflict caused numerous deaths, instability and violent aggressions from both parties (Bethell, 1990; Betances, 2005). UASD was and is the largest and most influential higher education institution in the country (OECD). This period of conflict was a major event in the recent history of the Dominican Republic and, as such, still holds a prominent place in the social consciousness of the Country. As a result, it is likely that
those individuals, for whom the conflict holds some significance, have made meaning of that conflict for themselves. More importantly for this study, is how they have engaged with family, friends, co-workers, and community members in sharing both their memories and the meaning they derived from those memories. It is also likely that some of that meaning in the shape of attitudes and beliefs has also permeated the collective memory of Dominicans to some degree and thus influence socio-cognitive responses.

I used the phenomenological framework to conduct interviews to probe into the memories, attitudes, and beliefs of a sample of former UASD students from that period. Subsequently, I built a map of how the personal experience of being in the center of such a violent conflict affects them. This is, how the experience translates to any form of residual attitudes and beliefs about higher education and educational leaders (Garagozov, 2016). I also attempted to trace how any attitudes or beliefs formed through the UASD experience are transmitted by UASD former students to subsequent generations of Dominicans (Louie, 2006) who might not have experienced such conflict but might be approaching the notion of higher education with bias due to the social transmission of collective memory (Dessi, 2008). See conceptual framework in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Conceptual Framework Map.](image-url)
Methods Overview

Considering the qualitative and experiential nature of the previously stated research questions, I chose the epistemological tradition of phenomenology to conduct my research. I built a map of this social memory (Garagozov, 2016) exploring the effects of conflict among individuals who lived it. Considering the possible effects of these events, I also paid special attention to learn if/how these individuals believe their experience might have an impact on how they engage with the next generation of Dominicans (Louie, 2006) around the notion of pursuing higher education (Dessi, 2008).

Its epistemological premises make transcendental phenomenology an effective methodological scaffolding to attain my research goal. This tradition studies how objects are regarded as an interpretable image of themselves, not paying attention to the discussion about a natural world around (Husserl, 1962). In this tradition developed by Edmund Husserl the analysis focuses on the lived experience common to a certain group and how individuals in such group commonly manifest the way they make meaning of the lived experience. The latter is known as imaginative variation (Husserl, 1962). It refers to those salient points describing how interviewees felt about their lived experience, involving their judgments and conclusions (structural codes); in addition, it deals with how these interpretations are determined and analyzed (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 2016; Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007; Creswell, 2013).

Closure

Recent history superficially registers a major and long-lasting social conflict inside UASD between 1966 and 1978 where the government and socialist groups collided constantly. During this period, the conflict claimed the lives of about four thousand men and women
according to Bethell (1990), caused the exodus of permanent faculty members (Pimentel, 2002) and prompted significant deterioration of university infrastructure (Franco, 2007; Kryzanek, 1977). Socially significant as it was, the effects of this conflict are unassessed by the academic narrative. However, concerning attrition rates of 80% suggest that among the college-age population the value of pursuing a higher education might not be appropriately comprehended. This combines with exogenous factors that current strategic plans are keen to address like teaching/learning difficulties and student income.

Through a transcendental phenomenology, this study aimed at understanding how the generation who lived through the conflict recalls it and makes meaning out of it. Additionally, this study sought to understand how these meanings are translated into beliefs, and how the latter may be infused into collective memory perspectives of Dominicans. Specifically, those perspectives related to the value of higher education, and trust of higher education institutions and their leaders in the Dominican Republic. This information can help educational leaders and policy makers design strategies to inform student collective beliefs about higher education and its worth.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The public *Universidad Autonoma de Santo Domingo* (UASD) is the oldest and largest Dominican higher education institution, and is currently experiencing a concerning 80% attrition rate (OECD, 2012). Given that UASD holds around half of national college enrolments, this attrition rate blocks the chances for a substantial portion of the rising workforce to receive adequate preparation. In consequence, it also makes it more challenging for the workforce to assume the roles and responsibilities for the knowledge economy of the 21st century (OECD, 2012). At the same time, this situation costs Dominican taxpayers millions of dollars in tuition and other services allocated to provide higher education to those students dropping out (OECD, 2012).

Interestingly, the current rate of attrition in UASD can also be an indicator of a present challenge of social perspectives in the DR. The frames of reference of human groups can indicate how likely they are to engage and endure in higher education (Louie, 2006; Lopez, 2011). The latter is an unexplored social issue in the DR. Initiatives to address or influence the perspectives of the college age population have not been developed by the national education policy and may be a key to matriculation and perseverance in higher education.

In order to review this gap, this section will begin with a discussion of higher education policy in the Dominican Republic. The narrative will include post dictatorship background and other further milestones, as well as the current state of affairs. Among the relevant material reviewed, the study examines the Ten-Year Plan for Higher Education (MESCYT, 2008) and the Strategic Plan for Science and Technology and Innovation 2008-2018 (SEESCOYT, 2008). In the same course of analysis, the narrative then examines the strategic assessments and
recommendations on higher education policy that include attrition rates made in the recent past by OECD and the World Bank. Then, the attention will turn to issues of attrition from an international perspective, reviewing the situation in the US and Europe.

After the examination of Dominican higher education policy and attrition, the theoretical framework for this research will then be discussed. Attrition in universities is influenced by social perspectives (Louie, 2006; Lopez, 2011) that are rooted in commonly shared interpretations of the recent past or collective memory. Therefore, the theoretical framework of collective memory will be developed. Specifically, with the interest to probe its usefulness to link high attrition rates to perceptions of higher education, which might be influenced by the trauma of the Balaguer’s “12 years” (1966-1978).

After the narrative on collective memory theory, a second complementary theoretical topic evaluates literature about how these memories of the recent past are transmitted within individuals and groups under the theory of socio-cognition. Following the theoretical examination, the history of how the Cold War geopolitics impacted UASD is discussed, focusing on how the ideology-driven struggle of this period fueled clashes that marked a generation. In addition, this examination considers the influence of Cold War conflicts inside public universities as an international trend, and how in the DR, UASD gradually turned into its preferred battleground.

**Dominican Higher Education Policy**

The year 2007 marks the beginning of contemporary national higher education plans in the Dominican Republic. In this section, I will review relevant information about the state of the higher education policy/system before 2007, as well as about national higher education plans formulated so far. As it will be noticed, the academic literature currently lacks information on
two main streams related to this study: (1) The influence of UASD’s recent past of conflict over current day social perspectives about higher education and (2) the influence of current social perspectives over attrition.

Following the end of the dictatorship of Rafael Trujillo (1930-1961), the climate of sociopolitical instability brought by a military coup, civil war, a multinational military intervention, and a call for new elections by 1965 (Bethell, 1990), challenged the higher education system. This succession of major events made the system lack integrality, intentionality and policy continuity in 1966, at the beginning of Balaguer’s 12-year presidential period (Brown-John and Brown-John, 1977).

Brown-John and Brown-John (1977) provides a static image of the Dominican higher education system between 1966 and 1977, coinciding with the first eleven years of Balaguer’s presidency, and showing how dependent was the system on its main institution, UASD. Throughout this period UASD remained at the center of the biggest and longest political conflict of the country’s recent history. This conflict consisted of frequent and violent clashes between the Dominican government and communist/socialist activists (students and faculty members) inside and around campus.

Parallel to persecution in UASD, the government also motivated the founding of other universities during the 60’s, which are private and mixed capital investments. This strategy was initiated to help mitigate the impact of the conflicts in UASD over the general higher education system. These latter institutions would be under rigorous supervision of the state. Brown-John and Brown-John (1977) depict the Dominican public higher education during this period as a resource to support the hegemony of the State, preventing the populace from being involved with subversive antigovernment movements: "… if he (Joaquin Balaguer) fails to provide an
educational system for his population, over time foreign and potentially subversive ideas may percolate into the illiterate society and this can result in upheaval" (p. 109).

Until 2007, there did not seem to exist a unifying strategy or policy guiding the Dominican Higher Education System. During that year, a series of efforts took place to build consensus around the future of higher education in the DR. This led to the development, in 2008, of the Ten-Year Plan for Higher Education 2008-2018 (Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology, 2008), the Strategic Plan for Science, Technology and Innovation 2008-2018 and, later in 2010, the National Development Strategy (Ministerio de Economía, Planificación y Desarrollo [MEPYD], 2010).

**The Ten-Year Plan for Higher Education**

MESCOYT (2008) was established to promote innovation within the cultural layer of the society, and for better collaboration among institutions of higher education. It aims to promote greater participation between government, HEIs, businesses and civil society around higher education. To achieve such goal, it proposed the secondary goals of: (1) increasing of student retention, (2) improving teaching quality, (3) promoting the relevance of education programs, (4) facilitating the professional development of higher education staff, (5) modernizing the higher education system and methods, (6) creating research groups, (7) developing university-industry links, and (8) more state support for higher education. Among the aforementioned secondary goals, goal number one addresses the issue of retention and goal number three focuses on promoting the importance of education programs as a means for national economic development. However, the plan fails to address the root causes of the problems associated with higher education that emerged from the Balaguer years.
Strategic Plan for Science, Technology and Innovation 2008-2018

SEESCYT (2008) was intended to be a first step to turn the Dominican Economy into an economy based on knowledge and innovation. It is described as a plan to support the improvement of the productive sectors and the quality of life of the Dominican people, and to promote sustainable development. Four main strategic goals embody its vision: (1) Strengthen the financial and public frameworks of the national system regarding science, technology and innovation; (2) develop research and development programs to improve the quality and positioning of products, goods and services generated in the local economy; (3) develop the human capital in science and technology required to strengthen the national capacity for the generation of knowledge and innovation; (4) facilitate the dissemination and social appropriation of science, technology and innovation as tools for social integration in the Dominican Republic.

SEESCYT (2008) addresses the need for the outreach of science, technology and innovation in Dominican society. Unfortunately, it did not consider whether the people are willing to embrace the educational agenda at the pace at which it was intended to be disseminated. This fourth strategic goal fundamentally includes the following actions: Curricula reforms for the teaching of sciences and mathematics in basic education and middle-to-high school, developing the national network of museums for science and technology, school programs for science and technology, promoting programs of scientific aptitude and the implementation of a National Plan for Dissemination.

Similar to MESCYT (2008), it does not address the root causes of these issues. These plans were formulated to, among other lines of action, increase student enrollment and completion rates as an indicator of institutional success. However, later and parallel studies suggest student attrition rates are in concerning high levels. OECD (2012), MESCYT (2011)
and World Bank (2006) all indicate concerns with higher education attrition rates in the DR. MESCOYT (2011) suggests the country’s dropout rate of college-enrolled students is approximately 50%, acknowledging this is still a domestic challenge together with low efficiency in education and course repetition.

Although absent among the premises in these plans, higher education and its efficacy is strongly connected to the social perspectives of those who learn (Louie, 2006, Lopez, 2011). As it will be discussed further on, these perspectives, in turn, are built out of social interpretations of the recent past whether traumatic or not (Barash, 2016; Mithander, 2012).

Assessment and Recommendations from International Agencies

OECD (2012) is the most recent official report conducted by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) on higher education in the Dominican Republic. It makes estimations on attrition rates asserting that UASD holds an 80% rate. After a diagnostic based on quantitative and chronical examinations, in a conclusive manner OECD (2012) suggests a set of 15 recommendations. These recommendations aimed at improving the general set of problems identified within the HE system, and specially UASD for having an incomparable weight on the system due to its size and cultural significance. The first four recommendations focus on the betterment of student access and retention. Specifically, they advocate for (1) accurate student field choice making through counseling and the diversification of programs; (2) improvement of teacher education, specially by improving the teacher education programs in UASD, implementation of incentive strategies, the setting of a selection criteria based on tests of aptitude and on admissions interviews; (3) have attrition rates reduced by 20% in 2018 through the increase of “higher education progression and completion” (p. 22); (4) the improvement of student retention through collection of data to analyze causes of attrition,
expansion of counseling services, and the development of a more selective admission policy in UASD. In addition, recommendations 3 and 4 address the issue of student attrition and retention by suggesting that special help must be provided to students during their first year, and that entrance requirements and exams need to be improved to let in only those students with the aptitude to be successful. The latter is expected to help prospects better understand what their potential is, helping them make an informed choice for a career. Recommendations 5 and 6 advise to include public and private sector employers in the process of updating higher education programs. First, (5) it bids on the involvement of employers so they can provide valuable feedback in the process of forming new higher education curricula; and second, (6) on the formation of a “high level national body” (p. 22) comprised of government authorities and public and private employers to help connect higher education policies to the national economy and the labor market.

Recommendations 7, 8 and 9 aim at the diversification and expansion of the higher education system. Equality and diversification in higher education were proposed by (7) suggesting the creation of two-year community college programs relevant to the labor market and the involvement through internet-based platforms of foreign qualified providers of higher education, be it individuals or organizations. In addition, (8) diversification and competitiveness were expected to improve by the creation of national accreditation systems, a national qualifications framework and the development of comparative indicators on the offerings, performance and capacity of higher education institutions. The latter is aimed at helping students choose a field or institution. Equality of access is also addressed from the financial point of view; the report recommends (9) financial aid for financially challenged students.
Recommendations 10, 11 and 12 relate to the necessary improvement of the practice of research in Dominican higher education institutions. This set advocates for (10) the establishment of research institutions with international standards and provision of funding to them according to their practices and performance, (11) likewise, the financing of centers and researchers in transparent peer reviewed processes, and finally, (10) the gathering of useful data by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MESCOY) from higher education institutions to help the former conduct research on how to improve the system.

Recommendations 14 and 15 aim at the improvement and update of UASD’s academic structure. The text reflects upon the betterment of UASD as having a significant impact in the country’s higher education system as well as on its economy and human development, asserting that UASD needs to improve its policies on admissions, curriculum, teaching, learning and governance. Therefore (14) UASD’s structure needs a reformation, and (15) such update must involve increasing the efficiency of admissions and governance within UASD’s Regional University Centers.

In general, OECD (2012) does pose a proactive response to the various challenges identified inside the Dominican Higher Education System. However, it renders the problem of attrition as caused by the financial hurdles of students, imprecise admissions selection criteria, lack of effective university counseling, non-diverse outdated and complex programs/curriculums and lack of effective teacher development.

At no point is attrition considered in its volitional dimension, in other words, as a decision based on values held by the individual, where significant degrees of freedom from financial and organizational hurdles play a part, however important the latter elements might be. Therefore, the recommendations suggest actions outside the student’s values and culture, instead
of addressing such values and culture. Perhaps acknowledging that attrition was not sufficiently reflected upon, recommendation 4 urges to the collection of data to better understand its causes.

On a similar fashion, the World Bank asserted in a 2006 report that poor performance in education in the DR is caused by insufficient investment in education, ineffective management, poor quality teaching and “bottlenecks in the supply of secondary schools” (p. ii). World Bank (2006) has the financial and mechanical aspects of the system addressed, although leaving out of scope how the population regards and makes sense of education. Interestingly, Louie (2006) discovered in a series of interviews that, in spite of contextual difficulties, second generation Dominicans living in the United States are motivated to engage into - and attain - higher education informed by collective frames of reference – transnational frames-. Seemingly, Louie (2006) found that the second generation Chinese also draw from their own community frames of references – pan ethnic - to successfully attain higher education degrees. Thus, collective memory holding the values and identity of communities does play a decisive role in student performance leading to program completion. Therefore, not only does social/collective memory play a role in attainment, but such frame of reference leading to completion can also vary from one community to another (Louie, 2006).

The problem of misinformed social perspectives or frames of reference as a cause for student attrition is relevant in the Dominican Republic considering that public higher education is practically free (OECD, 2012). Students do not find prohibitive tuition fees blocking their chances to complete their programs in UASD. Other countries or regions do not face the problem of social perspectives as primary issue. They have achieved civic maturity, leading to the common understanding of the worth of higher education for national economic growth and
individual development. Instead, these developed societies struggle with student attrition caused by mainly socio economic issues (ELS, 2002).

**College Attrition in the United States and the European Union**

Attrition in universities around the world is not necessarily caused by universal factors as it can be seen in the following examination of Ingels et al. (2014) and European Commission (2015), which report the state of attrition in the US and the European Union respectively. Attrition in the US is heavily connected to students’ financial limitations, while in Europe the predictors shift along different countries from socioeconomic status, gender, age, self-esteem, and lack of a culture of commitment. The Dominican context varies from that of US and Europe in a number of aspects, one relevant to this discussion is that the population income per capita is relatively lower but public higher education is almost free. However, a lack of a culture of commitment and self-esteem seem to be predictors for attrition locally as in Europe. Interestingly, culture and self-esteem are rooted in meaning making of the recent past in the form of belief, memory and perspectives. The UASD events between 1966 and 1978 were large enough and lasted long enough to impact the individual lives of those around and inside the institution, as well as society in ways not yet assessed (Bethell, 1990; Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998; Seigert, 2016).

**College Attrition Causes in the US**

In the United States, and probably other countries where tuition fees among public universities exceed the average prospects’ capacity to afford them, scarce personal or family resources seems to be the major obstacle to enrollment and attainment. In 2002, the National Center for Education Statistics, started the Education Longitudinal Study (ELS, 2002) to monitor the educational performance and attainment of a nationally representative high school
sophomore cohort. In 2002, 59% of students of low socio economic status (SES) within the cohort had expected to attain bachelor’s degree or higher. However, at the end of a ten-year period (2012) only 14% of them had attained such goal; compared to 60% of students coming from families of high SES who did complete a bachelor’s degree or higher. In second place, academic skills showed to be a major predictor of degree attainment. Students performing successfully in mathematics while in high school were considerably more likely to complete their higher education programs. Interestingly, one of the concerns expressed in OECD (2012) about the Dominican Higher Education challenges has to do with the quality of education in public high schools.

**Attrition in the European Union**

At the pan European level, despite its complexity among economic, ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the continent’s nations, a set of predictors for student attrition could be summarized in the report Drop Out and Completion in Higher Education in Europe of 2015 (European Commission, 2015). The study synthetized causes for attrition at three different levels: Individual, institutional and national or systemic level. Students’ socio economic status, age, gender and self-esteem impact significantly in their chances for program completion, where students of low SES and low self-esteem have lesser chances to succeed. At the institutional level, when a culture of commitment in teaching and learning is installed to support students in their bid to complete programs, completion rates improve, and vice versa. Finally, at the national level, attrition is conditioned by policies of access and selectivity. When selection criteria loosen, the chances of having unprepared students start programs increase and therefore the number of drop outs increase also. Nationwide, program flexibility has also been observed as a predictor, programs that favor student mobility have greater rates of completion. National policies of
broadening financial support are mentioned last in the narrative, financial difficulties harm students’ chances to attain a bachelor’s degree.

As it can be seen, Ingels et al. (2014) and European Commission (2015) measure attrition in the US and the EU in dimensions outside the students’ frames of reference and values, citing as primary hurdles the individual’s financial difficulty to afford tuition. Similar to OECD (2012) and World Bank (2006), Ingels et al. (2014) and European Commission (2015) fail to look to the lens of social memory theory in order to improve its body of assessment and recommendations.

However, it is important to notice that Ingels et al. (2014) and European Commission (2015) are assessments of contexts different to that of the DR and that –likewise- attrition causes might vary within countries and continents. Societies that value higher education as a significant means of individual and social development might have its attrition causes in financial, access or infrastructure difficulties. In turn, other societies need to build preceding social awareness on the importance of higher education too in order to address attrition. For the latter, research is needed to understand the nature of the society’s beliefs in relation to its past (Bethell, 1990; Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998; Seigert, 2016).

**The Role of Collective Memory Theory**

As it will be noticed in the further revision of Barash (2016) and Corning and Schuman (2015), theories of collective memory circle around the assumption that human societies share common images or interpretations of their past, and that these frameworks of interpretations have an impact in the people’s present values and behaviors. As inferred from Neal (1988), Langerbacher and Shain, (2010), McQuid, (2015) and Siegert, (2016), collective memory can contain social trauma within it. In this case, trauma (social or individual) is defined as a
particular memory that groups or individuals avoid or refuse to revisit because they consider it stressful and/or painful (Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998; Seigert, 2016).

Another important characteristic of collective memory has to do with its capacity to mutate and spread. Collective memory theories argue that the process of construction and transmission of memory is constant (Mithander, 2012); so, as it is noticed in Bandura (2001) and Dessi (2008), new efforts to edit social memories can actually help transform them. The latter involves influential individuals, or organizations, and enters also into the realm of the socio-cognitive theory, which will be discussed along the current narrative too.

Barash (2016) presents a philosophical discourse study that explores the meaning of collective memory as conditioned -among other factors- by time, space and cultural perception. In this narrative, social memory in a broader sense is the result of the remembrance of a past event perceived in a particular time through a certain perspective and revisited further in time repeatedly. Since it is fundamentally social, the meaning of collective memory depends on how people interpret human existence and human relations: "The predominant philosophical arguments regarding the significance and scope of memory owe their persuasive force in given historical periods to the fundamental convictions they convey concerning the sense of human existence and of human interaction in the sociopolitical sphere" (p. 2).

Students enrolled in UASD between 1966 and 1978 experienced the government-UASD conflict drawing social meaning from it. Such meaning might be transforming its nature ever since, as sociopolitical structures change in time too.

Like Barash (2016), Neal (1998) describes social memories as conveyors of meaning on human existence, focusing on traumatic collective recollections. The study develops a critical review on social trauma while analyzing various traumatic events for the American people: Pearl
Harbor, the Great Depression, World War Two, etc. It vows to consider the critical comprehension of the event causing trauma and its social acknowledgement, also on the social wound it caused. In relation to the latter, the work probes fear and anger as components of the nature of trauma. Fear is presented as a manifestation of discomfort related to a strong desire not to be exposed again to the traumatic stimuli. On the other hand, anger, is a predisposition to primarily seek for revenge. The event of trauma either is experienced in a moment of vulnerability or produces a condition of vulnerability in victims; and can trigger extreme reactions.

The study, over all, addresses the issue of trauma in collective memory not as a unilateral and field-limited pathology, but rather as one that embodies a number of interrelated and collateral effects to consider. Neal (1998) further explores the nature of trauma in collective memory, expanding the notion to also include its ramifications related to extreme social sentiments. The work asserts that another manifestation of trauma is the perception of constantly feeling in danger: "Many of the more severe traumas grow out of abrupt changes in the qualities of social relationships. Previous feeling of safety and security are replaced by perceptions of danger, chaos, and a crisis of meaning" (Neal, 1998, p. 3).

Also connected to Barash (2016), Corning and Schuman (2015) emphasizes time as a defining variable in the process of social memory construction and evolution. The work is a mixed methods study (phenomenology, literature review, case study and survey) built on interviews and historical research in the United States, China, Japan, Germany, Lithuania, Russia, Israel, and Ukraine. Its aim was to explore the socio political components of human generations and how shared experiences feed collective memory in societies around the world.
Corning and Schuman (2015) centers its attention in the stage of life of those who experience an event. Its most important finding is that shared experiences in adolescence and early adulthood make our most influential generational memories. However, there are exceptions, events that define an epoch in a certain territory, like revolutions, tend to compete with the age factor, influencing individuals of all ages similarly in power and lasting effect. Interestingly, and drawing from the latter, in the government-UASD conflict both elements combine. On one hand, most individuals experiencing the conflict were of early college age, on the other, the scale of the conflict made it indubitable epoch making.

In addition, Corning and Schuman (2015) warns about the considerable level of complexity within the concept of social memory according to its specific context:

…collective memory appears in many different contexts used by writers of all kinds; the common conceptual element is simply the remembrance of the past in some form by or for a collectivity, large or small. Within those broad boundaries, there are many variations, and we need to allow for such diversity when the term is used. (p. 10)

Common to the concern of Corning and Schuman (2015) that context-related complexity must be minded, Mithander (2012) considers a wide spectrum of circumstances and reactions to traumatic memories held over Europe and probes into ways these countries have dealt with such traumas. It conducts a critical review of 27 historic works to probe into the traumatic history of 20th Century Europe. The study asserts that Europe has managed those episodes of trauma mainly through remembrance, legal battles and historiography. The question of remembrance is related to the channels through which societies recall events of the past. Europeans have dealt with trauma in part by observing specific dates, and building commemorative monuments and museums. Harsh legal battles have also been fought to achieve favorable settlements to trauma
victims and their relatives. In addition, the production of accurate historiography poses a significant challenge for trauma victims, they must constantly guard to prevent inaccurate information from emerging.

The generation that experienced government-UASD conflict could or should likewise be embarked in a quest for necessary rituals to deal with their trauma, however not necessarily agreeing on a single version of the conflict. Mithander (2012) supports the idea that social memories are held under permanent negotiation, hence they are constantly self-editing:

The images of the past are in no sense shared in a unified way, but they emerge rather through social bargaining and contention, and social work in coming to terms with the past. They are seen as preliminary and open to future revision. (p. 12)

Learning from the European case study, the Mithander (2012) presents collective memory as a complex, non-linear, juxtaposition of images that can reflect a sum of commonalities but it at the same time show differences from an individual's perspective to another. Mithander (2012) asserts that remembrance, as a tool to address collective traumatic memories, involves the transmission of memory to the current population comprised by different generations. Such conveyance of memory or influence in memory be it by individuals around their circle of influence, states, or interest groups is the realm of study of socio-cognition or socio-cognitive theory.

Langerbacher and Shain (2010) explore through the critical review of historic events, how influential large-scale events can remain present in society. Events catalyze a unifying social manner in which people behave as a reaction to them, in addition, these events are not remembered without the presence of strong social bias. People's perspectives inform the perception of the events, as well as the perception of the events’ first order narrative as conveyed
and learned. When addressing the events of September 11, the authors assert: "...the events and the memories resulting from them became powerful motivating forces for Americans almost overnight" (p. I).

In second place, Langerbacher and Shain (2010) explain, through an analysis of the September 11 attacks to the World Trade Center, how traumatic events impact the way people perceive concepts like religion, ethnicity, technology, diversity and safety.

McQuid (2015) also probes into a historical conflictive event, the transition to peace in Northern Ireland, and how its memory is being manifested currently. It explores collective memory through a literature review narrative and makes use of theories of collective and cultural memory to assess examples of republican and loyalist parades in North Belfast. In the study, social conflict in Belfast is assessed through its cultural tradition of parading. McQuid argues that trauma survives in the memory of the people, making it more difficult to implement a process of recovery: "...there is fear of memory and identity collapse in particular communities on the margins of the peace process, leading to a conscious doubling of efforts to (re)articulate the hidden recesses of memory in the current transition" (p. 31).

McQuid (2015) explores the current sentiments of social groups with a conflictive past in common and how this affects their current daily lives. It also studies how social fear can be noticed through the group's traditions. As McQuid (2015) demonstrates on its observations of the parades, trauma is expected to be present in diverse forms of human and social production, not only in verbal communication. Under the qualitative tradition of case study, Siegert (2016) conducts a research on selected Angolan art works to assess how the interdependence between memory and trauma suggest the level of impact of the Angolan conflictive recent past over the population. Memory is regarded as the record to be kept in mind and revisited so it can be
shared, while trauma is in turn a cluster of a memory that we rather deny leaving it unmentioned and unaccounted in our recollections. "The notions of memory and trauma (as absence of memory) are closely related and interrelated to the topic of the archive, especially in regard to the collective or cultural dimension of the archive" (p. 103).

As the explanation suggests, the work analyzed what is present and what is absent in the art works, and considers the absence and presence of certain symbolic elements as a sign of trauma. Siegert (2016) concludes by confirming the influence of trauma and memory in the creative process of artists in Angola.

Verbal communication can also suggest trauma by what respondents decide to omit and by what they decide to report (Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998; Seigert, 2016). Although it is difficult to distinguish what a respondent omits voluntarily than what she/he ignores, it is possible to at least ask if there are voluntary omissions in their accounts related to a sentiment of pain or discomfort. It is also possible to notice and qualify symbolic language employed.

Through the critical review of a series of case studies from the past, Zerubabel (2012) explores not how facts developed but rather the way facts are remembered and the frames of references and perspectives that social groups use to remember the past. Normally the perspective or bias of the powerful is the one that transcends while that of the dominated is subjected to oblivion. In every case, to answer why we remember with a certain perspective we must engage into a process of examination around the way information about the past is remembered by our groups: "We must first examine the unmistakably social map-like structures in which history is typically organized in our minds. What we need, in other words, is a socio-mental topography of the past" (p. 1).
The work concludes emphasizing that memory has subconscious subtle bias structures that explain why we regard the past in a way or another. These biases are not always caused by trauma, they are comprised in an integral manner of all of the individual’s former experiences. The accounts of UASD students have to carefully be guided so impressions unrelated to their UASD experience will not contaminate the outcomes.

As it can be learned in the studies above revised, collective memory is a built account of the past held by a human group. Collective memory informs social perspectives through which groups make meaning of the world around. This is, depending on how individuals interpret these memories they can manifest a wide spectrum of behaviors and reactions. Memories of conflict or other perceived negative events that people find difficult to revisit are considered traumas. My research is built upon the premise that collective memory of much conflictive college years might have a negative impact on the subjects’ valuation of higher education and higher education institutions. The revised principles of collective memory have provided effective threads of inquiry with which I developed the data collection instrument presented in Chapter III.

**The Socio-Cognitive Theory**

Collective memory can be transmitted. This is yet another distinctive characteristic that allows it to transcend in time and expand in space among the population (Dessi, 2008). One of the research questions in Chapter I wonders how participants assess their influence over the people around them. This is important to identify how their beliefs –or lack of them- on higher education and its benefits have been shared on the last decades and probably will continue to do so. Socio-Cognitive theories deal with how individuals influence others within a social atmosphere having an impact on the social/collective memory.
Dessi (2008) uses the theoretical frameworks of socio-cognition and collective memory as an integral structure: Humans share unified images of the past that inform their values and behaviors –collective memory–, and those images can be influenced and transformed –socio-cognition–. The study investigates the optimal mechanism to influence collective memory drawing from interviews to the public in England and the United States exploring the effects of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) respectively. The paper also highlights the biases that often arise and shows how selective interventions in collective memory pose social benefits and costs.

The study found that social memory plays a defining role in a group’s identity. In addition, after having evaluated the influence of a number of actors and channels over memory, it found out that older generations have the most influence over the population with regards to the making of perspective and memory:

Memory plays a crucial role in the transmission of cultural and national identity. In every society and every country, the collective memory transmitted to the young by the older generation…, influences their perception of their cultural identity and values, and their willingness to invest in them with major economic as well as political and social consequences. (p. 109)

This outcome provides legitimacy to the research questions of my study since they involve inquiry about the influence that the generation exposed to conflict had over those around them nowadays. The population of my study is already an older generation and possibly the most influential means of perspective building to the rest of the population.

Bandura (1986) explores the primordial structures of social perspectives and behavior. It develops an integrated theory of action and motivation among humans, assessing the incidence
of processes in human behavior that are self-regulatory, cognitive, self-reflective and substitutive. Social role models are models associated to success that others emulate from their stand as followers. This is a seminal work for social reciprocal determinism. Bandura (1986) asserts that self-cognition and personal interpretation of the world around is drawn by the individual’s own experience as well as by the influence or accounts of others:

People's conceptions about themselves and the nature of things are developed and verified through four different processes: direct experience of the effects produced by their actions, vicarious experience of the effects produced by somebody else's actions, judgments voiced by others, and derivation of further knowledge from what they already know by using rules of inference. (p. 27)

Bandura (2001) elaborates on the influence of mass communication over social constructions. In this line, the work portrays socio-cognitive theory as informed by the social construction of reality, social prompting of human behavior, flow of social influence, behavioral diffusion, behavioral adoption, social networks and flow of diffusion, motivational effects and mechanisms governing observational learning. Social diffusion of perspectives is in this work the central subject: "Social cognitive theory analyzes social diffusion of new styles of behavior in terms of the psychosocial factors governing their acquisition and adoption and the social networks through which they spread and are supported" (p. 265). Defined in these terms, socio cognitive theory this is relevant to the line of inquiry of this study which is interested on how UASD students process events and pass beliefs on to others around.

**Socio-Cognition of Memory on HE within US Dominican Community**

It is certainly a challenge to find previous studies conducted among the current Dominican generation linking a shared perspective to higher education domestically. However,
there is a stream of academic literature drawing from the perspectives of second generation Dominicans in the US about higher education, as influenced by their Dominican background, that sheds light on how the community make sense of their past to engage into higher education. The researchers’ interest around the Dominican community engaging in higher education originates on the remarkably fast pace of college enrollment of this community as a reaction to their Dominican background.

Lopez (2011) provides a phenomenological study drawing from a series of 20 interviews to second generation Dominicans living in the United States. As explained in the study, second generation Dominicans are defined as people who either are born in the US to at least one Dominican born parent or went to live to the US before the age of 12. The work explores the context of second generation Dominicans living in the US as well as their vision of higher education. Lopez (2011) argues that this is the Hispanic group with more percentage of individuals attending to college in the US, 16% of second-generation Dominicans attend where the average for the Hispanic community is 12.9%. The work showed that different from traditional expectations over the community and different from their socio-economic peers living in the Dominican Republic, a growing number of second-generation Dominicans engage in higher education as it is seen by the community as a means of upwards social mobility and status, and a comparative advantage when measured against the perceived Dominican status quo as conveyed by friends and/or family members.

The work reports the academic achievements of this community and asserts that researchers need to study how second generation Dominicans see themselves in relation to their peers living in the DR (transnational frameworks) in order to be able to better understand their
mindset. The study validated the notion that Dominicans tend to seize opportunities that they feel other fellow Dominicans do not have access to. Lopez (2011) writes:

Second-generation Dominicans have made notable gains in attaining bachelor’s degrees in the United States. It is not clear why second-generation Dominicans have been able to do relatively well in college compared to some of their minority peers. Scholars have not fully explained the Dominican student experience in college, especially since they have not considered the role, if any, that transnationalism, may play in the lives of second-generation Dominican college students. Dominicans are known to be highly transnational. (p. 01)

In the first place, transnationalism is indeed a frame of reference held by the community, a perspective informed by memory that motivate individuals to complete their programs of choice. In second place, since the Dominican community engages into higher education as a result of using a transnational frame of reference, their views on higher education in the DR tend to be rather pessimistic. Louie (2006) validates the argument of Dominican transnationalism as a cause for educational success in the US. The study is a phenomenology drawing from 79 interviews and combined with a critical literature review on trans nationalist and pan-ethnic frames of reference among second-generation immigrants. About half of the participant sample is of Chinese background, the other half is of Dominican background.

The study shows that second-generation Chinese have strict parents with whom they do not have enough communication. Their parents' focus is to make their children blend in the new country, leaving behind their autochthonous language, friends and relatives, and other elements of their culture. They see themselves as ethnic Chinese, but not cultural Chinese.
In turn, second-generation Dominicans tended to have quality communication with their parents, travel constantly to the DR, and keep their parent's language and culture. Dominicans tended to use a transnational frame of reference, they see themselves as belonging to two realities simultaneously, and whatever goes on in the DR matters to them: "However, because the Dominicans used transnational orientations, my respondents also drew on Dominican conceptions of race to understand how they were incorporated into the American racial system, and to navigate social expectations for women and men" (p. 388).

In a separate article the same year, Louie (2006) probed more into the beliefs and causes associated to enrollment into higher education for members these two communities. Louie (2006) again debated which frames of reference Dominican second generation in the United States tend to use compared to second generation Chinese. This study drew from the same interviews to 79 higher education students, 39 Dominicans and 40 Chinese.

As a result, Louie (2006) concluded that, for both communities, the decision to enroll into higher education and thrive on it is linked to the frames of reference of their choice. Dominicans tend to use transnational frames of reference while Chinese use pan ethnic frames of reference. Louie (2006) found that the former feel optimistic as enrolling into higher education while comparing themselves to other Dominicans still living inside the RD under perceived worse conditions and the Chinese college students feel pessimistic comparing themselves to other Chinese living in the US on better standards:

The Dominicans believe they are doing better than peers in the Dominican Republic and in the United States. The pessimism of the Chinese can be traced to their use of ethnic/pan-ethnic frames of comparison. The Chinese believe they are faring worse than peers in the United States. (p. 537)
In conclusion, Louie (2006) and Lopez (2011) register a perception of advantage among the Dominican community in the US which is enrolled into higher education contrasted to their perception on the status quo in the Dominican Republic. As it will be noticed further on, the difficulties that this second generation of Dominicans identify in the DR’s public higher education system are related to the country’s recent past of conflict.

During the second half of the Twentieth Century, Dominicans were marked by the regional waves of a major and long lasting international struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union. After the interruption in 1961 of a 30-year Dictatorship, the country experienced 17 years of socio economic turmoil. During that short time lapse Dominicans passed through a military coup, a civil war, an international military intervention, and guerilla warfare, particularly around, about and inside UASD.

**Cold War in the Dominican Republic**

Cold War is the name most frequently given to the series and manners of conflicts between the competing victors in World War II so each would either gain or retain geopolitical power over the other. Interestingly, this conflict was marked by proxy conflicts around strategically sensitive regions of the world, financed and ideologically informed by the patronage of the colliding establishments of the United States and the Soviet Union (Finger, 2001; Rabe, 2006). As explained in Chapter I, for at least 12 years, between 1966 and 1978, the Dominican Higher Education System became the battle ground of this large-scale power struggle. In order to understand this local battle and how it migrated to the Higher Education System it is important to notice its background in the Caribbean Region and the Dominican state. Interestingly, one of the learning points and limitations of this research is that information on Soviet foreign policy towards Latin America is scarcely available (Pedemonte, 2015). Pedemonte (2015) provides a
historic account on the nature of the relations between various Latin American countries and the Soviet Union between 1945 and 1992. This research shows that Latin America's relations with the Soviet Union have not been sufficiently studied by researchers despite the relevance of the Soviet model in the politics of the region. During the sixties and seventies, the literature on the subject expanded timidly followed by a phase of silence until late eighties. By that time new literature emerged that is deemed as biased by the authors of the study. As a result of the study, the authors argue the social sciences are still deficient with regard to the subject of Soviet-Latin American ties:

Other than punctual interpretations, however, the end of the conflict has not stimulated the academic renovation that was expected, and an evaluation of the “state of the art” shows that, in the area of Soviet-Latin American ties, the social sciences are still in debt.

(p. 232)

Although the lack of information keeps part of the recent history still in the dark, my research involves interviews to former students who were academically trained and financed in the Soviet Union during that time.

Pujals (2014), using a historical account, puts into perspective the nature of the Soviet foreign policy toward the Caribbean since the beginning of the Twentieth Century. The region was always of special interest for the Soviet Union because of its strategic proximity to the United States. In consequence, influence networks were created having the Latin diaspora in New York as main actors who, aided by the Comintern (international organization promoting communism in the world until 1943), contributed to the international and transnational aspect of Caribbean radicalism extended through the post-war era:
The evidence, in turn, implies a call to reformulate the historical evolution of the Caribbean diaspora in New York between the 1920s and the 1940s, taking into consideration the Comintern’s contribution to the transnational aspect of Caribbean radicalism, politics and culture in the post-war era. (p. 255)

This research is of key importance since it provides background to the American-Soviet power struggle over the Caribbean territory, seeing how Soviet agencies were acting proactively to influence the young Latin-Caribbean leaders who would carry out revolution attempts in the region after World War II. This fundamental piece of the puzzle helps explain the origins of Communism in the Latin Caribbean islands of Cuba, Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico.

The chronical narrative of Bethell (1990) and Cassa (1982) show how since 1930, the Dominican Republic had been ruled directly or indirectly by Dictator Rafael Trujillo. His period lasted 31 years until his assassination in May of 1961. During this time, Trujillo had been a constant ally to the United States in the defense of its interests in the island and the Latin America region. This involved combating communism and socialism, whose local leaders already presented a threat for himself and his government. Moulton (2015) and Murkland (1950), also in a chronical fashion, explain how in 1947, a group of left-wing Dominican intellectuals working from neighboring Cuba had planned and attempted an expedition known as Cayo Confites together with other militants from diverse nationalities. It aimed at ending the Dictator’s rule. Cassa (1982), Betances (2015) and Bethell (1990) assert in their chronical accounts that although the expedition failed, the political and ideological climate would remain permanently tense due to a circumstantial complementarity of ideals. The anti-dictatorship sentiments merged well with socialist and communist ideals brought to the continent from different origins, among them, civil war immersed Spain.
Pre-Balaguer’s 12-Year Period (1961-1966)

Rodriguez, Figueroa and Green (1991) provides a critical review analysis of the recent geopolitical dynamic in the Caribbean region. It addresses the Dominican post-dictatorship conflict explaining the role of key stakeholders during the conflict. This source locates Juan Bosch, ideological leader of the Dominican revolution and its subsequent waves inside UASD, at the Marxist side of the conflict: “(Juan) Bosch began to make harsh criticism of imperialism and declared himself a Marxist” (p. 88). In addition, the study points at the intense polarization of the armed forces, where one side remained loyal to dictatorship frames of reference and other side supported change and the constitutionality of Bosch’s presidential term.

Harmer (2011) provides a critical review of the rule of Chilean President Salvador Allende, the context of his rise to office, his ruling style and the way he had his rule interrupted by right wing forces allied to the US government. The work recollects and interconnects the various frustrated attempts of Latin American leaders to start left-wing governments in the region, among them, the Dominican experiment:

Their examination of the alternatives available for bringing about progressive, if not yet socialist, change responded to the scars of the new intensified inter-American Cold War that had emerged after 1959. Cuban support in Colombian, Argentina, Peru, Venezuela, Guatemala and Bolivia had failed. The reformist government of Joao Goulart (Brasil) had also been toppled and replaced…US forces had invaded the Dominican Republic in 1965. (P.22)

This work portrays the Dominican case as a preamble to many other violent ideological clashes between communist socialism and capitalism in the region. It concludes defining the struggle as a Latin American Cold War, a part of the Cold War complex enough to have a name
of its own. It is relevant to my research since it renders the Dominican revolt as of socialist cut, something important to understand the subsequent clash between President Balaguer, supported by American President Lyndon Johnson and communism inside UASD, supported by Cuba and the Soviet Union.

McClung (1965) provides a historic account explaining what the situation was like during the first three months of the Balaguer ruling years and comparing this environment to the presidency of deposed President Juan Bosch. Although he had managed to implement favorable social measures during his first six months, he could not withstand the interests of local and regional power structures. Bosch was deposed by the right-wing military on ideological grounds, under the concern that he would turn the country into a communist nation:

Bosch did increase liberties in the country. Freedom of speech, press, assembly, and travel flourished. Even this eventually worked to the detriment of Bosch. It allowed extreme leftist elements to work freely, frightening the rightist elements of the country into fearing Bosch's own allegiances. (p. 28)

The work concludes with the validation of the thesis placing Balaguer as posted by the US government of President Lyndon Johnson to fight communism in the country. Wilson (1966), in chronical style explains how the Monroe Doctrine established, from the beginning of the 19th Century, that no European superpowers could force or attempt to re-conquer territories in the Americas. From that point on, the United States would start considering these attempts a threat to their interests in the region. Wilson (1966) explains how the process of US military intervention (1965) to prevent Soviet influence the region had this doctrine as background:

The Cuban economic dependence upon the Soviet Union, the discovery and removal of Soviet missiles, and Cuban infiltration and subversion in Latin America-most recently in
the Dominican Republic-have prompted a continuing debate and controversy about the

status of the Monroe Doctrine. (p. 322)

From a financial point of view, Wilson (1966) concludes by highlighting how the
regional geopolitics of the time played between Cuba and the US impacted the region and the
rest of the world. This work is relevant to establish a connection between the recent past of
turmoil and current collective memory since it explains with clarity the broad context in which
the UASD-Balaguer ideological conflict took place.

Rabe (2006) provides a historic account and literature review regarding the geopolitical
conflict between the US and former Soviet Union that lead to numerous proxy confrontations
inside Latin American nations. The case of the Dominican civil unrest during the sixties was a
key experience for American foreign policy, strengthening the premise that the US would not
allow any other communist regimes in the continent. Rabe (2006) record that "in his May 2,
1965 address to the nation, the president pronounced his Johnson Doctrine—the United States
would act to block a Communist takeover of a Latin American republic" (p. 48). In conclusion,
the study highlights the importance that President Johnson conveyed to the Dominican revolution
as a starting point for the emergence of yet another communist state.

Finger (2001) provides a historical account of the actions of the Department of State and
its foreign policy. It describes the American approach to foreign policy during the Cold War as
one of neighborhood consolidation where the sovereign territory near the US was of strategic
interest and could not surrender to communism: "President Johnson announced that the troops
were there (Santo Domingo) to prevent another Cuba…the essence of what has become the
Johnson Doctrine" (p. 67). The military intervention led by the US paved the way to Dominican
governments aligned to American foreign policy. In the eve of the intervention, the Soviet Union
expressed its formal complain about it before the United Nations. However, three years after it took place, the intervention became a convenient pretext for the Soviet Union to invade Czechoslovakia in order to “prevent” the spread of capitalism in East Europe.

Betances (2005) develops a critical review explaining how Joaquin Balaguer carried out different duties along his public career and went into exile before he turned president in 1966. Firstly, Balaguer occupied key posts during Trujillo's regime (1930-1961) where he worked as an advisor, ambassador, proxi president, among other functions. Then the regime ended with the assassination of Trujillo (1961) and he went into exile to become a collaborator with the CIA. After the US-led military intervention of 1965, President Lyndon Johnson endorsed Balaguer to lead the Dominican Republic so he would represent US interests domestically.

Balaguer, in exchange would wage war against communism: "For the United States, Balaguer was the right kind of ruler to promote in the context of the Cold War in societies that lacked credible political parties and government institutions" (Betances 2005, p. 46). As a result, Balaguer became the quintessential right-wing ruler for nearly 24 years, the first 12 years consecutively (1966-1978). Soon after Balaguer’s electoral victory in 1966, the cold-war ideological conflict in the Dominican Republic would migrate to UASD. Betances (2005) further argues that Balaguer implemented the politics of right-wing populism to remain in power while dealing with leftist opposition and a constantly changing international environment.

Vega (2004) infers that Balaguer was supported by US President Lyndon Johnson so the former could become President of the DR in exchange for fighting local communism. It was believed that the deposed President Juan Bosch was himself a communist and was the main motivator for the radicalization of the Dominican left.
In his further study, the same author revisits in Vega (2006) the history of the Dominican Civil War to explore if there were communist elements inside it. It questions the communist roots of President Juan Bosch and renders it as a pretext for right-wing factions to take control of the country. It also holds the US intervention accountable for Bosch’s further radicalization: "The US intervention would radicalize Juan Bosch, who followed so far the democratic ideals of leaders like Romulo Betancourt, José Figueres and Luis Muñoz Marin” (p. 1). Vega (2006) also describes this process as having also radicalized Bosch’s ally Francis Caamaño, “although the rest of the PRD leadership and the constitutionalist military kept believing in democracy and did not radicalize” (p. 1). This study explains among other things how the conflict during the civil war radicalized left-wing leaders who then fought against the Balaguer rule from UASD ground.

In his 2012 book, Pulitzer Prize winner Tim Weiner recollects important FBI cases which are now declassified. He describes Balaguer as an FBI informant who would regularly visit the Department of State while in his US exile period: "Balaguer was Identified as a recruited FBI source by Wallace Estill and Paul Brana, the record is in Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964-1968, Dominican Republic" (p. 494).

Weiner (2012) and Vega (2004) help clarify the motives for installing a long-lasting period of violence against communism and socialism inside the Dominican higher education system and eventually against the HE system itself by cutting funds and repressing students and faculty.

Bethell (1990) provides a historic account on the political and social evolution of the Dominican Republic from 1930, the starting year of Trujillo's dictatorship, until 1990 on the verge of the Soviet decline. The work counts on the writing collaboration of Dominican historian Frank Moya Pons who, with regards to the Dominican 1965 revolt states that Bosch's link to
communism was over exaggerated. The revolt broke to restore the rule of left-wing President Bosch, overthrown in 1963 by the national military six months after taking office. In addition, he describes the repression of Balaguer's police to the left as terror perpetrated by special forces to counter communism: "The Dominican Republic suffered for nearly eight years under the terror imposed by Balaguer's anti-communist forces" (p. 528). Balaguer had formed a paramilitary group so the involvement of the armed forces could be less visible. The group was called La Banda, and was comprised of left-wing deserters and “professional assassins paid out of the military's intelligence budget” (p. 528).

In a light-shedding account, Bethell (1990) provides a death toll that helps contemporary readers scale the conflict and expect long lasting social consequences: “More than four thousand Dominicans lost their lives in terrorist acts between 1966 and 1974, the campaign ending only when the leadership of the leftist parties had been wiped out and the parties completely disorganized” (p. 528).

Left-wing radicals, in turn, also responded violently in a permanent state of guerilla warfare after the revolution and as long as there was government repression from Balaguer: "…the open combat of the civil war was replaced by a long wave of anti-communist terrorism and the operations of leftist urban guerrilla groups. These groups consisted on commandos surviving since the civil revolution” (p. 528). They still carried weapons and had the conviction that they could accomplish their former goal of making a revolution “by killing police and soldiers” (p. 528).

Communism and Socialism in Public Universities

The socialist and communist resistance inside UASD during the 60’s as a reaction to perceived repressive governmental authority was part of a global cultural revolution. This
revolution pursued social justice, focusing specially on values of equality, freedom of speech and freedom of press; and heavily relied on transnationalism to operate as a network (Hendrickson, 2012).

Jobs (2009) makes a literature review to relate how Youth Movements of 1968 around Europe were interrelated and linked to socialist ideologies as a scaffolding to march for better social conditions, justice, and larger degrees of civil freedoms. These movements strengthened while clashing against ruling authorities, obtaining significant victories with regards to human rights:

The events of that year marked a turning point in the emergence of a cohort of young people who had come, through travel, to conceive of themselves not merely as members of a particular nation, but as a continent-wide, transnational social group. (p. 376)

Barcan (2001), studied the generational effects of student revolts in Australia from 1967 to 1974. The study emphasizes that the process is linked to the broad cultural revolution of the 1960's and that it impacted university campuses in France, United States and the Americas. The Cultural Revolution rebelled against almost any type of authority and paradigm, and had the universities as key headquarters. Barcan (2001) locates this revolution on ideology mostly coinciding with Balaguer’s 12 years (1966-1978) and asserts that this revolution is of paramount importance for those willing to understand the present state of affairs: "The cultural revolution of 1967-74 is still vital to an understanding of contemporary society, despite the new political economy which became dominant in the late 1980s" (p. 22). Another key characteristic of the Cultural Revolution is that it spread specifically among state universities, just like it happened in the DR with UASD.
Hendrickson (2012) explains through a historical account how the Tunis revolutionary unrest of 1968 was carried out from public university grounds and was supported by effective transnational networks of students that helped from abroad. This allowed the Tunis 1968 Student Revolution to achieve substantial human right victories from freedom of speech to freedom of press and freedom to freely circulate to freedom of assembly. Just like UASD students, Tunisian students involved in protests inside their national university drew from international emancipation currents. In the Tunisian experiment, the source of inspiration, ideology and knowhow was centered in Paris:

Through an analysis of student protests and government reactions, I argue that ties with the former metropole (Paris) shaped students’ demands and that a strictly national perspective of events is insufficient. In response to state repression, Tunisian activists shifted their struggle from global anti-imperialism toward the expansion of human rights on the national level. (p. 755)

Hendrickson (2012) explores how the cultural revolution of the 1960's linked to leftist leaderships inside the DR higher education system is the result of a broader global trend. Peterson (1968) describes through critical analysis the different streams of leftism emerging in American universities since 1960. The work explains about the origins of these movements highlighting the students' desire for social justice and willingness to stand for civil rights. Important conservative youth groups also emerged during those years to oppose leftists and demand for other vindications. One important detail of the narrative is that it asserts that until 1960 there were no known politically motivated demonstrations inside American universities:

(Before) There has never been a tradition of student politics, radical or otherwise, in American life, and it is in part because of the sharp break with the past that the surge in
student political activism during the 1960's has so captured the fancy of observers of the American scene (p. 293).

The article concludes by arguing that the left-wing groups are responsible of many significant reforms oriented to grant greater levels of freedoms to the people. Similar student reforms motivated by leftist demonstrations were held in Paris, and many other universities around the world during the 60's. This article-sheds light over the demands of student demonstrations, their background, their struggle and the outcome of their work. It also shows, within the American context, the systematic process of repression they were confronted with.

Student revolutions around the world during the 60s and 70s –however hard and traumatic- are known to have improved population access to higher education systems by turning universities into more inclusive institutions, easing examination methods and having their branches expand along national geographies (Peterson, 1968; Jobs, 2009; Hendrickson, 2012). The Dominican Republic saw part of these effects taking place in domestic soil. However, parallel to these positive outcomes, little is known about the conflicts’ impact on the students’ values and meaning making inside each country that experienced these dynamics.

**Cold War Inside UASD**

Franco (2007) provides a clear account on government repression towards UASD at the time, the conflict between the government and leftwing combatant groups inside campus, the deterioration of the institution as a result of budget shortage and violence, and the state of constant danger for UASD students. Franco (2007) asserts that “the conduct adopted with respect to UASD by the government of Dr. Joaquin Balaguer…was since the beginning one of economic restriction and police and military harassment” (p. 319). The study indicates that UASD had to also fight menacing leftwing extremism: “UASD had to fight…against extremist and sectarian
political forces, fanaticized up to absurdity that made of UASD’s campus their “home” and that sabotaged, strangely, in the name of the revolution… all the efforts to keep it as an open institution…” (p. 322). Franco (2007) describes these groups’ behavior as infantilism, making reference to an attitude of constant and dangerous stubbornness: “Leftwing infantilism that blossomed in UASD reached those extremes, that it got to propose the carrying out of the revolution using the university as platform” (p. 322). The study also highlights Balaguer’s budget restriction policy towards UASD and its climax. In 1969, three years after President Balaguer took office, UASD saw “the worst economic crisis ever lived by it” (p. 320). Franco (2007) describes a climate of imminent danger to innocent students and narrates an experience of “hundreds of police officers entered UASD campus with machineguns and hand grenades, raiding with bullets against defenseless students” (p.327).

Kryzanek (1977) provides a critical review of the different strategies used by former President Balaguer to neutralize the opposition to the government, which resided in UASD between 1966 and 1977. Drawing from local and international newspaper articles, reports from international agencies, academic articles and related books, Kryzanek (1977) argues how President Balaguer alternated measures of diversion, subversion and repression as he was willing to either distract, confuse or coerce his political enemies. The work recollects the violent confrontation between President Balaguer and the left, placing the left inside the only Dominican HE institution at that time: UASD. Kryzanek (1977) asserted that although Balaguer had succeeded in debilitating the PRD by means either rewarding or confronting its leadership “the Dominican president has yet to break the hold of the PRD and the left at the Autonomous University of Santo Domingo (UASD). UASD remains the stronghold of anti-Balaguer activity” (Kryzanek, 1977, p. 95).
Instead of exploring possibilities of negotiation, Balaguer’s recurred measure was to command the Nacional Police to attack the radical left opposition headquarter inside UASD: "As for Balaguer, his efforts at the UASD have been minimal. There have been (government) attempts to organize students, but these have generally failed. Balaguer has rather relied on the National Police…as the primary curbs on student radicalism" (p. 96).

Another policy to restrain the power of the opposition in UASD was to cut funding. Contrary to the desired result, this would often trigger student demonstrations that would, in turn, be repressively dealt with by the police:

Even though the presence of the Dominican police force and the demands of employment tend to curb anti-government activity, the UASD is still a hotbed. In March of 1977 students criticizing a budget cut took to the streets in a bloody confrontation with the police…Balaguer was reminded that the university remains a key opposition sector in the country. (p. 96)

Kryzanek (1977) also emphasizes that the PRD succeeded in recruiting large numbers of students as members of the party. The strikes from the government into UASD were deemed by the left as terror and as perpetrated by violent anti-communists: "The primary military and National police leadership behind this terror is difficult to pinpoint since most officers are violently anti-communist and lifelong enemies of the PRD" (p. 99). In his conclusion Kryzanek (1977) portrays Balaguer as a totalitarian leader who masters the art of domination. This, according to the narrative, puts the opposition side into a very difficult situation.

In the same line of highlighting the role of UASD as headquarters of the left, Betances (2015) draws from a mixed research method that combines critical review of forty publications and four interviews. The study explains the way grassroots movements organized inside UASD
to challenge (from UASD) the right-wing status quo in the DR. These groups demanded for human rights vindication and better working conditions for the working class. The study sets a clear line that divided the antigovernment movement. The consolidated movement opposing the government comprised two combined groups: High and middle-class leftists and communists on one side, and on the other, a marginalized faction of proletariat that could not succeed in making its voice heard until then. The work suggests most opposition leaders were not poor proletarians but of higher social status, they were students and had UASD as their common stronghold: "It is worth noting that the majority of the leaders were leftist militants who did not reside in poor neighborhoods. Most were students from the Universidad Autonoma de Santo Domingo (UASD), the public university" (p. 395).

Felten (1995) explains how left-wing factions trained students and other sympathizers so they could engage in the battle against right-wing military and the Triumvirate government. Felten (1995) argues that communism inside the country was limited and isolated from communism in the outside world due to the blocking action of the FBI so it would not communicate with Cuban or Soviet agencies: "(The left’s) only strengths rested on their ability to rally nationalist students and the insurgency training of a few dozens of their leaders" (p. 55).

Providing an account on how the conflict impacted UASD faculty members, Pimentel (2002), using available historical and quantitative information, presents an assessment of the public higher education system of the Dominican Republic. First it reflects upon the system's capacity to meet labor market needs and whether or not this should be its main goal. Then the study puts the public HE system into the global perspective highlighting the need for internationalization. The next subject deals with the reality of its faculty members during the Balaguer years, which were in a state of exodus according to the author.
Pimentel (2002) remarks that during the repressive rule of President Joaquin Balaguer a considerable -yet not assessed- number of faculty members left the country threatened by government repression: "Many fled the country to escape political persecution under the repressive regime of Joaquin Balaguer" (p. 31).

Closure of Chapter II

The oldest and largest Dominican higher education institution, UASD, is experiencing attrition rates of 80%. So far, the causes identified for it, as well as the strategies to address it at country level are technical and remedial in nature, they do not mind present social perspectives within the population. Social perspectives are rooted in social memories of the past and have shown to have an impact on student attainment in other contexts. Thus, specific notions within social perspectives about UASD could be linked to its high attrition levels. Social perspectives can be probed thought two complementary theoretical frameworks: Collective memory theory and socio-cognitive theory. The former focuses on commonly shared beliefs and values rooted in commonly shared interpretations of the past, while the later minds about how these beliefs, interpretations and values are transmitted from one individual to the other. These frameworks can also contribute to the understanding on how social perspectives can be informed and improved so the population can be persuaded about the importance of higher education.

Research shows that collective memories can host social traumas that are rooted in past events of conflict. The historic narrative indicates that ever since the abrupt end of Trujillo’s dictatorship, a violent sociopolitical struggle between domestic left and right factions emerged, remaining alive at least until 1978 when Dominican President Balaguer ended his 12-year period. Most of this conflict was fought inside and around UASD against socialist and communist
activists (students and faculty members). By the time, UASD held at the time nearly all national enrollments, and still hosts about half of them.

Literature on socialism in universities suggest that the reason for local socialism and communism to make of UASD its headquarters can be explained in the Cultural Revolution. It consisted of a transnational youth movement, mostly carried out during the 1960’s, were students leaning towards socialism and communism would protest from within public universities, advocating for human rights and freedoms, and protesting against state repression. However traumatic Balaguer’s 12-year period might have been, the social effects of this time are yet unassessed in the DR. No qualitative or quantitative studies have been conducted to map this social trauma, how it is manifested in ways that might be linked to student desertion, and how it is transmitted along the population. Hence, this study probed in search of possible links between the recent past of conflict in UASD and trauma in collective memory and social perspectives, and how the latter are socially transmitted. Understanding the ways how memory is more often conveyed as well as social bias on HE is a necessary step for the academic community. It will help local decision makers identify effective channels of communication and content to inform the people’s beliefs about HE. If a poor or trauma-related understanding of higher education is tied to low student performance and attrition, then a notion of education as a powerful means of personal and social development can be expected to improve attrition rates.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

This study attempted to identify one potential cause for negative perceptions of higher education that could contribute to the high attrition rate in UASD. Using the theories of collective memory (Barash, 2016; Corning & Schuman, 2015; Schutz, 1967) and socio-cognition (Bandura, 2001; Dessi, 2008), this phenomenological research explored the traumatic impact of the violent conflict between UASD and the State between 1966 and 1978 on the perception about higher education of those who experienced it. The primary purpose was to explore how/if the trauma caused by the conflict impacted the meaning making perspectives and behavior of people who were UASD students at the time (Dessi, 2008). The study explored how subjects remember their experiences as students during the conflict and what perceptions of higher education were developed based on those experiences.

Potential participants now range in age from approximately 56 to 74 years old, hence, they are expected to have a circle of influence comprised of their children, coworkers, neighbors and friends. As such, the study also seeks to understand how the participants believe that they might have transmitted those perspectives about higher education and higher education institutions developed as a result of their experience of the Balaguer conflict within their spheres of influence (Louie, 2006; Dessi, 2008).

Therefore, this study aimed at building an answer to the overarching question: How does a snowball sample of Dominican citizens who attended UASD between 1966 and 1978 remember their personal experiences as students during that period and how have those memories influenced their attitudes toward and beliefs about higher education? Additionally, how do these
former UASD students transmit their memories, perspectives and beliefs about higher education to subsequent generations?

To support the broader questions for this study, I organized my inquiry with study participants around the following research sub-questions:

1. How do individuals enrolled in UASD between 1966 and 1978 describe their experience as students?
2. How do these participants interpret what they experienced and what do they believe about those interpretations?
3. How have any perspectives held by these former UASD students influenced their attitudes about higher education?
4. How do these former students influence and share their experiences, attitudes, and beliefs about higher education with others in their families and community?

Research Design, Approach and Rationale

The purpose and research questions of this study highlight a specific conflictive event experienced in some way or another by various generations of Dominicans, and more closely experienced by students in Universidad Autonoma de Santo Domingo (UASD) between 1966 and 1978 (Franco, 2007; Brown-John, L. & Brown-John, 1977; Bethell, 1990; Cassá, 1982; Felten, 1995; Liberato, 2005; Louie, 2006; McClung, 1965; Pimentel, 2002; Rabe, 2006; United Nations [UN], 1969; Wilson, 1966; Weiner, 2012; Vega, 2012; Vega, 2006; Vega, 2004). Since the study drew from the recollection of memories from those involved and how it is socially shared, this study is informed by two theoretical frameworks: Theory of collective memory and theory of socio-cognition. The former rests on the assumption that groups hold shared perspectives
informed by memories of their recent past, while the latter asserts that these memories are transmitted and altered continually.

One fundamental assumption supporting the research questions is that shared memories and perspectives influence social action. Schutz (1967) validates this notion defining social action as the social behavior guided by social perspectives. Agreeing with the reflections of Max Weber on social sciences, Schutz (1967) grants that social action is defined through meaning or the perspective of individuals and social groups. The appearance of the world (phenomena) and the personal valuation of self and of the world as a result of bearing such personal world depiction in mind lays in the memory of experience “accessible to reflection” (Schutz, 1967, p. 12).

For focusing exclusively on exploring -through open accounts- how individuals make meaning of their lived experiences and their world around, and how this impacts their decisions, the research questions on this study were probed through qualitative research (Creswell, 2013; Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 2001; Barash, 2016; Corning & Schuman, 2015; Dessi, 2008; Garagozov, 2016; McQuid, 2015; Siegert, 2016). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) characterize qualitative research as the tradition employed to uncover “the meaning of a phenomenon for those involved” (p. 6). Qualitative research studies the interpretations that people make of their experiences, how they assemble an image of the world around and “what meaning they attribute to their experiences” (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 6).

Gall, Gall and Borg (2007), Merriam and Tisdell (2016) and Creswell (2013) suggest five basic branches of qualitative research: (1) Qualitative case study, which draws data from a number of different sources like interviews, written material and symbols; (2) narrative analysis, which draws information from written material of different origins; (3) ethnography, researching
the meaning making of specific cultural or ethnic groups; (4) grounded theory research, which focuses on the construction of theories through the gathering and analysis of existing data on a methodic manner; and finally (5) phenomenology. The latter poses that human behavior is driven by the individuals’ images or interpretations of their lived experiences (phenomena) “rather than by external, objective and physically described reality” (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 18).

Considering the absence of written information containing accounts of former UASD students describing their lived experiences during Balaguer’s 12 years and how the former were impacted by these events, the research questions on this study might not be answered through revisions of literature. This limitation rules out methodologies of case study and narrative analysis. Likewise, ethnography would not suit this research since the targeted population of this study is not confined to a specific ethnic group. The tradition of grounded theory research has also limited potential to seek a substantial answer to the research questions of this study. In the first place, grounded theory works under the premise that there must exist data available so theoretical assertions can be drawn from them. On the second hand, instead of formulating theoretical frameworks after data collection, this study uses a theoretical framework (collective memory and socio-cognitive theories) a priori to guide the formulation of its research questions and its instrument of data collection (interviews).

Phenomenology, in turn, is designed to harvest individuals’ open accounts through interviews as a fundamental source of data collection (Creswell, 2013; Gal, Gal & Borg, 2007), it also minds the elements of concern to the research questions of this study: The images or phenomena of past events as they are present in the collective memory of a group, and how these impressions impact their perspectives of life and the world around (Lin, 2013). Depending on the author, the classic type of phenomenology is known by various names: Pure phenomenology,
transcendental phenomenology, descriptive phenomenology and Husserlian phenomenology (Laverty, 2003; Moustakas, 1994; Creswell, 2013; Marshall & Rossman, 2016). Gall, Gall and Borg (2007) argues that phenomenology is the analysis of reality as it appears to individuals (phenomena) when they recall an experience. In addition, phenomenology seeks to identify commonalities within accounts from individuals who experienced the same events or circumstances.

The importance of acknowledging that accounts on the 12-year conflict are biased descriptions of facts, and that these descriptions allow this study to better understand human sense making and behavior much more than facts, is rooted in the assumptions of phenomenological studies since the beginning of the Twentieth Century. The current definition of phenomenology is attributed to the work of Edmund Husserl as recorded in his 1913 published study titled Ideas (Husserl, 1962). Husserl (1962) stressed that in phenomenology (1) consciousness has to be separated from phenomena, and that (2) assumptions of an external world like beliefs, culture and politics must be “bracketed” or filtered out in order to acquire knowledge of “essence”. Husserl explains that phenomenology minds how objects are regarded in transcendental (inter-individual) or pure consciousness, not paying attention to the discussion about a natural world around. Hence, this method probes the structures of consciousness as observed in the point of view of interviewees (Husserl, 1962).

In the terms of Husserl (1962), the concept of essence or common meaning is the result of observing transcendence among participant accounts. This is, first facilitating a guided emergence of information from participants individually, and second, paying attention to the clusters of information that are common along the accounts of most, or all participants.
More recently, and in connection to Husserl’s work, Creswell (2013) states that phenomenological research “describes the common meaning for several individuals of their lived experience” (p.76) and reduces “individual experiences…to a description of the universal essence” (p. 76). Marshall and Rossman (2016) validate this description explaining that the experiences of participants are studied initially as singular expressions to be later compared in order to discover essence. This common meaning or essence refers to the concepts, valuations and descriptions that repeat or coincide from one subject account to the other (Marshall & Rossman, 2016).

The answers to the research questions of this study were built from the assembling of such essence regarding three main realms. First, the study explored what is the common description of how individuals interpret/produce meaning. The latter, concerning the people’s perception of the conflict of UASD between 1966-1978. Second, what was the common interpretation or significance these participants attribute to their experience, what meaning is produced. Finally, what is the common appreciation on how this significance is transmitted from them to other individuals they interact with.

Since in phenomenology the data source must be accounts from participants, and such accounts be personal and intentional, the data collection instrument chosen for phenomenological studies should facilitate the free flow of information from participants, guided only by probe questions that lead to open thematic descriptions as answers. This suggests the need to conduct individual encounters with willing participants in order to carry out sessions of inquiry guided by a set of open questions common to all participants. This is why Creswell (2013) explains that phenomenological research relies mainly on interviews: "Often, data collection in phenomenological studies consist of in-depth…interviews with participants" (p. 81). Interviews
in phenomenology provide researchers extensive descriptions of built images of the world as it appears to human groups, and—in these images—a possible explanation for social behavior or social action (Schutz, 1967).

Hence, interviews facilitate the extraction of thick narrative suitable for inter-account comparison. This is why in order to build an answer to the overarching research questions of this study, as well as the specific research questions deriving from them, I assembled and administered a designed interview guided by open-ended questions.

**Reflections on My Identity**

Parallel to the formerly enlisted reasons why this research is relevant to the current academic literature, I have at least one personal reason that drove me to conduct it. The deterioration of UASD that followed Balaguer’s 12 years drove me to enroll into a private university having to invest considerable amounts in tuition fees. Thus, I also carried out this research with the hope of helping improve UASD so it can provide quality education to anyone willing to develop him/herself obtaining a degree without having to pay for it.

Born and raised in the Dominican Republic, almost all my childhood and teenage years took place during the 80s and 90s, until President Balaguer’s recurrent presidential terms ended in 1996. During this time, I lived neighboring Zona Universitaria (University Zone), which is where UASD is located, witnessing the still remaining waves of the 12-year conflict and learning how amid clashes it had costed the lives and freedoms of people from both sides: Students, faculty members, police officers and passersby. Growing up, I found it interesting that no actors of the conflict would publicly declare adherence to either the Soviet Union or the United States regardless of the documented sponsorship they were being granted over from these Cold War super powers. Little could my generation understand those years because the government
exercised strict control over the media. If one side acknowledged adherence to a foreign sponsor then would have a hard public opinion battle to face, but paradoxically, a whole generation of young students -some of whom I got to know personally during the conflict years- was sponsored by the Soviet Union to study and train on its territory and its allies'. On the other side, from former government officials to whom I have had direct access in the past, I recollect stories of how the United States, ever since the Dominican Civil War (1965), supported president Balaguer so he would locally repel any communist upraise for as long as he were in office.

I personally think this conflict had a multilayer, unexplored cost for the country regardless of which party is or is not responsible. Among other effects, on one side there was a progressive deterioration of the higher education infrastructure for decades, and on the other, there was the terror associated to involvement in higher education. The latter kept faculty members on the hide and potential students struggling to finish their programs.

As a means of bias control, I plan to involve fellow researchers from two different standpoints to supervise the process of interview analysis: One that isn’t expecting to find a direct effect of this conflict over Dominicans today and one that actually is. They would also validate the sample selection and review the interview questions to check if the wording suggests premises.

Population, Sample and Setting

Site or Source of Potential Study Participants

The individuals of interest for this research did not occupy a geographical cluster, rather they share a lived experience during a time span, so they belong to a specific generation who enrolled in UASD between 1966 and 1978. Nowadays, these individuals are disseminated along a wide range of social and work-related circles playing different roles: Public servants, political
leaders, faculty members, private entrepreneurs, corporate employees, etc. However, a sense of community is still influencing a substantial number of them through time, this facilitates their outreach through methods like snowball sampling. Many of these individuals of interest are within reach for being nowadays related to UASD as faculty members or administrative personnel; some others are faculty members in a Santo Domingo private university where I teach.

**Population**

The target individuals for this study were adults geographically enrolled in UASD between 1966 and 1978. The sample consisted of participants having attended UASD at the time specified. Drawing from empirical knowledge, Creswell (2013) endorses the idea that phenomenological research should study a sample of 5 to 25 individuals "who have all experienced the phenomenon" (p. 81). Within this range, the sum of accounts tends to cover a sufficiently wide narrative of the event and its transcendent meaning. Such sufficiency is called data saturation. It is reached when the information stops changing or expanding as new participants included provide their accounts. Taking this into consideration, I interviewed a sample of 12 subjects who qualified, achieving saturation approximately after interviewing the eight subject.

**Access and Recruitment**

The target population was defined with precision, making sure that such group has experienced the phenomenon, thus, in coherence with the limits of the purpose statement and research questions (Creswell, 2013; Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2016).

As for the inclusionary criteria for subjects, participants were adults, either males or females, enrolled as students in UASD between 1966 and 1978. These former students might
have been leaders during the conflict, followers, or subjects who expressed not to fit in those categories. The exclusionary criteria ruled out subjects who neighbored UASD and experience the effects of the conflicts in one way or another, but were not enrolled as a student.

Potential subjects were recruited by first identifying at least one insider in the community who meets the study criteria. Since their recruitment had the goal of allowing me to gain access to other people who meet the study criteria, they had to be trusted and known by the community (Creswell, 2013; Marshall & Rossman, 2016). I worked through the designated insiders to approach potential participants, identifying the latter through the snowball sampling process. Once identified, insiders distributed my recruitment flier to each potential participant. I also sent the flier through email as potential participants requested that I do so (see appendices A and B). Finally, I asked other potential participants to forward the flier to people identified through the snowball chain.

The recruitment flier provided my contact information, a description of the study, a description of the expected role of participants, and a statement about participants’ rights. This facilitated interested candidates to learn about the work and reach me. When potential participants contacted me, I fully explained the details of the study and answered any questions they have. Afterwards, people who were still interested proceeded to the informed consent process (see appendices C and D).

**Purposeful Sampling Strategy and Numbers**

For this study, the purposeful sampling criterion used suited its distinctive nature. As the sample isn’t primarily constrained by geography but by a time lapse, the snowball sampling method helped conform the desired group compared to other sampling criteria (Creswell, 2013,
p. 158). Using the snowball method, individuals already known to meet the sample criteria lead by referral to other individuals with the same background.

Since the information I needed to collect could be sensitive or distressful to some individuals they were informed *a priori* in written and verbal forms about the details of the research plan and the purpose of the study, as well as the expectations for participant involvement. As it was indicated in the flier, prior to interviews, all the necessary information sessions were held to discuss the research details where, with the proper Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, the study was also explained through audiovisual materials and brochures (see Appendix E). Potential participants were given consent forms that they were able to take home and study for a reasonable time so they could consult their possible involvement with close advisors, family members or friends. At the end of the information and exchange process carried out in written and verbal form, I conducted a Subject Comprehension Assessment to measure if the research, its benefits and risks had been understood. Finally, once it was verified that subjects had understood, those among them who agreed to engage in the project signed the consent form with the option, also written in the consent document, to remove themselves at any time if they so decided. The latter could take place without the need for explanation or any repercussions or penalties.

**Data Collection Methods, Procedures, and Instrumentation**

**Forms of Data**

The type of data I collected for my research, given that it is a phenomenological one, was qualitative data in the form of transcribed interviews. I conducted interviews with the individuals in the sample and transcribed them to obtain the text that was analyzed.
Data Collection Protocols and Procedures

Marshall and Rossman (2016) notes that the experiences of participants are studied as singular expressions to be compared in order to discover essence. This suggests the need of a data collection instrument that directly draws such information from individuals in the form of answers to questions. Creswell (2013) explains that phenomenological research relies mainly on interviews: "Often, data collection in phenomenological studies consist of in-depth…interviews with participants" (p. 81). Patton (2002) states that in qualitative analysis coded and categorized data from interviews constitute findings.

Considering that this research project is a phenomenology, the type of data I collected is qualitative, in the form of audio record interviews that were transcribed. I conducted individual recorded interviews in the place of choice for each participant or via video conference. After each interview was completed (see interview protocol in appendices F and G), I coded and stored the data in a database on a secure, password protected server. Upon completion, I transcribed the interview’s verbatim using pseudonyms to protect participants’ identities, removing also any personally identifying information regarding the participants or others. The questions during the interview gradually helped the participant to recall and communicate their account about what she/he experienced, how she/he interpreted the experience, and how it has affected her/his life. Additional questions focused on ways in which participants’ experiences in UASD during the specified time period influence their interactions with subsequent generations regarding the pursuit of higher education and trust in the public higher education system.

Instrumentation

As explained, I collected data through conducting recorded individual interviews containing specific and open-ended questions while fomenting a climate of rapport (Creswell,
The interview procedure I designed is based on Creswell (2013), Marshal and Rossman (2016) and Gall, Gall and Borg (2007). It began with basic questions to register demographic information such as the names of interviewer and interviewee, location and date; including also a profile of participants. The next part contained greetings and words of appreciation to the interviewee while introducing the research project: Its background, outline, justification, goal, research questions and methodology. As it can be seen in the set of questions in the interview protocol (see appendices 1 and 2), the following part looks to elicit the experience of each individual along with a set of probes through a conversation prompt. The researcher examines various dimensions of experiences in this part together with the participant. Appendices 1 and 2 show how the open-ended questions start guiding the conversation towards a recollection of the lived experience of the participant as a UASD student during the conflict. Then, the interview questions focused on the realm of meaning making were the participant expresses how her/his perspectives about the world around and about higher education have been impacted by her/his memory of the experience. Finally, the interview questions asked the participant to reflect on her/his influence on those around them, how she/he considered that her/his gained perspectives are spread. Once all relevant probes were exhausted, a closing statement again thanked the interviewee and explains that her/his involvement has been of positive relevance. Hatch (2002) suggest so as a gesture of appreciation for the participants’ willingness. I provided the interview protocol (appendices 1 and 2) in both English and Dominican Spanish because the latter is the native language of potential participants. Once recorded, interviews are transcribed and studied.
Trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Marshall and Rossman (2016) indicate that qualitative research must “respond to criteria or canons for good research practice” (Marshall & Rossman, 2016, p. 43) embodied in the notion of “trustworthiness” (Marshall & Rossman, 2016, p. 43). This concept is normally addressed by the researcher as she/he ensures the work’s credibility, transferability, comfortability and authenticity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 2016).

Transferability. For this research to be transferable to other scenarios, the context discussions and interviewee surveys at the initial part of the instrument contained substantial and accurate information on the social and historical context, culture, time and place (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 2016). As explained formerly while providing a definition of data saturation, I reached saturation with participants that experienced the circumstances, time and place studied.

Credibility. During the interview, I made use of probes to foment a climate of fluent exchange so the resulting data was relevant and thick. This helped salient issues to clearly emerge from the interviewee’s recollection. To accomplish this aim, I gained the interviewee’s trust and made her/him feel comfortable, working to create a climate of rapport, relaxation and respect. If feeling uncomfortable or unwilling to continue definitely or through a specific topic, the interviewee knew a priori from his/her reading of the informed consent form that he/she could stop the interview and leave with no consequences. Although it was not necessary, if I happened to notice distress, I would stop the interview and remind the interviewee of this.

Establishing a climate of comfort allowed me to gather sufficient quality data to analyze. In addition, I was permanently making memos to record changes experienced over the original
course of the research and to follow up my development of constructs (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 2016). Memos recollected special connections between what the subject was saying and her/his corporal gestures or reactions.

**Authenticity.** This research claims to authenticity based on a number of strategies. I already formulated a reflexivity statement or *epoche* describing my assumptions and predispositions related to the topic researched. Among other goals for the *epoche*, I wanted the reader to understand what personal motivations I might have had to carry out this study.

This statement was complemented with a traceable data analysis and a series of memos that helped show an appreciation of the different values, beliefs and perspectives involved as neutrally as possible (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 2016). To strengthen neutrality, I invited another researcher that examined my work. These consultations were also a strategy for conformability as it will be seen in the next section.

**Conformability.** In addressing conformability, I ensured the connection between the data on the study and its interpretation through a process of reference making and consultation. I referenced all judgments, conclusions, interpretations and valuations back to their salient points previously lifted from the transcripts of the interview.

Such salient points were displayed and sub grouped with the other segments of meaning that share common themes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 2016). In second place, I invited another researcher to study the interview transcripts and codebook in order to corroborate my interpretations. This way I ended up with more accurate interpretations.
Data Analysis

Type of Data Analysis

For carrying out my study, I conducted a "textural and structural description" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 180-181) that allowed me to identify commonalities among participants related to their lived event and their meaning making about it separately; so these commonalities could be deeply studied independently.

Analysis Steps

Interview transcripts were read thoroughly a number of times by me and a colleague researcher so as to reach a consensus on the salient points or invivo codes present in the text.

1. Phenomenological reduction: Following Husserl (1962), in this step the judgement about the natural world (the event) is ruled out of the discussion, and the researcher’s attention focuses on the identification of the individual’s construction of the experience instead. Thus, the textural codes are identified. Once all invivo codes are identified at the texts of all the interviews, those which contain accounts of the phenomena -a description of how the event took place- are separated from the rest and studied.

2. Imaginative variation: The structural codes are identified. Those are the codes describing how individuals feel and view the world as a result of their image of their lived experience.

3. Synthesis of textural and structural descriptions: At each group, subgroups of invivo codes are formed as they are identified to be part of different categories present. These subgroups finally suggest common themes that explain for that given sample of individuals what the common nature of the conflict was like, how they feel about it,
what they think of public higher education as a result and how influential they esteem their views are over their children. These findings were deployed on a manner which is both intuitively and reflective to elaborate a synthesis of the phenomenon's essence and meanings along a narrative following the subthemes emerging out of the analysis and as answers to the stated research questions.

**Trustworthiness in Analyzing Data**

Throughout the process of data analysis, I focused on four aspects critical in order to embody trustworthiness: Credibility, transferability, conformability and authenticity. Data credibility was addressed by motivating participants to expand on their answers so the resulting data is thick and of relevance, study transferability by providing careful and extensive information on the study's culture, context, place and time, conformability by referencing all conclusions, judgments and valuations to the invivo codes and their theme groups at the analysis. And finally trustworthiness was addressed by authenticity, by deploying a balanced panorama of all beliefs, values and perspectives.

**Delimitations and Limitations**

This research reached -and was contained within- a set of individuals who experienced violence coming from a long-lasting clash between the right-wing government of President Balaguer and communist/socialist activists residing inside UASD. The information sought after through interviews was about what they experienced, how they made meaning of it and how likely was this memory of the facts and their judgment to have passed on to a second generation.

My study design contained certain features that pose limitations on the study findings. The sample was of 12 individuals and my research was qualitative, so valuable information might not be obtained unless a quantitative research is later carried out to complement. These
participants have been enrolled in UASD at probably different stages of the conflict along its 12 years of duration. In addition, the effect of the conflict amid today's college-age population could be subconscious to them and their parents, and can therefore appear in the form of disregard. Finally, the opinion of college-age subjects was not present at the study, but that of their parents or older influential figures.

**Chapter III Closure**

My research was informed by the theoretical framework of two interrelated fields: The Collective Memory Theory and the Socio-Cognitive Theory. The former rests on the assumption that groups hold shared perspectives informed by memories of their recent past, while the latter asserts that these memories are transmitted and altered continually. These theories supported the assertion of this study that commonly shared notions about the past can influence social behavior and spread within individuals in intelligible ways.

This study explored through the qualitative phenomenological tradition how a set of 12 individuals assess their commonly lived experience of trauma while studying in UASD between 1966 and 1978. The sample was within my reach as they belonged to circles I had access to: University faculty circles and professional associations. Each individual was interviewed using the IRB standards regarding the involvement of human subjects into research. Such interviews were analyzed assessing the salient points that build the different categories inside the structure of the narratives in order to identify commonalities among the interviews. This rendered how different individuals coincided as for the recollection of what took place, how they made meaning of it and how their points of view transcended into their second generation.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The meta narrative on the topic of this research achieved saturation within the first eight participants, however, a total of twelve different participant interviews were conducted and the data analyzed. The analysis carried out follows inductive data analysis for interview interpretation (Foss & Waters, 2007; Thomas, 2003).

The purpose of this study was to explore the long term social effect of the major conflict within the Dominican higher education system that took place between 1966 and 1978. The study focused on if and how current Dominican parents and educational leaders might be influenced in their attitudes about public higher education by their experience as UASD students during the period of conflict and through the collective memory of that event. Specifically, the study attempted to ascertain how these individuals perceive their experience might have an impact in their circles of influence. Particularly, how they engage with the next generation of Dominicans around the notion of pursuing public higher education.

To better understand how the memory of the conflict affects the perspectives of Dominicans about public higher education and how the participant perceptions might influence later generations the following overarching questions were used:

1. How does a sample of Dominican citizens who attended UASD between 1966 and 1978 remember their personal experiences as students at that time?

2. How have those memories influenced their attitudes toward and beliefs about higher education and the leaders who promote higher education or lead higher education institutions?
3. How do these former UASD students contribute to the collective memory of that time in their families and communities and/or transmit their attitudes and beliefs about higher education to subsequent generations?

Drawing from the overarching questions above, the following set of specific research questions was used:

1. How do Balaguer era UASD students describe their experience of violence and persecution between 1966 and 1978?

2. How do Balaguer era UASD students interpret what they experienced and believe about those interpretations?

3. How have any attitudes held by the Balaguer era UASD students influenced their attitudes about higher education?

4. How do Balaguer era UASD students influence and share their experiences, attitudes, and beliefs about higher education with others in their families and community?

**Unit of Analysis**

The primary unit of analysis for this project are the 12 resulting interviews to former UASD students enrolled between 1966 and 1978. Participants were reached through emails and phone calls. Once participants expressed their willingness to participate and consciously signed the Informed Consent Form, they agreed on appointment dates for their respective interviews. Interviews were held through a web meeting or inside a room at the UNIBE campus during times most convenient to the participant. The interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes. Participants in this study collaborated fully answering all the questions asked.
Participants

The 12 participants’ ages are within the expected range of 59 to 75 years old at the time they were interviewed. Professional and ethical standards require information that can compromise participant identity will not be published in this dissertation document. Within the sample, three participants are female and nine are male. As for their professional field, there are seven architects, two engineers, two mathematicians, and one accountant. Nine out of twelve taught in college as either full or part time faculty members. The youngest participant was 60 years old at the time of the interview, while the older was 73. Table 1 shows basic demographic information of participants.

Table 1

Basic Demographic Information of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Participant Letter Assigned</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Academic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As for academic attainment, the highest level attained was PhD, while the lowest was Master degree. Ten participants had completed a Master program and two had received a PhD. Therefore, the sample shows skewness inclining toward individuals that have completed an advanced graduate program. The fact is, indeed, not surprising since the sample is mostly comprised of persons who taught in college at the time of the inquiry. In addition, participants are former college students from the 60’s and 70’s who are expected to have at least completed their degree, and have had more than enough time to enroll into a graduate school.

**Analysis of Themes**

After having interviewed each of the 12 former UASD students enrolled between 1966 and 1978, I listened to the recorded materials repeatedly and finally transcribed them. Once the transcripts were completed, I read them a number of times as I carried out the coding of the data. The type of coding carried out is called invivo coding. These codes are literal fragments singled out in each the interview transcript. They comprise significant statements related to the study’s research questions (Creswell, 2013). They depict how participants describe their lived experience and how they make meaning out of it.

These invivo codes, once identified, were listed in what Creswell calls the “horizontalization of the data” Creswell (2013, p. 193) and arranged considering each had equal worth. Then, codes were deployed minding not to have repetitive or overlapping content among them. Subsequently, the lists of invivo codes to each interview account were sent back to interviewees to collect possible observations. As a result, two of the participants provided minor observations, not of content but of grammar. After implementing the suggested adjustments, I revised again the codes against the research questions enlisted above.
To explore transcendent images and meaning between participant accounts, codes from all twelve accounts were initially displayed and then regrouped according to what they describe. Those that described the lived experience or “textural description” (Creswell, 2013, p. 193) were grouped together, while those that described the meaning-making of such experience or “structural description” (Creswell, 2013, p. 194) were grouped separately. Secondly, inside each code group (textural and structural) all codes that answer a specific research question were revised in pursuit of commonalities among participant descriptions. This led to the discovery of units of meaning or themes that showed to group large sets of codes from all participants.

As they answered a semi-structured interview, the participants voiced their accounts with no constrains. Participants elaborated as much as they desired regarding descriptions of their lived experiences, how they make meaning of their memories, and the nature of the messages they convey to others about public higher education. A climate of confidence and rapport combined with open-ended questions allowed participants to comfortably provide the information sought after for this study. Interestingly, most answers were provided gradually. While participants may have concluded their response to a specific prompt, later in the interview, they would interject a comment that related more directly with an earlier prompt. This dynamic was observed more clearly in the response of most participants to question number one requesting them to describe their lived experience. Most would continue adding fragments to that response throughout the interview. All participants expressed to have felt life-threatening danger and to have waited much longer than necessary in order to be able to finish their graduate program. All participants perceived to have an influence over their children. Although a significant number of the participants estimate that UASD has improved and/or is doing efforts
to improve in its challenged areas, most would not recommend UASD to those around them, or haven’t had their children enroll there. Most declared to convey negative valuations of UASD.

Hence, derived from the transcripts of interviews administrated to former UASD students, five major themes were observed to have the power to group transcendent invivo codes. These main themes are:

1. Lived experience of danger and delay
2. Life-transforming experience
3. Experience influences perception of public higher education
4. Generational Rupture: Would not recommend UASD/Offspring did not study in UASD
5. The State has responded to repair public higher education system: Perception that UASD has improved recently

Additionally, sub-themes were observed among invivo codes grouped under themes one to three. As Theme 1 embodies descriptions of a dangerous and frustrating life chapter, its codes relate to each other in five different conceptual realms. Most codes described (1) a lived experience marked by aggression from multiple parties, (2) life-threatening events happening to them and/or people near, (3) extreme program delays, (4) good education quality at that time, and finally, (5) student and faculty exodus from UASD.

Invivo codes under Theme 2, describing the lived experience as a life-changing one, could also be sub divided in two different complementary groups, according to the concept encompassing them. One set of codes was observed to describe the lived experience as (1) hardship, while another set described it as (2) transformative. Those concepts, however different,
complement each other as most narratives point out that hardship and struggle brought such growth to participants.

Theme 3 links codes by their capacity to describe how participants use their memory of the event as a component to their life perspective. Within it, two main streams were observed. The first one depicts a link established by participants between the conflict and the current state of UASD. The other stream involves codes that describe the public higher education system as lacking quality and not trust-inspiring. See Table 2.

Table 2

Emerging Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lived experience of danger, program delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Aggression from multiple parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Life-threatening danger, persecution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Uncertainty of degree duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Good quality of education until then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Memory of student, faculty exodus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Life-transforming experience</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Hard experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Maturing and transforming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Experience influences perception of HE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The conflict negatively affected current public Higher Ed. System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Public Higher Ed. system lacks quality and/or not trustable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Generational rupture: Would not recommend UASD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perception that UASD has improved</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Letters in column headings represent participants’ names.
Theme 1: Lived Experience of Danger and Program Delay

The first research question reads: “How do Balaguer era UASD students describe their experience of violence and persecution between 1966 and 1978?”. It aimed at collecting the common memories of participants that describe their lived experience.

Once the interview was introduced to each participant, they were asked the first question, which invites to provide a personal account on the lived experience as UASD student between 1966 and 1978: “Would you please describe your recollections of what it was like to be a student at UASD during the conflict between the forces of the Balaguer government and the students and faculty at UASD?”

After having analyzed the accounts around this question, I noticed that all participants agree that their experience was marked mainly by danger and program delay. They recall that, while studying in UASD, their safety was threatened by dangerous events motivated by the government and multiple inside rival left-wing parties. In the events revisited, participants declared to have run away, hide and/or escaped from attacks of different sorts and scales; while also having their program completion severely delayed. However, most of them acknowledged that the quality of education was high. Another interesting salient point has to do with the memory of dropping out of UASD, or having seen others drop out. An additional point was having seen faculty members leave to other universities. This last subject having to do with the climate of danger and delay as declared.

Initially, the participants talked about a climate of siege induced by multiple parties, from which they recalled experiencing fear while also escaping or hiding. Participant A expressed:
“…it was like always expecting for something bad to happen. I had to escape from the campus like a scared rabbit”. Participant F notes, “very frequently we had those problems, having to run, looking for those way outs to escape quickly, before tear gas reaches us.”

Participant H expressed about her worry and the spirit of the time telling that: “The problem was how to leave UASD, without being harmed by the bombs”. Participant G, describing a state of threat and anxiety, said about his memory on what to expect from the government and political student groups respectively: “They would surround the campus, and then they would invade the campus. Then came the imprisonment, the mistreatments, the blows, and sometimes the disappearances” and “these (student) groups would make war against each other, to death. Being from the left”. Participant B noted “I once had to sleep overnight on campus.” Thus, in general, accounts depict an environment of fear for multilateral aggression and danger.

Additionally, participants agree in their accounts of degree uncertainty. This is, constant and despairing semester delays caused by the conflict. Some participants perceive semester delays extended program durations far beyond what was formally determined by university authorities. Participant B summarized “the program delayed too much”, Participant F points out that “classes would be shut down in the midst... due to the political conflict”, Participant D regretted “I realize it was the loss of a precious time.”

About the quality of education at the time, most participants concur in that the quality of education was premium until then, however delayed and hard to keep up with due to the conflict. Participant A appreciated the climate of elevated academic conversation as “all those intellectuals would gather around...” Participant B states that in UASD there was “great quality
of education.” Participant D expressed “…having a UASD diploma hung at the wall was a statement of superiority.” However, tensions inside UASD, made it very difficult for students and faculty members to remain involved into it. Most participants recalled having quit, having seen other fellow students drop out, or having seen teachers leave.

Hence, in connection to the introduction to Table 2, five overarching concepts showed to prevail in most accounts of the lived experience throughout participants. Such sub-themes under Theme 1 were named to suggest the concepts they embody as follows: (1) Aggression coming from the State and/or multiple parties, (2) life threatening danger, persecution, and people hurt, (3) uncertainty of degree duration, (4) good quality of education until then, (5) memory of student drop out and/or faculty exodus.

Table 3 shows the how Theme 1 and its five sub-themes deploy and interact with participants. Marked with an X are the instances were participants’ accounts support Theme 1 and sub-themes.

Table 3

**Emerging Sub-Themes from Theme 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lived experience of danger and program delay</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Aggression from multiple parties</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Life threatening danger, persecution</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Uncertainty of degree duration.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Good quality of education then.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Memory of student, faculty exodus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Letters in column headings represent participants’ names.*
Sub-Theme 1.1: Aggression from the State and/or Multiple Parties

A fundamental subtheme that emerged during interviews is the memory of having been threatened by attacks motivated both by the government and left-wing political groups on-campus. The latter battled the government but they also battled each other in rivalry. The accounts on one hand describe a climate of government control and of fear around UASD. They recalled that the Government employed the National Police, the Armed Forces, paramilitary forces and spies to siege UASD campus. “You could arrive at campus and find a war tank in the corner of Jose Contreras St. with Santo Tomas de Aquino St., and having then to run back away” remarked Participant A. Also describing the situation as a way of life, Participant A declared that he and his fellow students “had to be expecting for State repression, because that was the way how life was lived”. While recalling an event, he declared that President Balaguer “kidnapped the university” placing “one soldier every ten meters around the whole perimeter of the campus so no one could enter.”

Participants often highlighted that former President Joaquin Balaguer had the leading role in the conflict, Participant B stated that “Balaguer was responsible of the killing of many of those left-wing youngsters, students at UASD, my neighbors.”

The group coincided that the UASD conflict had a large social and national scale, that it also was violent and life-threatening, forming a climate of repression for students inside and outside campus. Participant G recalled that:

The government came with repressions where there were lots of deaths. Not only that, but also direct attacks with the army and the police to the very university… when the university held demonstrations outside campus it was confronted even with helicopters. And many troops and police agents. Highly repressed. Since the early 60s there were
deaths regarding this. At the National Palace there was a demonstration from the youth movement, and a killing of students took place.

Participants also recall student groups inside campus, belonging to various left-wing currents that were popular at the time. Participants A and E stated respectively “back then inside UASD there were many different political parties” and “there were groups of the left, the radicals, middle and the moderate”. Confrontation among these student group was recalled as periodic, Participant H states “at times they (student groups) would clash against each other inside the university.”

Participants render these groups as guerrillas that resided in UASD, Participant G declared: “The groups would operate inside and outside the university, there were guerrillas, urban guerrillas, they formed rural guerrillas. …those groups had a sort of sanctuary inside the university territory.”

The accounts indicate that these groups engaged in open shootings that resulted in deaths, beatings, and the making of bombs. Participant E dated their origins back to the 1965 civil war, where constitutionalist left-wing factions took the streets to demand the restitution of Juan Bosch’ presidential mandate: “UASD was a spoil of war…the system had to corner certain opposition groups. Those groups found residence in the university, they were nurtured by the university budget. Balaguer cornered the left there.” In addition, he explained that during a period there were “youngsters armed with grenades, machineguns …in those days there were killings”. Participant H corroborates the extent these groups would go to pursue their goals: “Between 1966 and 1970, and between 1970 and 1974, there were deaths in the university as a cause of clashes between student groups that had nothing to do with the government. Clashes between political factions.”
While telling of their rivalry, Participant G expands that “these groups would make war against each other, to death. Being from the left.” In Appendix H, the combined list of textural descriptions regarding Sub-Theme 1.1 is provided.

As summary of the major ideas to Subtheme 1.1, participants described an environment of aggression that was multilateral. The State is remembered to have exercised organized violence over UASD students and campus to combat left-wing student militants. This repression was played both actively and passively, through means like military campus incursions and insiders respectively. Likewise, participants share memories of a left-wing militancy inside UASD that was seemingly threatening and was not a uniform structure. They recall multiple left-wing groups fighting violently against the government and against each other posing threats to their safety.

Sub-Theme 1.2: Life-Threatening Danger, Persecution, People Hurt

Accounts recollected in Sub-Theme 1.1 were regarded as life-threatening situations for participants and other students close to them during that period of time. The most mentioned threats were gunshots, teargas, war tanks, helicopters, imprisonment, beatings, and death. Participant A expressed having felt threatened stating that during his time in UASD he would “arrive at the Architecture Faculty and watch the people run away while hearing the sound of gunshots, having to hide behind the columns fearing to be impacted by a stray bullet.”

Accounts depicted events where students had to abandon class in the menacing presence of heavy war machinery, troops and teargas, Participant B declared:

We were in the third floor of the School of Architecture, and we tried to keep the class of Professor Tolentino running as much as possible…but at a given point the clashes between leftwing students and the government… accompanying the police force and the
Dominican Army troops, the government sent helicopters to shoot tear gas bombs inside campus. The chaos was immense. We decided to leave fearing to be trapped inside.

Likewise, Participant C narrated about being threatened and attacked. He declared: “The military would surround the university with war tanks and would bombard us. They would shoot at us with machineguns. It was extremely risky to be young, to be a student and to study in UASD.” Describing in more detail, he asserted that he experienced “moments in which I saved my life out of courage and training being student. I was surrounded by the paramilitary group called La Banda. They persecuted and killed young revolutionary militants.

Interviewees recall being attacked and placed at risk, Participant D stated: “One afternoon, while waiting for the class to start…, out of the blue a tear gas bomb fell near our feet. We ran… The police threw a teargas bomb.” When asked if at some point he felt at risk, Participant E replied “yes… in various occasions the university was surrounded with war weaponry, like tanks, fully armed troops. Totally cornered, there were shootings …to intimidate.”

Participant F recalled, when asked if she found herself in danger at some point, replied “yes, off course, many times.” She described being attacked, running from government incursions frequently: “Very frequently we had those problems, having to run, looking for those way outs to escape quickly, before tear gas reaches us.” In addition, her account shed light on a gender-related state of things that constituted an additional fear mostly for women. Describing yet another modality of in-campus aggression, she expressed: “I experienced sexual harassment. A teacher had to intervene. Then I passed from being more independent into having my father pick me up while I studied in UASD.” Participant G answered “yes, yes, off course” when asked if he felt in danger at some point, and went on into saying “I had to run, I had to look for escape
points along the university campus.” In Appendix I, the combined list of textural descriptions regarding Sub-Theme 1.2 is provided.

As a summary to Sub-Theme 1.2, there is a transcendent memory among participants that the type of aggression and harassment reported was indeed life-threatening during their time in UASD. Both the State and the different left-wing groups were described as inflicting humiliations, fear and/or anguish, and at times physical damage to participants or other students near them. Escaping from campus, hiding in campus, or running from shootings and teargas were among the most commonly reported memories, other frequent memories are images of people being hurt next to them.

**Sub-Theme 1.3: Uncertainty of Degree Duration**

The third most frequent memory within participants has to do with time it took them to complete their degree programs. Most participants bitterly complained about having to spend an extra 50 to 100% of time to reach graduation. The main reason stated were the frequent clashes between the government and student groups resulting in indefinite closing of the university by the government.

Participant J described the ordeal as follows: “My second semester lasted almost one year. …I finished my four-year degree in (19)76, in six years. …Two of my grades were lost, disappeared, and I had to take those subjects again.” Participant I and H declared “I lasted nine years in UASD” and “we all spent additional three or four years to graduate” respectively. Participant F had to quit her program and had to leave UASD: “I studied civil engineering for a year and a half, and it was all shutting down, politics, tear gas bombs.” Participant D, while reflecting upon the time he spent on completing his degree in UASD: “I enrolled in (19)75, but could not finish the program before (19)83, and did not graduate before (19)86.”
A group of participants portrayed leftist student groups as bearing more responsibility for the delays. Participant H, asserted that clashes within rival student groups “did much harm to university students. Because, one semester could last up to nine months. At times the university could last 10 days closed, one week closed, 15 days closed.” Participant E, also regrets the extraordinary delays while blaming the delays on student groups: “It affected me because that (student) movement caused a delay in our completion time, lasting additional five years. The conflict delayed the completion time for students, affected them.” In an emotional manner, some participants, told anecdotes that portray the prevailing sense of desperation with regards to program delays due to the clashes. Participant B shared:

One day, while desperate, ...and helpless, ...willing to finally graduate, ...a group of us stood in Bolivar Avenue, looking down to the campus, lifted our arms shouting: “by God, we want to graduate, stop the politics now!” ... the leftist groups were keeping the political situation alive.

Other participants focused more on the state as responsible for the delays. Participant G made a similar valuation about the government stating that “each time there was an incursion from the government they would close it for months and even a year.” And again he brings the subject in the course of the interview: “my friends who started college in (19)75, (in other institutions) completed their programs in four years ...while I was at the middle point of my program I think.” In Appendix J, the combined list of textural descriptions regarding Sub-Theme 1.3 is provided.

In summary, most participants revealed a lingering frustration for the delay of their stay in UASD due to the interruptions and administrative hurdles caused by the conflict. They recall a strong desire to graduate and enter the professional labor market, sentiments of losing heart,
friends who quit and never returned, others that transferred to private colleges. This memory was observed to have a similar weight in the narrative as the memory of life-threatening situations, most participants deeply lament to have spent more time than they were supposed to last in UASD, and similar to Sub-Theme 1.1, they recall both State and left-wing groups as responsible for it.

**Sub-Theme 1.4: Good Quality of Education Until Then**

Most participants agreed that the quality of education in UASD was very good while they were enrolled. Participants cite as causes for this environment of academic excellence the involvement in UASD of highly qualified faculty members and lecturers, the climate of freedom of thought and elevated academic discussions taking place spontaneously. Critical topics within this subtheme involve quality ranking, quality of faculty, free and open discussions, curiosity and critical thinking.

About faculty member excellence, participants J and B stressed respectively: “The best education quality at that time, was in UASD” and “great quality of education”. Other participants expressed memories of UASD being highly ranked by society, Participant I expressed: “Public college education was not bad. …that is lost, but there was a time where the university was well ranked” and “when we studied, our program was highly ranked.”

Other participants praised the atmosphere of freedom of expression and elevated dialectic discussion. Participant E stated:

We felt that UASD was an open place, were you could release your curiosity… much philosophy, political climate, reasoning about everything… UASD was the melting pot of all point of views… attractive environment of thought… reading exchange, music. The lecturing dynamic was dialectic, shared, interactive.
He also recalled that education quality was a priority: “Even in the midst of the conflict the respect and transfer of knowledge took place with certain rigor.” In Appendix K, the combined list of textural descriptions regarding Sub-Theme 1.4 is provided. In summary, most participants admitted that although the climate in UASD was dangerous and uncertain, the education quality was notable until then. They praised the high academic standards of faculty members and the passion for teaching and learning that they remember to have experienced in campus. As it was observed, that climate of academic excellence combined to the (then) new discourse of freedom of speech, social justice and individual liberties, was a factor that bonded many among their generation to UASD.

**Sub-Theme 1.5: Memory of Student Drop Out and/or Faculty Exodus**

The participants provided a strong image of students, faculty, and administrators leaving UASD. Throughout the interviews, the recollection of students quitting UASD or transferring from UASD to another university was recurrent. So was the memory of faculty members, lecturers and teachers leaving UASD behind or being expelled, in both cases due to disagreement with the left-wing environment and entering into other universities to teach.

In describing the experience of students having to drop out unwillingly, interviewees like Participant E noted that students from the rural areas simply could not withstand the cost of delays: “Many students had to go back to their towns and many did not come back.” And went into detailing the situation furthermore describing the ordeals of parents too: “I knew many people from Santiago that could not return to the university because they were frustrated …many parents would come from the country side to pick up their sons.”

Others quit UASD to enroll in private or semiprivate colleges. Such was the case of Participants F and G, who told of how they ended up transferring from UASD to another college
in order to be able to finally complete a program: “It (the conflict) affected me negatively because I had to leave UASD to enter into an emerging university. Which was formed as a consequence of the UASD conflicts” and “I didn’t get to finish my program in UASD. I went abroad to finish at the midpoint. I had to start over my degree” respectively. Participant H brings the memory of her younger brother’s dropout: “My younger brother started studying medicine and had to dropout, and went to a private university.” Participant J went into a yet more intimate layer of the discussion, telling about her desire to “dropout out and all” out of “disappointment”. However, she endured until she could finally graduate.

Interviewees also recalled faculty members migrating actively to the (then) new Universidad Nacional Pedro Henriquez Ureña (UNPHU). Participant A expressed: “The university had lost many of the best teachers, the star teachers. They left UASD and joined UNPHU.” Similarly, participants E, I and K declared how students and faculty members left UASD to enter UNPHU and other institutions. In Appendix L, the combined list of textural descriptions regarding Sub-Theme 1.5 is provided.

In summary, the image of people fleeing UASD is a recurrent element along narratives. Most participants recalled student and faculty exodus as a result of the lingering and dangerous conflict. Students and faculty would leave to either quit studying or teaching or to engage in other emerging colleges that were private or semiprivate, the latter being the case of UNPHU. Some express that faculty exodus was forced by the (then) new left-wing leadership of UASD, others link it to a natural reaction to the environment of danger.
Themes Related to Research Question 2

Theme 2: Interpreted as Life Transforming Experience

Research question number two reads: “How do Balaguer era UASD students interpret what they experienced and believe about those interpretations?”

It regards how participants interpret or make meaning of what they went through while enrolled in UASD during the Balaguer period between 1966 and 1978. The interview protocol conducted was designed to probe how participants make such meaning in two different aspects: One addressing the participant’s valuation of their experience of threat and the other addressing the participants’ valuation of the system of public higher education. Theme 2 relates to the former, a consensus of the kind of value participants add to their experience of risk. To that specific end, participants were asked the second, fourth and fifth questions in the interview protocol:

2. As you recall these events, what are your emotions and beliefs concerning the conflict and the institutions that were involved?

4. What do you believe are the most important ways your experience during the conflict has influenced your life?

5. How do you believe your interpretations of the conflict have changed over time?

After having analyzed the accounts around these questions, the notion that their UASD time turned into a life-defining experience emerged. All participants declared to have learned important life lessons from both pleasant and unpleasant events lived.

Participant C considers his stay in UASD as one of only two fundamental life transforming experiences: “There are two stages in my life that I highly regard. The first is my participation in the War of April…That marked me…and the experience in UASD. What I am today is the fruit
of those two stages.” The War of April Participant C referred to took place in 1965, and was fought to restore the constitutional mandate of leftwing President Juan Bosch. It preceded the UASD conflict. Similarly, Participant E defines his college years in UASD as transcendental and transforming: “It was one of my most extraordinary life experiences, it helped me transform.”

Similar to the manner in which answers to research question 1 were collected, research question 2 had its answers fragmented and scattered along the length of interviews. Most participants took their time to value this life experience using adjectives associated with hardship and even trauma in the discussion prior to their statements regarding it as a maturing or transforming experience. Thus, in the narrative, their transformation is both linked to experiences they regard as pleasant, like the climate of freedom of expression in campus, and unpleasant and threatening, like running for their safety or fearing. Participant A first remembered his experience as a fearful one comparing himself to a “scared rabbit” and stating he was “fearing to be impacted.” However, he was confident to say that these events “bring the best of you” and that he lost fear to face unknown stigmatized environments: “I lost fear to visit slums.” Participant I associated one of his experiences with the state of being “all nervous” and referred to hardship frequently during the interview repeating the word “hard”, and stating various times “it was hard.” In parallel, the same Participant I stated that “being there taught me to see life in another way.”

Hence, Theme 2 embodies two relating sub-themes: (1) Hard experience, grouping adjectives and descriptions valuating the experience as a difficult and threatening one; and (2) maturing and transforming experience, grouping descriptions associated to learned lessons. The feeling having positively matured out of their experience stands in contrast with the perception of most participants that the university is not worth recommending to college students nowadays as
it can be seen further below in themes 3 and 4. Table 4 shows the how Theme 2 and its two sub-themes deploy and interact with participants. Marked with an X are the instances were participants’ accounts support Theme 2 and sub-themes.

Table 4

_Emerging Sub-Themes from Theme 2_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Interpreted as life-transforming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Hard experience.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Maturing and transforming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Letters in column headings represent participants’ names.

**Sub-Theme 2.1: Hard Experience**

All of the participants qualify their lived experience providing expressions or using adjectives associated to hardship, fear or violence. Some participants even spoke of trauma or traumatic events. Participant C defines being college student during those years of conflict as “extremely risky.” Participant A talks of the “fear to be impacted” by bullets. Participant B continued the narrative of repression expressing that the time was indeed “traumatic, difficult, violent, those were violent years” and one of “violent harassment.” He went on into talking about “trauma” to qualify the conflict, while associating the violence of the time to the administrative and delay difficulties within UASD caused by the turmoil: “It was a trauma for the society, it was a trauma for the university, …it was a difficult experience to me.” Similarly, Participant D employs the word trauma while specifically describing the experience of program delays and gaps in his program content at the time: “that time of Balaguer brought as
consequence that the students trained during those years are professionals with many missing
lessons, and even trauma.”

Administrative difficulties caused by the conflict also lead interviewees like Participant F
to describe her time in UASD as psychologically challenging and depressing: “UASD made me
lose control, it caused me depression. The crazy schedules, the kilometric lines, the filthiness, the
lack of hygiene in classrooms, lack of hygiene in restrooms. It affected me.” Violence also took
a toll on participants. Participant F, described she had been sexually harassed among other perils
she went through. Her state of unwillingness and depression peaked just before she decided to
drop out of UASD to join a newly established private university: “I reached a point where I was
not even willing to study. Due to the conflict inside campus and inside yourself. To stop willing
to attend, lose motivation.”

Similar to Participant F, other interviewees had to drop out. Participant G declared he had
to quit after a few years and defines the time of conflict as a “cruel and genocide fight.” Further
on, he labels it as “ideological and absurd” while making a back and forth recollection on the
influence of Cold War super powers over the Dominican higher education system. Participant
H, after expressing to have ran away and hid fearing for her safety periodically, tells of a time of
“uncertainty” and very critical moments”, and summarizes declaring: “the truth is it (conflict)
was hard for us.” Participant J, who is nowadays working in the public higher education system
and looks at the current state of the institution with optimism, also interprets her experience as
one of hardship: “Those were truly difficult times.” In Appendix M, the combined list of
structural descriptions regarding Sub-Theme 2.1 is provided.

In summary, the meaning-making of the lived experience starts with a reflection on how
difficult it was for most participants. This could be anticipated by the account they provided of
their lived experience. Participants expressed in a wide variety of ways just how hard they think their time un UASD was. Difficulties related to the conflict affected the university’s administrative efficiency, and peace inside campus, and yet students had to attend and study, while losing heart while witnessing scenes of abuse and even murder.

**Sub-Theme 2.2: Maturing and Transforming Experience**

However difficult their experience might have been, eleven out of twelve participants clearly declared that their experience in UASD transformed them in a transcendental manner. They describe their change as into being stronger in character, more balanced, mature and reflective, more aware of peoples’ or institutions’ “real intentions”, more sensitive with regards to human suffering, better defendants of social justice, and finally, more resilient before life’s difficulties. Participant C, who suffered targeted imprisonment and persecution, stated about his current state of matureness: “I feel I am a result of that time.”

As a general comment, most participants considered that the outcome of the conflict in his personal life is positive, Participant A shared: “These conflicts bring the best of you.” Participant C declared “It (the experience) gave me the opportunity of growth.” Participant E also points at the transcendence of the experience declaring: “it was one of my most extraordinary life experiences, it helped me transform”, and again… “it made me change my perception of life itself.” Similar to the latter assertion, Participant I highlights the power of the experience as life’s perspective: “Being there taught me to see life in another way.”

Participants’ exposure to the diverse and struggling human environment in UASD made them value human relations in a way they hadn’t had the opportunity to value before. They also battled class prejudices they carried with them at the time. Participant A declared: “I lost fear to visit slums, my classmates lived there.” Participant B also valued the effect of having been
exposed to people who thought different than he did as positive and growth triggering: “Having to share day by day with leftwing people and with ideas very different to ours brought growth to me.”

In addition, interviewees consider to have gained intellectual, social and practical competencies for life, Participant C stressed: “I learned responsibility… and the worth of freedom… expresses myself, to have initiative, to propose…”, “one acquires a more holistic vision, of more rationality, where emotion gives room to reason.” As a conflict that generated much sensibility, Participant F stated: “We are always talking about human rights. Those of us who studied in UASD, although we didn’t graduate, became more socially empathic.”

Women, having withstood delays and constant threats to their safety and that of their friends, include adjectives associated to personal resilience and courage. Participant J declared:

The values that I found in UASD, is that no matter the problems you are living, you have the capacity to overcome that situation. I learned that, to me that value is very important. Bravery, face life, and the most important… to fight for what you want.

Participant F, also female, expands this idea declaring that she learned to take responsibility for her own intellectual and professional development without the help of others: “The conflict helped me to learn how to self-educate.” Accounts highlighted endurance as a gain out these students’ experiences. Participant G expressed: “That generation is marked by a pursuit of quality. We were a very battling and competitive group. …people with principles…” Participant K stated “We learned to overcome obstacles. We grew as persons.”

Distrust and disappointment have also contributed positively according to some participants. Participant I praised the surgical skepticism he gained out of his stay in UASD: “It
helped me learn when something was truth or not.” In Appendix N, the combined list of structural descriptions regarding Sub-Theme 2.2 is provided.

In summary, a second transcendent way in which most participants described their meaning-making of the experience was as a maturing and transforming one. Although the experience was processed as hard (see Sub-Theme 2.1), it also is remembered as a transformative one in a positive way. Participants expressed to have matured remarkably, becoming better human beings as a result of having been through this unique hardship.

**Themes Related to Research Question 3**

**Theme 3: Experience Influences Perception of Public HE**

The third research question, or “how have any attitudes held by the Balaguer era UASD students influenced their attitudes about higher education?”, is addressed in this next section. Most participants responded to this question with similar views. Responses around this topic mainly described two ways in which their experience of conflict is related to their perception of higher education. The first one has to do with the perception that the conflict had a negative impact on the public higher education system. Participant E, while talking about the effects of the conflict expressed: “That conflict produced a deterioration of the quality.” This perception has been addressed under the sub theme the conflict affected negatively current public HE System.

The second way in which the answer to research question three was provided by participants was manifesting a perception associated to low education quality and distrust for the institution. Participant C, for instance, stated that “quality of education has dropped.” The latter has been addressed in the sub-theme public higher education system lacks quality and/or not trustable. Table 5 shows the how Theme 3 and its two sub-themes deploy and interact with
participants. Marked with an X are the instances where participants’ accounts support Theme 3 and sub-themes.

Table 5

*Emerging Sub-Themes from Theme 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Experience influences perception of public HE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The conflict negatively affected current public HE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Public HE system lacks quality and/or not trustable.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Letters in column headings represent participants’ names.

**Sub-Theme 3.1: The Conflict Affected Negatively Current Public HE System**

While participants estimate to have obtained a positive personal gain from their experience in UASD, they also consider the conflict as to have had a degenerative impact in the Dominican system of higher education, which is fundamentally UASD. When asked “Do you think that the current state of public education is a consequence of the conflict somehow?”, participant K asserted: “Yes, there is a heritage of that conflict.”

Participants link the conflict to a wide range of challenged fields from education quality, faculty member development, administrative efficiency, infrastructure capacity, transparency, political presence, the emergence of competing private institutions, and public image. In general terms, Participant E laments over his view that the conflict severely damaged the system of higher education: “The university, with that conflict destroyed, to a certain extent, what it meant before to graduate from UASD.” Participant B declared: “What we experienced definitively
altered or modified higher education, so much so, that...Universidad Nacional Pedro Henriquez Ureña (UNPHU) started welcoming faculty members that left UASD.”

Many interviewees highlight the political invasion of UASD as a fundamental negative effect of the conflict that is still present nowadays, Participant F expressed: “The problem of UASD during those 12 years, I think it has never ceased having problems, because it became too politic, and it remained too politic, politics inside the university is I think one of the worst problems it has.”

For others, the lingering effect is mainly manifested in low education quality. When asked “do you think the current state of quality in higher education is a consequence, maybe indirect, of that conflict of the twelve years?” Participant D said “Yes, totally agree. To study in UASD nowadays is no reason for pride right now.” Interestingly, during his interview he also stated that UASD has changed for better. Perhaps this could be explained as an attempt to acknowledge that, although the institution is challenged by hurdles, it is on a path of improvement. To the same question, Participant E replied: “Yes, yes, yes, it is part of the outcome of that conflict. That conflict produced a deterioration of the quality.” Participant K declared: “Yes, there is a heritage of that conflict.”

In the same line, Participant C perceives a state of “destruction” in terms of quality which is a result of the conflict: “Over the destruction of that educational system, an anarchy overcame. The quality was destroyed. The State tries to recover the system but you see that the quality of education has dropped to the bottom.”

Other participants highlight organizational challenges as the main effect of the conflict over the UASD of today. Participant J considers that UASD suffers from an administrative and academic deficiency yet unaddressed by the State as a consequence of the conflict. When asked
if the State has responded accordingly to the deterioration of the higher education system the answer was: “It hasn’t been, it hasn’t supported it. …the operations there (UASD) were very deficient, with regards to other universities.” When asked if she considered that the current deterioration is a consequence of the conflict she answered “off course, yes.”

In more specific remarks, Participant G considered that the conflict also affected, in some degree, the administrative ethics of the university: “There is a crisis …there is corruption, there are groups, there are people that don’t let others work because they have power.” When asked if there is a relation between the conflict and the current crisis he described, he replied: “Let’s say that on one side yes.”

The challenged public image of UASD was also identified as a consequence of the conflict. And for Participant I, such image is a perspective that is conveyed to the next generation. To the question: “Do you think the way that people regard higher education nowadays is the result of that conflict?”, he replied “yes, here there are people that still say ‘my son will not study there’.” In Appendix O, the combined list of structural descriptions regarding Sub-Theme 3.1 is provided.

As summary to Sub-Theme 3.1, most participants expressed that there is a link between the current state of crisis in the public higher education system and the conflict between 1966 and 1978. Lingering effects range from administrative bias and irregularities, to poor education quality, to faculty lack of qualification.

**Sub-Theme 3.2: Public HE System Lacks Quality and/or Not Trustable**

Independent to their valuation on how or if the conflict affected the public higher education system, most participants consider that currently the system lacks quality and/or is not reliable. The discussion of education quality mainly orbited around the competencies of faculty
members in general. However, seven out of 12 participants, while highlighting negative valuations about education quality, also expressed that this is not an absolute verdict. They implied that education varies in quality within schools in UASD, and that student development has much to do with the level of interest and passion the latter has for learning. Minding education quality, participants used expressions of distrust towards UASD. They link distrust to the state of administrative processes in the institution, and would point out this feeling as either coming from the society or of their own.

With regards to the current state of education quality in UASD, participants A and C stated that “mediocrity has it trapped and isolated”, and that it “has dropped to the bottom.” Participant E pointed out that there is a problem of quality and of social image: “The institution has to be more responsible rising the academic level… The university needs to turn its image around and its quality to be able to compete.”

Participant G, in a more balanced manner asserted that “each person determines how well prepared (he/she) will be. But definitively there is a difference”, meaning a difference in quality among higher education institutions.

As of the perceived administrative state of the institution associated to the feeling of distrust, Participant F was asked if she considered that the current generation shows disbelief towards public higher education. Her answer was “…I think so. UASD has to revise all of its processes and focus on education.” In addition, she declared: “UASD remains with a mess in terms of class schedule, kilometric waiting lines.” When asked if her generation distrusts the higher education system, Participant H declared: “Distrust in the public higher education system, yes, definitely.”
Participant G was asked: “-Do you consider that there is a crisis in the quality of public higher education?” and replied an answer that connects education quality to bad administration ethics: “…there is corruption…there is people that don’t let others work because they have power.” Participant K also tied the issue to ethics and power dynamics. He described a system biased by political networks and privilege: “Political groups that use the university to employ family members, …use the university for their political activities. Nepotism. Difficulties for new teachers. …you have to be well connected.”

Participant I points at the competencies and behavior of faculty members as a factor of quality. In relation to competencies, he declared: “First, the quality of teaching is not the same (as before). Second, there is a social fear, to call it somehow, with that.” As for behavioral matters he expressed that “…there are teachers that go, mark their attendance and then leave (without teaching).” In Appendix P, the combined list of structural descriptions regarding Sub-Theme 3.2 is provided.

In summary to Sub-Theme 3.2, most participants expressed distrust in UASD while also describing it as underperforming in terms of education quality. Most participants expressed that nowadays UASD is still passing through a crisis of education quality that is caused mainly by the qualifications of faculty members and administrative malpractice. This conclusion is to be balanced with Theme 5, in which it is evident that most participant acknowledged that the institution has improved notably.

Themes Related to Research Question 4

Theme 4: Generational Rupture: Would not Recommend UASD

The fourth research question, or “how do Balaguer era UASD students influence and share their experiences, attitudes, and beliefs about higher education with others in their
families and community?”, is addressed in this next section. As it has been explained before, most participants manifested a belief that the public higher education system faces a major challenge of education quality, and provide expressions of distrust. In connection to this, most participants expressed to convey messages of discouragement to the younger generation around them and/or haven’t had their offspring enrolled in UASD. As an example to this, Participant E declared to have explained to his son why UASD is not an option, arguing among other factors that it “will not contribute satisfactory levels of personal-academic education.” Hence, this content has been contained under sub-theme “would not recommend UASD/Offspring did not study in UASD.”

As seen so far, most participants recall the conflict as a life-threatening event that affected the current state of the Dominican public higher education system, which they perceive as lacking quality. Consequently, this lack of appreciation regarding the system leads most participants to transmit explicitly or implicitly, negative perspectives about the system to those around them.

Participant B advises his students at the private university in which he teaches “to learn to appraise their opportunity” of being in a different context. He continued by asserting “I do not see how they can even have a reference of what we had to pass through.” Participant D conveys a similar framework to his family members, he declared “I share to my family: ‘Private education is superior to public education.’ …They lack training.”

Participant E was probably among those who elaborated the most about his transmission of negative frameworks to his offspring. When explaining the nature of the messages he has conveyed to his son he expressed:
I explain to him the reasons why enrolling in UASD will not contribute satisfactory levels of personal-academic education, social network, and respect for himself as professional. The university, with that conflict, destroyed to a certain extent what it meant before to graduate from UASD.

As he continued, he also added about his three daughters’ college choice: “They didn’t go to UASD, instead they enrolled in … (private universities). They didn’t go to UASD because it is still perceived that there are delays and low academic level.

In similar words, Participant F declares how she addresses others that manifest interest to enroll in UASD: “If a close one asks me if it’s a good idea for their kids to enroll in UASD, I always say don’t do it.” Reaffirming her position, she answered the question “you wouldn’t recommend UASD to a son or daughter?” with an emphatic “-No, not at all. I have had close relatives that have started studies in UASD and have had to quit.”

Participant H, when talking about her faculty in UASD during her student years, expressed reluctance to recommend it nowadays due to the low skill level of current faculty members according to her: “I would not recommend it to any of my family members. Unfortunately. Its faculty members don’t have the quality of those we had.” She went on into expressing how she considers that her generation’s offspring reacts about the issue: “So much so, that none of the off spring of all of our colleagues have studied in UASD, they have studied in private universities. Because the deterioration has been much, academically.”

Participants I and K consider UASD as an option only for those who cannot afford to pay for private education. Participant I expressed that people who can pay for private education tend to go elsewhere due to the deterioration of education quality in the institution:
…Individuals that can afford private universities and that know what it (importance of education) means, prefer that (private university). And won’t go there, were the education is decimated, and on top of that, look now, they said more student demonstrations are coming. Forget about it.

Participant K stated it in more general terms: “I would recommend them to enroll into another university. Now, a person with no resources, there is where he/she has to go.” In general, the idea of generational continuity in UASD enrolment was not a supported or popular idea among participants. As it has been presented before, the sense of personal growth out of the conflict is not accompanied by a sense of pride for the state and governance of the institution. However, as it will be seen next in Theme 5, these appreciations are held while most participants also acknowledge that UASD has improved integrally. In Appendix Q, the combined list of structural descriptions regarding Theme 4 is provided.

In summary, as a consequence of having a decaying image of UASD, most participants showed no institutional loyalty toward the institution. In addition, they conveyed messages of discouragement to the next generation with regards to enrolling in UASD. UASD is rendered as the undesired choice for those who have no means to enroll into private colleges.

Additional Comments

Theme 5: Perception that UASD Has Improved

Despite the dominant narrative of negative perceptions, seven out of the twelve participants also expressed, as additional comments, their perception that UASD is being invested in and that is has indeed improved in different critical aspects. They mentioned aspects related to education quality, infrastructure and political stability.
The prevailing perception within participants is that UASD has a major challenge with regards to education quality that rests mainly upon the performance of faculty members. Seemingly important, they consider that the university faces administrative and governance hurdles that drains its potential as an engine to empower the college-age population. These frameworks, have a decisive impact on the kind of message that participants convey to the people around them, which are of a discouraging nature.

However, one additional subtheme that emerged as interviews were conducted has to do with the participants’ parallel perception that UASD has improved integrally in the recent years. Along the narrative of the interviews these two conflicting ideas at times seemed to contradict each other without the awareness of interviewees. Comments of this sort relate to the betterment of academic standards, improvement in infrastructure and a climate of lesser demonstrations. Participant D, having been one of the sharpest critics of education quality, stated surprisingly: “The university has changed much and for better.” Participants F and L corroborated this later assertion. Participant H acknowledged that recent governments have been doing a more proactive work to improve UASD stating: “I understand that the Ministry of Higher Education has aided much and has tried to make UASD overcome those hurdles.” Participant L expressed of university authorities: “They are taking the steps to reverse a process that took us to the bottom.”

Regarding education quality, Participant E mentioned that UASD attempts to improve its academic standards: “Nowadays, the university is trying …to elevate the academic level a little bit more.” Participant K also expressed in those positive terms saying that “from the academic point of view it has improved… better development of faculty members.”
Investment in infrastructure was also mentioned, participants H and I noticed respectively: “The recent governments have helped and invested much to UASD’s infrastructure.” and “(a former president) invested much there.”

Lastly, a climate of lesser demonstrations was also praised. Participant J declared that UASD is living “an extraordinary experience… there are almost no demonstrations, protests are taking place in a different way, more sporadic.” Participant K claimed that “this is a period of certain stability.” In Appendix R, the combined list of structural descriptions regarding Theme 5 is provided.

As a summary to Theme 5, most participants acknowledged that UASD has undergone significant improvements in the recent decades. These improvements consist of retrofitting and expanding infrastructure, research enterprises, and better salaries for faculty members. This seems to counterbalance former results that render UASD as a last choice for those who wish to enroll into college.

Chapter IV Summary

This phenomenological research had the purpose of exploring the long-term social effect of the major conflict within the Dominican higher education system that took place between 1966 and 1978. This chapter consisted of a description of how participants recall their memory of the conflict, how they make meaning of these memories, and what perspectives they declare to convey to individuals within their circle of influence about public higher education as a result. The themes and subthemes deployed in this chapter were developed drawing from interview analysis.
Four main themes were identified as answering the four research questions, while one more theme regarding a positive valuation of UASD emerged as interviews were analyzed. The resulting five main themes are listed below:


2. The question: How do Balaguer era UASD students interpret what they experienced and believe about those interpretations? was addressed by the theme: Life-transforming experience.

3. The question: How have any attitudes held by UASD students influenced their attitudes about higher education? was addressed by the theme: Experience influences perception of public higher education.

4. The question: How do UASD students influence and share their experiences, attitudes, and beliefs about higher education with others in their families and community? Was addressed by the theme: Influential over next generation.

5. The theme State has responded to repair public HEd System, might also be part of the answer to research question 3, however, with seven out of 12 participants supporting the notion, it did not count on the same level of consensus theme 3 had among participants.

Summary of Findings

As shown in this chapter, most participants coincided in descriptions of what they experienced, as well as of how they made meaning about it. Their memories portray college years marked by the constant expectation of government incursions inside campus and of
retaliation from student groups. These groups were described as opposed to the government and rivals to each other. Such actions from the government and student groups were remembered as attacks that threatened their safety and that of their fellow students and faculty members, causing serious injuries and deaths among the people around. Due to attacks and further confrontations, participants declared to have run, hid or escaped campus, aimed at with fire arms and even shot at. Some described events of sexual harassment by UASD elements and of humiliation by government forces. One of the most common memories among respondents was their exposure to teargas and teargas bomb firing by government forces. They described to have run from, hid or simply withstood teargas at a frequent basis.

The turmoil itself is remembered to have also caused significant delays in the duration of programs in UASD, these time extensions could normally be 50 or 100% of the formal program duration. Interviewed former students shared feelings of profound frustration for not being able to move forward in their programs and seeing their time prorogued in UASD for years before they could finish. Delays were remembered to be mainly related to administrative malpractice, government incursions in campus, and student group strikes.

However difficult the climate was inside campus, one factor emerged as a bond most students felt toward UASD: The institution had notable education quality at the time. Participants described an environment of free thinking, dialectic discussion, qualified teachers and curiosity for learning. They found in UASD a place to participate in decision-making processes, as well as where to learn a wide range of philosophical perspectives and about the broader world outside national borders. Unfortunately, as they describe, this attractor could not keep many of their acquaintances and faculty members involved in UASD. In fact, some of the participants did drop out of the institution out of frustration. Memories of having their friends and acquaintances and
their teachers leave the university are recurrent in their accounts. They remember that people quitting UASD usually had one of two destinies. Some would never enroll in higher education again; some others would go to emerging private colleges paying comparatively high tuition fees.

Hence, while considering the dangers and learning points, most participants describe their years in UASD as transformative. During their time in UASD they remember to have gone through once-in-a-life-time difficulties and hardship. They also assert that such hard experiences forged their character positively to make them wiser, more sensitive toward human suffering and advocates for the defense of human dignity.

Curiously, this was not observed to have also motivated advocacy for involvement in public higher education. Instead, most participants link the conflict they lived through to the current state of the public higher education system, a system they showed not to valuate positively. Accounts tell of institutional hurdles present in UASD, which are inherited from the conflict. Administrative ethic and transparency problems, strong influence from outside and inside politics compromising governance, challenged public image, infrastructure deficit and low faculty member development are among the inherited difficulties most often mentioned. Their image of UASD supports their resulting reflection that the institution is not trust-worthy to handle the educational needs of further generations. According to participant accounts, this perspective of UASD as bearer of problems inherited from the recent past makes them doubt of its efficacy to properly educate, and is transmitted by them to those around. In general, participants mention to have had words of discouragement with their acquaintances and children in meetings, and these conversations are complemented also with key features of their background like not having their children study in UASD. Culturally, in the DR parents have a
decisive role in the process of college choice-making for their children, they also often pay totally or partially for college tuition fees. Thus, parent perception about a given college has an effect on student beliefs and choices. Interestingly, most critics to UASD haven’t had a direct involvement with it in the last decades. Even so, they grant the contrasting assertion that progress has been made in UASD.

Although most participants do not regard UASD positively or as the college of their choice for new generations, they acknowledge that the institution has improved significantly during the last decades. Such improvement consists precisely in areas that participants have identified as of need: Infrastructure, research and faculty wages and faculty development.

As for the fate of the institution, generally, neither hope nor pessimism was observed to prevail within accounts. A reflexive discussion about these findings, conclusions and recommendations for future studies are provided in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Developing a thorough understanding of attrition is paramount in the current scene of national strategic plans of higher education in the Dominican Republic (SEESCYT, 2008). UASD is the oldest and largest higher education institution within the DR, still holding about 40% of national enrollments (OECD, 2012). In the last decade, substantial government investments for its infrastructure and professional development have taken place (SEESCYT, 2008). However, its attrition rate is approximately 80% (OECD, 2012). One generation ago, UASD was the epicenter of a 12-year violent conflict (1966 and 1978) between local leftist leaderships and the State (Kryzanek, 1977; Bethell, 1990). In the first eight years of the conflict, it is believed that more than 4,000 civilians lost their lives (Bethell, 1990). As it was later observed in this research, the conflict itself generated lingering effects over the public higher education system; and more importantly, the current social memory of it, shapes the frame of reference that many people still use to make meaning of the public higher education system.

Through the study of the social effects of this conflict, this research explores foundational collective beliefs that could be having an impact in student attrition and retention. I have departed from the assumption that attrition can be seen as social behavior or social choice-making, a stream of inquiry so far not developed in the academic literature. Research suggests that social perspectives inform and fuel social behavior (Schutz, 1967); and are conveyed most efficiently from one generation to another (Dessi, 2008). Surprisingly, until now, the current social effect of this conflict that the previous generation of UASD students went through had not been assessed.
While attrition rates have failed to effectively lower through the investment in infrastructure and faculty development alone, the goal of this study was to probe into the impact of the conflict on the perspectives and actions of 12 former UASD students who underwent it. Consequently, the study also concerns how they estimate that their beliefs and values are transmitted to those around them.

I found this enterprise valuable since informing the belief system of the college-age population and their families about the worth of public higher education is key to trigger higher levels of commitment and participation. Unfortunately, this line of action is not being addressed in current strategic plans (OECD, 2012; MESCYT, 2018). This apparently innocuous omission contributes to the perpetuation of a culture of attrition, costing Dominicans millions of dollars annually. This is so because tax payers are financing a system that fails to educate and graduate 80% of enrolled population.

I wanted to inform educational leaders and decision-makers inside and outside UASD, about this often overlooked belief trench so they can improve the coming strategic plans and perhaps also the municipal and national legislation regarding higher education. Thus, in order to have the necessary body of information elicit from participants, four specific research questions guided the inquiry of this study:

1. How do Balaguer era UASD students describe their experience of violence and persecution between 1966 and 1978?

2. How do Balaguer era UASD students interpret what they experienced and believe about those interpretations?

3. How have any attitudes held by the Balaguer era UASD students influenced their attitudes about higher education?
4. How do Balaguer era UASD students influence and share their experiences, attitudes, and beliefs about higher education with others in their families and community?

Apart from its pertinence aforementioned, this study also contributes to the understanding of the recent history of the Latin American Region and the Dominican Republic, specifically a chapter scarcely documented about the effect of Cold War politics over the nation, and its higher education system.

The Dominican higher education policy, as well as the recommendations of international agencies, fail to consider the need of informing social memory about the worth of public higher education; and as expected, they also fail to view attrition as a behavioral cultural perspective. Currently, the DR holds high attrition rates in its higher education institutions if compared to other countries and regions (World Bank, 2017). Present social perspectives are rooted in the collective memory of the recent past and how this recollection is spread along individuals and populations (Bandura, 2001; Mithander, 2012; Neal, 1998). This makes collective memory and its mechanisms of dissemination play a decisive role in social decision-making. In previous researches related to the Dominican community living in the US, it has been observed that the frames of reference of human groups -built out of their background- can indicate how likely they are to engage and endure in higher education (Louie, 2006; Lopez, 2011). To understand social memory and social behavior then, it is necessary to assess the effects of the recent past.

Between 1966 and 1978, the Cold War permeated strongly in the DR, where a rightwing government was installed to combat leftwing militants, which were mostly allocated in UASD. The conflict was distinctively long lasting, violent and large in scale, and its effects in social memory and perspectives about public higher education have not been previously assessed.
Within the qualitative epistemological tradition, this study was carried out using the method of transcendental phenomenology, and counted on the participation of 12 individuals as sample. To reach data saturation, Boyd (2001) and Creswell (1998) recommend a number of participants between 2 and 10. These individuals enrolled in UASD as students between 1966 and 1978.

The different stages of the conduct of the study included: Research approach, population, sample, site, data collection, instrumentation, data analysis, reflexivity, and finally, delimitations. Each participant was invited to an open question interview designed following the structure of a phenomenological narrative. This is, by first formulating questions regarding how participants remember the events they went through, and then, how they make meaning of such lived experiences (Welman & Kruger, 1999). Lastly, participants are invited through questions to also expand on the kind of messages they convey to those around about the system of higher education.

Interviews conducted were recorded and transcribed. Transcriptions were visited various times in order to identify salient codes or units of analysis. Through an inductive approach, codes with common content were grouped forming five themes. Within those main themes, salient codes could be arranged according to their more specific content into sub-themes too.

The five major themes derived from the transcripts of interviews administrated to former UASD students are listed below:

1. Lived experience of danger and delay
2. Life-transforming experience
3. Experience influences perception of public higher education
4. Influential over next generation
5. The State has responded to repair public HEd System

In Chapter IV, themes and subthemes were explained in relation to the four research questions of this study. The fifth theme comprises an emerging threat as the majority of participants estimated it necessary to include it in their narratives.

**Summary of Major Findings**

In this section, the most important findings of this research are developed. This research aimed at exploring how former UASD students during the conflict make meaning of their memory of the conflict and what type of perspectives they convey to their acquaintances about the system of higher education or education itself as a result. Within this sample, this research provides new insight on the kind of messages and perspectives about public higher education that the previous generation may be conveying to the next one. Additionally, the research shows how most participants highlighted a relation between the current state of public higher education and the conflict they experienced. Thus, this sample of participants provide new insight by pointing at the conflict as a major generator of current higher education challenges regarding both the system, and how people learn to perceive the system.

Regarding Research Question 1, stating “how do Balaguer era UASD students describe their experience of violence and persecution between 1966 and 1978?”, most respondents responded that their lived experience was one of “danger and program delay” (Theme 1).

Participant F noted, “very frequently we had those problems, having to run, looking for those way outs to escape quickly, before tear gas reaches us.” This finding affirms previous historic accounts telling of a violent conflict that integrally affected UASD, provided by Bethell (1990), Franco (2007), Kryzanek (1977) and UASD (2014). Within this large theme, five sub themes were observed to emerge. The first sub-theme, “the aggression came from the State and multiple
parties” (Sub-Theme 1.1), tells of a state of expectations of multilateral aggressions. About government incursions, Participant A stated: “You could arrive at campus and find a war tank in the corner of Jose Contreras St. with Santo Tomas de Aquino St., and having then to run back away.” As for the role of combating student groups, Participant H noted: “Between 1966 and 1970, and between 1970 and 1974, there were deaths in the university as a cause of clashes between student groups that had nothing to do with the government. Clashes between political factions.”

This sub-theme specifically affirms Bethell (1990) and Kryzanek (1977) who describe both conflicting factions as equally proactive, but do not specify in detail that the left was divided and clashed internally. In addition, both studies fail to elaborate on the effect of the conflict over nonpartisan enrolled UASD students. Franco (2007) explains the situation of menace from the State as well as from leftist rival parties inside UASD.

The second sub-theme answering Research Question 1, “memory of life-threatening danger and persecution” (Sub-Theme 1.2), tell of the intensity of the aggression described in Sub-Theme 1. Participant A testified he would “arrive at the Architecture Faculty and watch the people run away while hearing the sound of gunshots, having to hide behind the columns fearing to be impacted by a stray bullet.”

As a consequence of the conflict, bureaucracy and semester schedules altered in UASD. The third sub-theme under Theme 1 tells of “uncertain degree duration” (Sub-Theme 1.3). Participants I and H declared “I lasted nine years in UASD” and “we all spent additional three or four years to graduate” respectively. Franco (2007) describes events of violence against students and activists inside UASD campus, as well as a strategy of repression through suspending university activity.

However difficult the situation in campus was, good quality education in UASD at the time emerged as a common bond to participants, hence, the fourth sub-theme reads “good quality of education until then” (Sub-Theme 1.4). Participant E recalled that education quality was a priority: “Even in the midst of the conflict the respect and transfer of knowledge took place with certain rigor.” Franco (2007) explains how as a consequence of the conflict, gradually, many well-prepared faculty members left UASD, compromising the good education practices at the time.

This memory from participants yet connects to the final sub-theme to Theme 1, the shared image of an exodus, it reads “memory of student dropout and faculty exodus” (Sub-Theme 1.5). Participant E talked about students from the rural areas that could not hold on: “Many students had to go back to their towns and many did not come back”. Participant A recalled good faculty members leaving UASD with this account: “The university had lost many of the best teachers, the star teachers. They left UASD and joined UNPHU”. Pimentel (2002) also mentions faculty member exodus. Franco (2007) provides an account on how faculty members left or were expelled out of UASD.

Research Question 2, that reads “how do Balaguer era UASD students interpret what they experienced and believe about those interpretations?”, has its answer summarized under Theme
Most participants found their lived experience as “life-transforming” (Theme 2). Participant E defines his college years in UASD as transcendental and transforming: “It was one of my most extraordinary life experiences, it helped me transform.” Franco (2007), Neal (1998) and Langerbacher and Shain (2010) elaborate around different aspects within this notion that will be mentioned further on. Drawing from this main theme, two sub-themes define the nature of the answer. The first one depicts participants’ years in UASD as a “hard experience” (Sub-Theme 2.1). Participant B recalled that the time was indeed “traumatic, difficult, violent, those were violent years” and one of “violent harassment.” Franco (2007) tells of events traumatic to students due to their violent nature and the numerous difficulties they pose. Neal (1998) highlights sudden changes in the “qualities of social relationships” as causes for trauma, producing new sentiments of “danger, chaos and crisis of meaning.” (p. 3). However, this experience of danger and hardiness did bring growth to respondents. The second sub-theme, “maturing and transforming experience” (Sub-Theme 2.2), tells of a positive outcome as a result of their time in UASD. Participant C declared “It (the experience) gave me the opportunity of growth.” In the context of American social traumas, Langerbacher and Shain (2010) report that resulting memories of much traumatic events became “motivating forces for Americans almost overnight” (p. I).

The response to Research Question 3, or “how have any attitudes held by the Balaguer era UASD students influenced their attitudes about higher education?”, showed that participants’ image of UASD was strongly influenced by their memory of their lived experience and is embodied under Theme 3: “Experience influences perception of public higher education.” When asked “Do you think that the current state of public education is a consequence of the conflict somehow?”, participant K asserted: “Yes, there is a heritage of that conflict.”
Drawing from this theme, two sub-themes emerged, supported by OECD (2012), World Bank (2006) and Franco (2007). The first sub-theme highlights that the effect of the conflict over nowadays UASD is one of deterioration: “Perception that conflict affected negatively the current public higher education system” (Sub-Theme 3.1). Participant E, connects the conflict to a negative image of today’s UASD: “That conflict produced a deterioration of the quality.” The second sub-theme suggests that public higher education struggles to fulfil the goal of educating professionals for numerous reasons, including little governance transparency and low faculty development. This was observed to be considered as compromising trust in the institution: “Perception that public higher education system lacks quality and/or not trustable” (Sub-Theme 3.2). Participants A and C stated on a pessimistic mode that “mediocrity has it trapped and isolated”, and that it “has dropped to the bottom.” OECD (2012) and World Bank (2006) diagnose the public higher education system depicting major challenged areas regarding education quality, attrition and infrastructure. Franco (2007) reports improvements in the institution despite challenges in high student attrition and program completion delays.

Research Question 4, or “how do Balaguer era UASD students influence and share their experiences, attitudes, and beliefs about higher education with others in their families and community?”, was responded with statements of generational rupture. Institutional loyalty was not present in the predominant narrative. Theme 4, answering Research Question 4, was synthetized as “would not recommend UASD or offspring did not study in UASD” (Theme 4). As expected, no previous research on the topic of generational rupture toward UASD could be found. Participant E declared to have explained to his son why UASD is not an option, arguing among other factors that it “will not contribute satisfactory levels of personal-academic education.”
After statements of pessimism and distrust, one interesting finding in the narratives was a common acknowledgement that UASD has indeed made considerable improvements in the last decades. Emerging Theme 5 summarizes this notion as “perception that UASD has improved recently” (Theme 5). Participant K expressed in positive terms that “from the academic point of view it has improved… better development of faculty members.” OECD (2012) acknowledges that improvements have been made in the last decades. Franco (2007), in its chapter Aportes de la UASD a pesar de la precariedad de los recursos (Contributions of UASD despite the scarcity of its resources) describes recent improvements in UASD in faculty development, gender inclusion and research. Appendix S relates the five major themes to the findings in this study and to previous research.

**Interpretation of Findings**

**Introduction to Interpretation of Findings**

In this section, findings and additions to the academic literature are interpreted. First, the interpretations of observed findings are deployed initiating hierarchically by themes where new findings emerged, then sub-themes. Then, interpretations to observed additions to literature are deployed. As Appendix S shows, one theme and two sub-themes could not be directly connected to specific previous research, thus, constituting new content in the academic literature. The most significant of these findings is the response to Research Question 4 and is synthesized in Theme 4, having to do with the type of message participants transmit to their close ones as a result of their UASD experience. Most would not recommend UASD to college age-persons around them despite acknowledging that the institution has changed for the good. This new finding supports a previous suspicion about a generational perspective that downplays the fundamental role of UASD and public higher education as an engine to national development.
Another defining finding of this study is within Sub-Theme 3.1. Most participants consider that the conflict between 1966 and 1978 is causal, fully or partially, to their perceived current state of integral deterioration in UASD. When Participant E was asked whether the current state of education quality in UASD is a consequence of those years of conflict? He affirmatively replied “yes, yes, yes, it is part of the outcome of that conflict. That conflict produced a deterioration of the quality.” This research initially speculated that there exists an influence of the conflict in the people’s perspectives about the present state of public higher education. This finding in Sub-Theme 3.1 supports that hypothesis, most participants do use a predominant trans temporal frame of reference linking their time to the current time.

Finally, an important understanding of the mindset is derived from Theme 5. Although most participants convey memories of anguish, desperation, abuse and social neglect, and keep a predominantly pessimist image of public higher education, they think that their experience produced personal growth in them. They reported traits associated to maturity, empathy and wisdom. This apparent duplicity was observed to be much more a dynamic were maturity is consequential to suffering. As it will be reflected upon later in the narrative, this finding supports previous research that indicate that undergoing intense social conflict tend to trigger motivation for life (Langerbacher and Shain, 2010).

As Appendix S shows, this study also identifies four additions to the academic literature. Among the most significant additions is the fact derived from Sub-Theme 1.5. Most participants report vivid memories of students dropping out and faculty members leaving UASD. According to the narrative, those students would either enroll into another institution or quit studying at all. Faculty would leave mostly to teach at UNPHU. Their association of their UASD experience and collective dropping out as a predominant memory suggest this could have a considerable weight
in their perspective or frame of reference. Franco (2007) corroborates the accounts of faculty members leaving UASD to join UNPHU.

Another significant addition to the literature is contained in Sub-Theme 1.4. As I observed, participants recurred to the memories of program delays and uncertain program duration as frequently as they did to memories of escaping from attacks. As mentioned previously, most participants declared to convey messages associated to discouragement to the college age population around. The former two additions seemed to amount significant weight in these messages.

Appendix S also showed that this study affirmed existing literature six times. The most significant of these contributions is related to the acknowledgement of most participants that UASD has made improvements despite its challenges. This belief matches the accounts made by Franco (2007) about a significant development in UASD with regards to infrastructure and research culture.

**Research Findings #1**

As introduced in this section, the most significant finding of this study is embedded in how Research Question 4 has been answered drawing from the accounts of participants. Research question 4 wonders about the type of influence former UASD students have with their families and community, specifically, it probes about how participants share their experiences, attitudes and beliefs about higher education to those individuals. As seen in Theme 4 that answers that question, the study revealed that most participants convey a negative perspective or frame of reference of UASD. This frame of reference has been observed to be predominantly trans temporal, this is, it has a link to their experience regardless of the time passed from their years of difficulty until the present day.
Most participants have shown an attitude of disqualification towards UASD either by stating they would not recommend it to those close to them or by not having their offspring enroll in it as students. Hence, participants show no significant sense of institutional loyalty. This makes generational continuity unlikely and shows (within this sample) the kind of discouraging and incomplete messages that current generations receive about the worth of public higher education.

Most participants argued that education had still good (if not the best) quality in UASD during the conflict years. Nesset and Helgesen (2009) found that learning quality is the most influential cognitive antecedent on loyalty to institutions. But regarding UASD, the conflict and its effects on safety and administrative processes had more weight on the perspective of participants. Thus, they convey distrust and discouragement to the next generation instead of being loyal or promoting loyalty. This study approaches attrition as social behavior. This social dynamic of transmitting distrust could be systemic, permeating through society, if so, it is possible that the current generation of students are in need of strategies that inform their perspectives about public higher education (Dessi, 2008; Bandura, 1986). Once beliefs are conveyed to younger generations they influence their actions or decision-making. Schutz (1967) validates this notion defining social action as the social behavior guided by social perspectives.

Thus, in this sample of participants and their circles of influence, the realm of belief about the worth of public higher education is not working in synergy with government expenditure in tangible areas to prevent persistent high levels of attrition and improve quality. This suggests that the attrition problem could be an issue of belief in greater measure than it can be currently understood.
**Research Findings #2**

Another key finding that could inform processes of strategic planning on education is part of the answer that this study provides to research question 3 (how have any attitudes held by the Balaguer era UASD students influenced their attitudes about higher education?). As mentioned, Sub-Theme 3.1 shows most participants held a predominant trans temporal frame of reference regarding their memories of the lived conflict. Hence, they considered that, in greater or smaller measure, the current challenging state of UASD has its origin in the conflict.

Specifically, current perceived problems of education quality, administrative inefficiency, political agendas and program delays were linked to the conflict between 1966 and 1978. Thus, it is possible that memories of the conflict are being used to build generational messages of discouragement that compete with an agenda of improvement in UASD. This latter assertion might be the subject of a future study or a next step.

**Research Findings #3**

In third place, part of the answer that this study provides to Research Question 2 is also worth highlighting. Research Question 2 has to do with how participants make meaning of their experience and its response is embodied by Theme 2 (Life-transforming experience). Paradoxically, as Sub-Theme 2.2 asserts, when it comes to reflect upon a personal outcome of the lived experience, most participants coincide that it brought growth to them. Sub-Theme 2.2 reads: Maturing and transforming experience. The experience was described as dangerous and even life-threatening but also one that caused them to be more empathic toward human suffering, and integrally wiser. The fact that most participants would not recommend UASD states no contradiction with this belief since they do not refer to a growth experience resulting from a pleasant college life. Instead, they talked about the growth that comes after having survived a
very difficult and prolonged situation. This finding is supported by Langerbacher and Shain (2010) who reported a comparable outcome within survivors of much tragic events in the US: “…the events and the memories resulting from them became powerful motivating forces for Americans almost overnight” (p. 1).

**Conclusions**

Drawing from the sample of participants who collaborated in this study, there are important conclusions that need to be cross-examined, expanded, and taken into consideration by educational leaders and strategists of higher education. Among the most relevant conclusion I could point out that:

1. Negative messages of distrust toward public higher education are present in the sample. If this is a reflection of a broader social state, those messages need to be countered at a systemic basis through a plurality of channels.

2. The trans temporal perspective or frame of reference that the conflict is causal to the current state of things in UASD might suggest that the conflict could still be an unresolved chapter of recent history, specifically for former students and their families. An episode that hasn’t been properly dealt with socially, awaiting for an initiative based on public participation to be carried out. Research questions 2, 3 and 5 probe into que meaning making of participants in order to identify lines of action.

3. As seen in themes 3 and 4, participants keep from their lived experience an inclination for social justice and empathy together with the mentioned negative regard about public higher education.

As seen previously in this sample, negative belief bearing and transmission are linked to disregard and distrust of public higher education. Rooted in real facts or not, beliefs inside the
collective memory of Dominicans regarding public higher education (mostly UASD) must be informed at the same time UASD infrastructure and education quality are addressed. Investment in infrastructure or higher wages alone has proven not to have a significant impact in student attrition. It is time to explore seeing attrition as social action rooted in belief. This, considering of course, that it is a behavior that can be fueled also by the economic and academic pressures over students. Rooted or not in real facts, the belief that current state of things in UASD is connected to the conflict could suggest a form of perpetuation of the conflict in the perspectives of participants and those influenced by them. This could point at a social state of things yet unaddressed by public policy.

Among a number of alternatives and channels that the DR can make use of in the course of informing social memory and social generational messages, media in all its variants could be fundamental. Dessi (2008) investigates the optimal mechanism to influence the collective memory proving among participants the effects of the British Broadcasting Corporation and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting respectively. Although parents and other mature individuals resulted more influential than media, the later showed to be paramount. The study highlights the biases that often arise in state media, but also shows how selective collective memory poses benefits in the construction and informing of social identity. State media has historically played a decisive role in informing, building and maintaining social identity in countries like United Kingdom, Spain and Italy (BBC, 2019; TVE, 2019; RAI, 2019). When used responsibly and creatively, it has proven to render positive educational results at the social level.

A reflection attributed to Scottish philosopher Andrew Fletcher decisively highlights the importance of sublegal cultural messages that amount more weight to social behavior than cold public policy: “Let me make the songs of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws.” In a
figurative sense, it is time for public actors and educational leaders to incur into “songwriting” as policy.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

This study could open a thread of research, in any given epistemological tradition, that considers attrition as social behavior. In addition, its results within the sample of participants interviewed, should be contrasted with further statistical studies involving a larger number of respondents.

It would also be enlightening to understand from current students’ point of view, how they internalize collective social memory. Specifically, how their perspective about public higher education affects their decision to either stay or drop out of college. This could be explored through both qualitative and quantitative methods. Lastly, this study can open a line of research on effective ways how collective memory can be addressed to in order to inform peoples perspectives in the Dominican Republic.
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Appendix A

Recruitment Email in English
Re: The Effect of UASD-Government Conflict Between 1966 and 1978 Over Perspectives About Higher Education

Dear UASD former student,

I am writing to let you know about an opportunity to participate in a research study about the effect of UASD-government conflict between 1966 and 1978 over perspectives about higher education. This study is being conducted by myself (Jesus D’Alessandro) at Western Michigan University. This study will analyze, drawing from interviews with former UASD students, the long term impact of the crisis, how decisions made at the leadership level in both sides triggered events that ended up touching students’ lives in a way they want to describe. I am contacting you through other former UASD student who also attended the university during the period of 1966-1978, when UASD was at the center of social and political conflict.

If you participate in this study, I will ask you to meet me in a private conference room at the national library or another non-residential location of your choice to conduct a 45-60 minute interview about your experience as a student at UASD during the time of conflict. To participate in this study, you must have attended UASD for at least two years during the period of 1966-1978. Also participants in this study must not have been involved in leading or participating in decisions or strategies for either party in the conflict. In case you are interested in learning more about the study please contact me replying either by phone or email to learn about this study. This will not mean you are obligated to participate in this study.

If you would like additional information about this study, please call Jesus D’Alessandro at 809 712 8385 or email him at j.dalessandromartinez@wmich.edu. Thank you for your time and for considering this research opportunity.

Sincerely,

Jesus D’Alessandro
Appendix B

Recruitment Email in Spanish
Estimado exestudiante de la UASD,

Te escribo para informarte de la oportunidad de participar en un estudio sobre el efecto del conflicto UASD-gobierno entre 1966 y 1978 sobre perspectivas sociales de la educación superior. Este estudio está siendo llevado a cabo por un servidor (Jesús D’Alessandro) en calidad de estudiante doctoral en la Western Michigan University. Analizaré, basado en entrevistas de antiguos estudiantes de la UASD, el efecto de largo plazo de la crisis: Cómo las decisiones tomadas por el liderazgo de ambas partes detonaron eventos que terminaron tocando las vidas de estudiantes en la forma en que ellos deseen describirlo. Te estoy contactando por la mediación de otro exestudiante de la UASD quien también estudió allí durante el período mencionado, cuando esta institución se encontraba en el epicentro de grandes conflictos políticos y sociales.

Si participas en este estudio, te pediré que nos reunamos en un salón privado de reuniones de la Biblioteca Nacional u otro lugar no residencial de tu elección para realizar una entrevista que duraría entre 45 y 60 minutos sobre tu experiencia durante este tiempo. Para participar debes haber estudiado en la UASD por un espacio de al menos dos años durante el período de 1966-1978. Los participantes en este estudio no deben haber sido altos líderes estudiantiles o administrativos de la universidad. En caso de que te interese aprender más sobre este estudio puedes llamar a mi número telefónico o escribir a mi dirección de correo electrónico. Esto no significará que estás obligado a participar.

Si deseas información adicional acerca de este estudio, me puedes llamar al 809 712 8385 o escribir a j.dalessandromartinez@wmich.edu. Gracias por tu tiempo y por considerar esta oportunidad de participación.

Atentamente,

Jesús D’Alessandro
Appendix C

Informed Consent Form in English
Western Michigan University
Educational Leadership Department

Principal Investigator: Joseph Kretovics, PhD.
Student Investigator: Jesús D’Alessandro
Title of Study: Trauma and Social Frameworks: The Effect of UASD-Government Conflict Between 1966 and 1978 Over Perspectives About Higher Education

You have been invited to participate in a research project titled “Trauma and Social Frameworks: The Effect of UASD-Government Conflict Between 1966 and 1978 Over Perspectives About Higher Education”. This project will serve as Jesus D’Alessandro’s dissertation work as required to complete his PhD degree.

This consent document will explain the purpose of this research project and will go over all of the time commitments, the procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participating in this research project. Please read this consent form carefully and completely and please ask any questions if you need more clarification.

What are we trying to find out in this study?
We want to know how students of UASD enrolled between 1966 and 1978 recall their lived experience as they engaged the governance crisis between the State and UASD’s authorities. Consequently, we want to better understand how these individuals feel about these memories and how they think these feelings impact others around.

Who can participate in this study?
This study requires as participants people of either gender who were enrolled in UASD between 1966 and 1978.

Where will this study take place?
You will be asked to attend an interview session with the student investigator, Mr. D’Alessandro, that can be web-based (via Internet) or in a place of your choice.

What is the time commitment for participating in this study?
You will spend about 15 to 30 minutes reviewing this consent form prior to participating in the study. If you agree to participate in the study, you will participate in a 45 to 60 minute interview between February 1 and March 31, 2018 at a time that is convenient for you.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study?
If you choose to participate, I ask you questions about your experience being a student at UASD during the period of 1966-1978. You will also be asked to reflect on that experience and talk about what it meant to you, and how it influenced you. You will not be obliged at any point to answer any of the questions.

What information is being measured during the study?
From these interviews as a set, I will identify what common categories emerge that can explain how you and other participants make sense of what you experienced as well as of how you feel about it; and how you feel it affects your ideas about higher education, leadership in education and public life.

**What are the risks of participating in this study and how will these risks be minimized?**

Since I will be asking you questions about your experience during a time of conflict, you may experience some emotional discomfort while recalling those events. If you become too uncomfortable answering a specific question or are unable to complete the interview because of emotional discomfort, I will move to a different question or honor your request to stop the interview at any time. The latter will have no negative repercussions for you.

The other potential risk could be a breach of confidentiality, but I will use a code number on all study data to represent you and eliminate any personally identifying information from your interview while transcribing. I will also destroy the audio recording of your interview after transcribing.

**What are the benefits of participating in this study?**

You will not receive any direct benefits, but there may be a number of fundamental benefits for society, public policy making and governance. So far, this episode in history has not been visited through a coherent and integral narrative that exposes the hurdles of former students. Through this research, you will have your story told along with the stories of other participants. This opens the door to a process of social healing and vindication.

**Are there any costs associated with participating in this study?**

You will not experience any costs associated, directly or indirectly, with this research except the time you spend reviewing the consent form and participating in the interview.

**Is there any compensation for participating in this study?**

You will receive no material compensation in exchange for engagement.

**Who will have access to the information collected during this study?**

In all written and oral forms were this research can be reproduced of presented, participant identity will remain confidential. In order to grant confidentiality, your names will be omitted in published materials. Once confirmed for interview, you will be assigned code numbers and your real names will be listed in a safe place under the custody of Western Michigan University. This list is to be kept in a locked file in the office of the Principal Investigator or in university archives. The information will be maintained for three years after the study closes.

**What if you want to stop participating in this study?**

You can choose to stop participating in the study at any time for any reason. You will not suffer any prejudice or penalty by your decision to stop your participation. You will experience NO consequences either academically or personally if you choose to withdraw from this study. Likewise, please notice that the investigator can also decide to stop your participation in the study without your consent.
Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the primary investigator, Jesús D’Alessandro at 809 712 8385 or j.dalessandromartinez@wmich.edu. You may also contact the Chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than one year.

I have read this informed consent document. The risks and benefits have been explained to me. I agree to take part in this study.

Please Print Your Name

Participant’s signature Date
Appendix D

Informed Consent Form in Spanish
Has sido invitado a participar en un proyecto de investigación titulado “Trauma y Marcos Sociales de Referencia: El Efecto del Conflicto UASD-Gobierno entre 1966 y 1978 Sobre Perspectivas Sociales de la Educación Superior”. Esta investigación es el fundamento del proyecto de tesis doctoral de Jesús D’Alessandro, requerida para obtener el grado de doctor (PhD). Este documento de consentimiento explicará el propósito de la investigación, así como todos los compromisos de tiempo, los procedimientos a usar, y los riesgos y beneficios de participar. Por favor lee esta hoja de consentimiento completa y cuidadosamente, y haz las preguntas que desees si necesitas más aclaraciones.

¿Qué queremos encontrar en este estudio? 
Queremos saber cómo los estudiantes que asistieron a la UASD entre 1966 y 1978 recuerdan su experiencia vivida durante la crisis entre el gobierno y las autoridades universitarias. Consecuentemente deseamos entender mejor cómo estos exestudiantes se sienten acerca de estos recuerdos y cómo piensan que estos sentimientos impactan a los demás a su alrededor.

¿Quién puede participar en este estudio? 
Pueden ser personas de ambos sexos que estudiaron en la UASD entre 1966 y 1978.

¿En qué lugar tendrá lugar este estudio? 
Se te pedirá que asistas a una sesión de entrevista con el investigador estudiante (el Sr. D’Alessandro), en el lugar de tu elección. Esta reunión también podrá realizarse vía Internet.

¿Cuál es el compromiso de tiempo para participar en este estudio? 
Los interesados pasarán entre 15 y 30 minutos revisando este documento antes de su participación en este estudio. Luego de llenar el formulario de consentimiento, el interesado participará en una entrevista que dura entre 45 y 60 minutos entre febrero 1 y marzo 31 de 2018, a la hora que más le convenga.

¿Qué se te pedirá hacer si accedes a participar en este estudio? 
Si decides participar, te haré algunas preguntas acerca de tu experiencia como estudiante en la UASD durante el periodo entre 1966 y 1978. Además se te pedirá reflexionar sobre esta experiencia, lo que significó para ti y cómo te influenció. No estarás obligado en ningún momento a contestar ninguna de las preguntas.

¿Qué información se analizará durante este estudio? 
De este grupo de entrevistas, identificaré qué categorías comunes emergen que puedan explicar cómo tú y otros participantes explican lo que experimentaron, así como la manera en que se

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigador Principal:</th>
<th>Joseph Kretovics, PhD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estudiante Investigador:</td>
<td>Jesús D’Alessandro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sienten al respecto; y cómo sienten que esto afecta sus ideas sobre educación superior, liderazgo educativo y servicio público.

¿Cuáles son los riesgos de participar en este estudio y cómo estos riesgos serán reducidos?
Debido a que te estás haciendo preguntas acerca de tu experiencia durante un tiempo de conflicto, podrías experimentar sensibilidad emocional. Si te llegas a sentir incómodo mientras piensas en contestar alguna pregunta específica o no te sientes capaz de terminar la entrevista debido a un malestar emocional, me iré a una pregunta diferente o honraré tu solicitud de detener la entrevista en cualquier momento. Esto no tendrá ninguna repercusión negativa para ti.

El otro riesgo potencial es la pérdida del anonimato de los participantes. En respuesta a esto, usaré un código numérico en todos los documentos del estudio para representarte. Es igual forma eliminar cualquier información que haga identificable tu identidad, esto incluye la transcripción de tu entrevista. En adición, destruiré el archivo de audio de tu entrevista luego de realizada la transcripción.

¿Cuáles son los beneficios de participar en este estudio?
No recibirás ningún beneficio directo. Pero podrían existir beneficios para la sociedad en su conjunto, el estudio servirá para mejorar las políticas públicas y la gobernanza pública, entre otras cosas. Hasta ahora este episodio de la historia no ha sido registrado o estudiado mediante una narrativa integral que exponga los obstáculos de exestudiantes. En esta investigación podrás contar tu historia, y los demás participantes también. Esto abre la puerta a un proceso de vindicación y reconciliación social.

¿Existen costos asociados a la participación en este estudio?
No incurrirás en ningún gasto asociado, directa o indirectamente, con esta investigación; excepto el tiempo que inviertas revisando este documento de consentimiento y participando en la entrevista.

¿Hay alguna compensación por participar en este estudio?
No recibirás ninguna compensación material a cambio de tu participación.

¿Quién tendrá acceso a la información levantada en este estudio?
En todos los formatos escritos y orales en que esta investigación puede ser reproducida o presentada, la identidad de los participantes se mantendrá confidencial. Para brindarte confidencialidad, tu nombre será omitido en materiales publicados. Una vez que confirmas tu participación en la entrevista, se te asignará un código número y tu identidad real se mantendrá guardada en un lugar seguro bajo la custodia de Western Michigan University. La lista de participantes se mantendrá en un archivo digital con clave en la oficina del investigador principal o en los archivos de la universidad. La información será conservada por tres años luego de concluida la investigación.

¿Qué pasa si deseas dejar de participar en este estudio?
Puedes elegir dejar de participar en este estudio en cualquier momento por cualquier razón, no sufrirás ninguna penalidad por decidir suspender tu participación. NO experimentaras ninguna consecuencia, académica o personal, si decides salir de este estudio. De igual forma, por favor
ten en cuenta que el investigador puede también decidir detener tu participación en este estudio sin tu consentimiento.

Si tienes cualquier pregunta antes o durante este estudio, puedes contactar al investigador Jesús D’Alessandro al número telefónico 809-712-8385 o a la dirección de correo electrónico j.dalessandromartinez@wmich.edu. Si te surgen preguntas en cualquier momento, también puedes contactar al Encargado del Departamento de Revisión Institucional deExperimentación con Sujetos Humanos (Chair of Human Subjects of the Institutional Review Board) al número telefónico 269-387-8293, o al Vicepresidente para Investigación al número telefónico 269-387-8298.

Este documento de consentimiento ha sido aprobado para uso por un año por el Departamento de Revisión Institucional de Experimentación con Sujetos Humanos (Human Subjects of the Institutional Review Board) como está indicado por la fecha en la estampa y la firma del encargado del departamento en la esquina superior derecha de este documento. No participes en este estudio si la fecha en la estampa es anterior a un año.

He leído este formulario de consentimiento. Me han explicado los riesgos y beneficios. Estoy de acuerdo con ser parte de este estudio.

Por favor escribe tu nombre

________________________________________________________________________

Firma de participante  Fecha
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HSIRB Approval Letter
Date: July 25, 2019

To: Joseph Kretovics, Principal Investigator
Jesus D’Alessandro, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: IRB Project Number 19-07-22

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled “Trauma and Social Frameworks the Influence of UASD-Government Conflict Between 1966 and 1978 Over Perspectives About Higher Education” has been approved under the expedited category of review by the Western Michigan University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may only be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes to this project (e.g., add an investigator, increase number of subjects beyond the number stated in your application, etc.). Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation.

In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the IRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

A status report is required on or prior to (no more than 30 days) July 24, 2020 and each year thereafter until closing of the study.

When this study closes, submit the required Final Report found at https://wmich.edu/research/forms.

Note: All research data must be kept in a secure location on the WMU campus for at least three (3) years after the study closes.
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Interview Protocol for Interview in English
Interview Protocol for Interview in English
Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this research project. For this interview, the period of political unrest at UASD between 1966 and 1978 will be referred to as “the conflict.” This research is an attempt to better understand this particular period of our recent history by examining the perspectives of individuals, like yourself, who experienced this conflict. This research will also attempt to better understand how those perceptions of the conflict might be transmitted to the next generations of Dominican university students. Hence, the following questions are designed to fully explore the perceptions of former students who attended UASD during the conflict and how those perceptions might influence the attitudes and beliefs of later generations of university students. Follow-up questions may be asked to help clarify your perceptions of that experience. Thus, if you agree, I would like to begin by asking some general questions about how you remember that period of your life when you attended USAD within the context of the conflict.

1. Would you please describe your recollections of what it was like to be a student at UASD during the conflict between the forces of the Balaguer government and the students and faculty at UASD?

2. As you recall these events, what are your emotions and beliefs concerning the conflict and the institutions that were involved?

3. Do you recall how the conflict affected your attitudes toward and beliefs about higher education during that period of time?

4. What do you believe are the most important ways your experience during the conflict has influenced your life?

5. How do you believe your interpretations of the conflict have changed over time?

6. In what ways do you believe the conflict currently affects your attitudes toward and beliefs about higher education?

7. Over the past 10 years, when you discuss higher education with your children, family and friends, what opinions do you express?

8. How does your experience of the conflict affect the way you engage with family, friends and your community regarding social and political issues?

9. Is there anything else you would like to add about how the conflict affected your beliefs and values or how you communicate to others regarding higher education?

10. Thank you for your patience and kindness as you share your experience. As you heard from me when we started, I am exploring the long term social effect that the 1966-1978 government-UASD crisis had, if any. To achieve this goal, your story will be of great value. Would you like to add anything else to the interview?
Appendix G

Interview Protocol for Interview in Spanish
Interview Protocol for Interview in Spanish

Muchas gracias por aceptar participar en este proyecto de investigación. Para los fines de esta entrevista, el periodo de inestabilidad política en la UASD entre 1966 y 1978 se denominará “el conflicto”. Esta investigación es un esfuerzo por comprender mejor este periodo particular de nuestra historia reciente. Esto, examinando las perspectivas de individuos que, como usted, experimentaron el conflicto. Esta investigación también buscará ayudar a comprender mejor cómo esas percepciones del conflicto pueden transmitirse a las próximas generaciones.

De ahí, que las siguientes preguntas están orientadas para explorar las percepciones de ex estudiantes de la UASD durante el conflicto, y explorar además cómo esas percepciones pudieran influenciar las creencias de próximas generaciones de estudiantes en la institución. Es probable que surjan en el proceso preguntas de seguimiento que ayuden a definir mejor su percepción de esa experiencia. Así que, si me permite, me gustaría iniciar haciéndole algunas preguntas generales sobre cómo usted recuerda ese período de su vida en la UASD.

1. ¿Podría describir sus recuerdos de cómo era ser estudiante en la UASD durante el conflicto entre el gobierno de Balaguer y los estudiantes y profesores de la institución?

2. ¿Mientras recuerda este evento y las instituciones involucradas, qué emociones y valoraciones le merece?

3. ¿Recuerda cómo este conflicto afectó sus actitudes y percepciones sobre educación superior en ese período de tiempo?

4. ¿De qué maneras importantes esta experiencia influyó en su vida?

5. ¿Cómo cree que su interpretación sobre el conflicto ha cambiado con el tiempo?

6. ¿De qué formas cree que su recuerdo del conflicto afecta actualmente sus actitudes y percepciones sobre la educación superior?

7. ¿En los últimos 10 años, cuando habla de temas relacionados a educación superior con sus hijos, familia y amigos, qué opiniones expresa?

8. ¿Cómo su experiencia del conflicto afecta la forma en que entabla con su familia, sus amigos y su comunidad conversaciones sobre temas sociales y políticos?

9. ¿Hay algo más que desee agregar sobre cómo el conflicto afectó su perspectiva de la vida y valores, o cómo comunica usted a otros su percepción sobre educación superior?

10. Gracias por compartirme sobre su experiencia con paciencia y amabilidad. Como le expresé al inicio, estoy explorando los efectos de largo plazo que tuvo la crisis entre el gobierno y la UASD entre los estudiantes, si es que hubo alguno. Para lograr esta meta, su historia es de mucha importancia. ¿Desea añadir algo más a esta entrevista?
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List of Textural Descriptions for Sub-Theme 1.1
Table 6

*How Balaguer era UASD students describe their experience. Sub-Theme 1.1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ I was there the last time Balaguer kidnapped the university, back then there was no fence. He placed one soldier every ten meters around the whole perimeter of the campus so no one could enter. (Participant A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~The government of Balaguer would limit the budget of UASD knowing that inside the university there were leftwing leaders that used the university as headquarters to act against the government. (Participant B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Balaguer was responsible of the killing of many of those leftwing youngsters, students at UASD, my neighbors. (Participant B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ They intended to crush all initiatives of protest against the government. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ …out of the blue a tear gas bomb fell near our feet. We ran…. The police threw a tear gas bomb. (Participant D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The repression was so strong that, it was the time when they imprisoned Jottin Cury, president of the university… (Participant E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ …having to run, looking for those wayouts to escape quickly, before tear gas reaches us. (Participant F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Balaguer would restrict the university budget, freeze it, little cash flow. That affected a lot the development of the university. …a budget administered little by little caused an important deterioration in infrastructure, teaching, laboratories, research, all of university life. (Participant G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~The government was not allowed to incur in the campus, but that was violated permanently. …they would shut the university down for long periods. (Participant G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~The governments of Dr. Joaquin Balaguer harmed the university greatly. Definitely. Not only to the university but to all the education system of the country. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~In the time when Sagrario was killed, Balaguer closed the university for three months, precisely for that reason. To disarm the different student groups, they would produce all things: Bombs. They had it all ready for any messy event. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~The government would pressure over UASD, economic and repressive at times. It would send covered agents inside the university to collect information. …if they were caught they would be beaten and had to be rescued by the authorities. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aggression from State and/or multiple parties | ~We even knew the protocol they used to close the university doors, this door first, then the other, and so they would surround it systematically. …those who left could be imprisoned. If you looked like you were throwing stones of like a leader, you would easily end up in jail. It happened many times. (Participant K)  
~ (The government) would introduce covered agents, originally to seek information, …but also it was known that they would send covered agents to plant a spark of conflict at a given point, that would generate a mess that would justify some action against the university. (Participant K)  
~ When Caamaño came they shut the university down with (army) tanks. (Participant L)  
~ Back then inside UASD there were many different political parties. (Participant A)  
~ There were groups of the left, the radicals, middle and the more conservative. (Participant E)  
~ There were many political groups un UASD. (Participant F)  
~ A great number of (opposition) militants of the 1965 April war (still) had their headquarters in UASD. (Participant G)  
~ The student movements, from different political streams, most of them leftists, would normally oppose the government that was right wing. (Participant G)  
~ The (leftist guerrilla) groups would operate inside and outside the university, there were guerrillas, urban guerrillas, they formed rural guerrillas. …those groups had a sort of sanctuary inside the university territory. (Participant G)  
~ These (student) groups would make war against each other, to death. Being from the left. (Participant G)  
~ Being all from the left, there were lots of variants of leftist ideology. Different versions of what socialism and communism was, the Chinese on one side, the Albanians on the other side, the Russians on the other side, the Cubans, …Trotsky. There was also the 14th of July Movement, practically annihilated later. …These groups would dismember and reassemble. There was no unity. Possibly…that (disagreement) …was a job from outside, for it to be so. (Participant G) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~Many UASD students participated in the 1965 April War. …They were in different political groups, always against the Balaguer government. …conflicts would start among UASD political groups. Very critical moments were lived, really. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Between 1966 and 1970, and between 1970 and 1974, there were deaths in the university as a cause of clashes between student groups that had nothing to do with the government. Clashes between political factions. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~There left was divided in approximately 20 different ramifications. It was hard, they would shoot each other. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~The CORECATO, they were the hardliners from the Movement 14th of July. The MPD members, they were hard. It was no game, they would enter places and kidnap people. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~There were Maoists, the Leninists, the Trotskyists, it was a wide range of all colors you can imagine. FEL, FEFLAS, FRAGUA, UNER, FJS, all you can imagine. And each one had a different perspective of what revolutionary fight was. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Off course, we didn’t experience the time of the Half Million movement, which was between 1969 and 1970. It was the cruelest, there where even deaths. Even more, the PACOREDO (Communist Party of the Dominican Republic) and MPD (Dominican Poplar Movement) being strong left parties, would shoot at each other. …And they would write it down on a blackboard “PACOREDO 8-MPD 9”, meaning deaths, they would keep count of them. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~There were various (internal) groups, and they fought each other for the right to conduct that type of activities. …there were different groups, FLEPA, PACOREDO, all those groups, and they sent all time fighting for the total dominium. …With weapons, with weapons, with weapons was the mess. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Because they clashed with each other. …They prepared Molotov bombs, with gasoline and those things. They had a process. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression from State and/or multiple</td>
<td>~ Those groups that battled against the government had different ideological perspectives. … there was a group MPD that had a way to see things, another group, PACOREDO. Between them there were so many differences that there were disputes. At a moment there was aggression among them. … There were people hurt and even dead. Without the involvement of the government. (Participant K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ (Student groups) They would blame each other of being traitor, or revisionist, the other was the good one. … there were markedly violent fights internally. (Participant K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ There would be fighting between MPD and PACOREDO. There would be fighting against the police. Once I attended with a red t-shirt and black pants, and I had to be put inside a classroom because I was shot two times. (Participant L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

List of Textural Descriptions for Sub-Theme 1.2
### Table 7

**How Balaguer era UASD students describe their experience. Sub-Theme 1.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Life-threatening danger, persecution, people hurt | ~ It was like being always expecting for something bad to happen. I had to escape from the campus like a scared rabbit. (Participant A)  
~ Arrive at the Architecture Faculty and watch the people run away while hearing the sound of gunshots, having to hide behind the columns fearing to be impacted by a lost bullet. (Participant A)  
~ They would take friends of mine to jail. (Participant A)  
~ She would be put in jail, and her sister was being looked for the same purpose. (Participant A)  
~ Balaguer was responsible of the killing of many of those leftwing youngsters, students at UASD, my neighbors. (Participant B)  
~ Amaury was literally shot to death by the Balaguer regime.  
~ There were many abuses and distortion. (Participant B)  
~ We saw such a violent harassment of the government against the university. (Participant B)  
~ We were in the third floor of the School of Architecture, and we tried to keep the class of Professor Tolentino running as much as possible...but at a given point the clashes between leftwing students and the government...accompanying the police force and the Dominican Army troops, the government sent helicopters to shoot tear gas bombs inside campus. The chaos was immense. We decided to leave fearing to be trapped inside. (Participant B)  
~ There was an escape route just behind the Alma Mater of the university, in Tiradentes St. We were given that escaping choice before de government fence would block the (UASD) perimeter.  
~ My brother got trapped there too, he had to spend the night in the Faculty of Medicine. (Participant B)  
~ We had to be (constantly) expecting for State repression, because that was the way how life was lived. (Participant B)  
~ Years of extremely complex and extremely radical politics from the government against the leftists. (Participant B)  
~ Being student in UASD meant risk. (Participant C) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Life-threatening danger, persecution, people hurt | ~ I had to move very carefully and look after myself. I had to protect myself from government agents that were after all the student leaders. (Participant C)  
~ Was it menacing of human life to be a UASD student back in those years? – Off course it was. (Participant C)  
~ The university would often be bombarded and surrounded and people died. Even inside campus students died, like Sagrario Ercida Diaz, massacred by the police. (Participant C)  
~ I had moments in which I saved my life out of courage and training being student. I was surrounded by the paramilitary group called La Banda. They persecuted and killed young revolutionary militants. (Participant C)  
~ The military would surround the university with war tanks and would bombard us. They would shoot at us with machineguns. It was extremely risky to be young, to be student and to study in UASD. (Participant C)  
~ My parents suffered much while I was at risk… my mother would kneel every morning praying to God to look after me… she (mother) once went even to Dajabon looking for me. Because I had been kidnapped, I was put to jail… the house of my parents was also monitored. (Participant C)  
~ One afternoon, while waiting for the class to start…, out of the blue a tear gas bomb fell near our feet. We ran…. The police threw a tear gas bomb. (Participant D)  
~ At some point you felt in risk? – Yes… in various occasions the university was surrounded with war weaponry, like tanks, fully armed troops. Totally corned, there were shootings … (Participant E)  
~ That day we were cornered in the Calazans student residence.  
~ The repression was so strong that, it was the time when they imprisoned Jottin Cury, president of the university, he was harmed and thrown on the back of a truck as if he was just anyone. (Participant E) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~The army had the university surrounded…A commission of military personnel entered the auditorium and entered all rooms taking out all students to the auditorium. Everyone that did not belong to Calazans was taken to jail. In order to be able to leave the residence, a friend priest had to come pick me up. (Participant E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then came a movement that triggered many demonstrations and much destabilized the university. It was called The Fight for the Half a Million. Youngsters armed, with grenades, machineguns. …In those days there were killings. (Participant E)</td>
<td>~ My father…a salesman… introduced me to street vendors so they could help me get out of UASD during the attacks. (Participant F) Very frequently we had those problems, having to run, looking for those way outs to escape quickly, before tear gas reaches us. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~At some point you saw yourself in danger? -Off course, many times. (Participant F)</td>
<td>~ I experienced sexual harassment. A teacher had to intervene. Then I passed from being more independent into having my father pick up while I studied in UASD. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Once, I was in the building of Architecture, and they (government forces) entered. And we felt the screaming, the bombarding, the what now, the tearing caused by teargas bombs. (Participant F)</td>
<td>~The government came with repressions where there were lots of deaths. Not only that, but also direct attacks with the army and the police to the very university. (Participant G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~When the university held demonstrations outside campus it was confronted even with helicopters. And many troops and police agents. Highly repressed. Since the early 60s there were deaths regarding this. At the National Palace there was a demonstration from the youth movement, and a killing of students took place. (Participant G)</td>
<td>~In the university campus, before the 70s there were many shooting and people died. I remember Sagrario Diaz, an emblematic victim of all that repression from the Balaguer government who was in power from 1966 to 1978. (Participant G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-threatening danger, persecution, people hurt</td>
<td>~ Did you feel in danger at some point...? Yes, yes, of course. I had to run, I had to look for escape points along the university campus. They would surround the campus at all points and there were very little places left were to escape from. (Participant G) ~ They would surround the campus, and then they would invade the campus. Then came the imprisonment the mistreatments, the blows, and sometimes the disappearances. (Participant G) ~ These (student) groups would make war against each other, to death. Being from the left. (Participant G) ~ Always there was uncertainty about when a conflict would emerge that would make the police to come. (Participant H) ~ Once, ...some helicopters started throwing bombs inside UASD, it caught us inside. We thinking as youngsters, wanted to see the helicopters. And one helicopter (accidentally) hit a high voltage wire above the Building of Odontology. How did we get out of there? I don’t know. I said “if the helicopter falls we are all going to be killed inside here. (Participant H) ~ The problem was how to leave UASD, without being harmed by the bombs. (Participant H) ~ Once, we were at the Engineering front plain, and didn’t realize that the guys (students) were already in the limits of the university. We were in the 207 classroom of Engineering, and the bombs were falling already in the garden of Engineering. That time we had to look for the ways to leave rapidly from UASD. Teargas bombs. (Participant H) ~ One afternoon, as we were at the front plain (of Engineering), we didn’t realize that by the Juan Sanchez Ramirez St, there was a confrontation with the police. And when we heard the gunshots we had to run away. (Participant H) ~ At times they (student groups) would clash against each other inside the university. ... Once we had to look for a way of locking ourselves in the third floor. One student group wanted to reach the third floor to the headquarters of the rival student group, with sticks and stones. We had to lock ourselves in the third floor to protect ourselves. (Participant H)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Life-threatening danger, persecution, people hurt | ~Students would be wounded from gun shots. (Participant H)   
~Professor XXXXX, he was about to be killed inside. Due to political conflicts inside university (rival) groups. (Participant H)   
~It (the conflict) was unbearable (to the neighbors), the university shares three of its limits with houses. Then immediately the university was closed (a given day) at 10am no one would be allowed in or out from the neighborhoods around UASD. The only way out we could use sometimes was behind Alma Mater St. but the other three sides (residential area) were blocked and one would suffer much from seeing kids being taken out while asphyxiating due to the tear gas bombs. There was no week were stones weren’t thrown one day. At times the police got to shoot houses while aiming at UASD. (Participant H)   
~Once, I was with my girlfriend sited in the Faculty of Economics, eating some sandwiches and juice, and out of the blue there was an unrest. A helicopter was on them, so they pulled a mirror, to reflect sun light to the vessel so it would fall down. So I said to my girlfriend “lest leave this place, there are going to be problems soon. And we had to leave quickly in the midst of all, if that helicopter fall there, imagine what would have happened. After that the Air Force would come, shooting from a height not superior to four feet. Shooting, the red berets. (Participant I)   
~The CORECATO, they were the hardliners from the Movement 14th of June. The MPD members, they were hard. It was no game, they would enter places and kidnap people. (Participant I)   
~Sagrario Díaz. She was killed, the voice shouting the order was heard clearly: Shoot! There were police officers extending back to Alma Mater St. She was the sister of a colleague of ours. (Participant I)   
~My brother saw when some guy was killed next to him. He jumped over a tear gas bomb …the guy fell because he was asthmatic and then they (the police) came and hurt them, and then he died. (Participant I) |
Table 7—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Life-threatening danger, persecution, people hurt | ~We had a teacher who had studied in the Soviet Union. He had a PhD in structure, great teacher. He and other two pertained to the Dominican Communist Party (PCD). And some group was looking to kill them in the university. It was that delicate. If a teacher got into trouble, he had to hide. All that happened there. You were teaching, and at a given point, at 10 am some guys would come with a flag for a “warm up” march to invite others. At ten am they had warm up, and at three they would march for true. Some teachers would refuse, among them the guys I mentioned, the PhD. He would say “no one will break my class in two. No one enters here with flags or other things”. And therefore they were after him. It was hard. (Participant I)  
~ Once I didn’t have time and when I was about to leave, being in front of the Art School, and there I was reached by all the bombs, and all that. I had to take refuge in the Architecture and Engineering Faculty. (Participant J)  
~They decided to launch teargas bombs from a helicopter, the State. …to all the buildings. (Participant J)  
~We felt in danger, …all the teargas bombs falling into the buildings, where it is not supposed to happen. (Participant J)  
~ -Did you experience some kind of wound? –No, but Asphyxia, due to teargas bombs. (Participant J)  
~ -Were people close to you wounded? –Yes, wounded colleagues. (Participant J)  
~Students were in danger too in those conflicts? -Of course, that was the situation. Because they clashed with each other. …They prepared Molotov bombs, with gasoline and those things. They had a process. (Participant J)  
~In the time when Sagrario was killed, Balaguer closed the university for three months, precisely for that reason. To disarm the different student groups, they would produce all things: Bombs. They had it all ready for any messy event. (Participant J)  
~Did you feel in danger, feared for your life in campus? -Yes, when there were protests, there was also the presence of police surrounding the area. (Participant K) |
Life-threatening danger, persecution, people hurt

~They would shoot supposedly to the air, but people would end up hurt. So when there were shooting people were instructed not to know where the shootings came from but to drop to the floor. (Participant K)
~Each week at the national level, there would be reports of university students persecuted, incarcerated and even dead. For a period, we would come after weekends to the stairs of the Engineering Faculty to read an information panel placed there with the photos of people killed during the weekend. There was already a culture of inviting each other to go see who was killed during the weekend. (Participant K)
~One would accept the danger as part of daily life. (Participant K)
~ I had some friends that were taken to prison, some were tortured, beaten by police officers. (Participant K)
~I remember a classmate that was found dead in a restroom in campus. He was shot. Details were never known. (Participant K)
~ -Did that put you in some kind of danger? -Off course. …They would meet in a public area, outdoor, and would start beating each other with flags. They would also pull weapons. They would hurt each other physically. (Participant K)
~ Studding there was at times as if you were in the war, expecting that something could happen to you. (Participant K)
~ Every so often you had to leave running. (Participant L)
~ Once I was leaving the university and I was aimed at with a rifle, they told me “put out the fire on that (burning) tire”. In my memory, that rifle had the size of a tank canyon. I only stared at the tip of that rifle canyon and replied “what will I put it out with”. They replied back saying “with your tongue”. (Participant L)
~ We used to climb walls. We used to be shot at. (Participant L)
~ I was shot two times. (Participant L)
~ Students outside the university would be taken to jail and killed anytime. (Participant L)
~ Ten minutes after we left the university Sagrario Dias was killed …One could get killed anytime as they killed her. (Participant L)
Appendix J

List of Textural Descriptions for Sub-Theme 1.3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ One day, while desperate, ...and helpless, ...willing to finally</td>
<td>~ One day, while desperate, ...and helpless, ...willing to finally graduate, ...a group of us stood in Bolivar Avenue, looking down to the campus, lifted our arms shouting: “by God, we want to graduate, stop the politics now!”... the leftist groups were keeping the political situation alive. (Participant B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Classes were often suspended, the university would often close for</td>
<td>~ Classes were often suspended, the university would often close for one week, two weeks, three weeks, because the clashing was permanent, that was traumatic. (Participant B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The program delayed too much. (Participant B)</td>
<td>~ The program delayed too much. (Participant B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ University shutdowns of two to three weeks with no class. (Participant D)</td>
<td>~ University shutdowns of two to three weeks with no class. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~I got to experience one year long semesters, and I think even more</td>
<td>~I got to experience one year long semesters, and I think even more than one year. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~I enrolled in (19)75, but could not finish the program before (19)83,</td>
<td>~I enrolled in (19)75, but could not finish the program before (19)83, and did not graduate before (19)86. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~I got used to the idea that accomplishments would take place only</td>
<td>~I got used to the idea that accomplishments would take place only when possible... so much so that I finished the program and did not think about (doing) the thesis project. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~One day you enrolled there and you could not know when you would</td>
<td>~One day you enrolled there and you could not know when you would graduate, you would manage accordingly (with uncertainty). You would not mind to take two subjects, or three, or five, whatever possible I will do it. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~My brother had the same experience... he finished (program) and did</td>
<td>~My brother had the same experience... he finished (program) and did not do his thesis project. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~My friends who started (like me) college in 75, (in other</td>
<td>~My friends who started (like me) college in 75, (in other institutions) completed their programs in four years ...while I was at the middle point of my program I think. That is when I realized: This UASD thing, don’t even think about it. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~You couldn’t know when you would take classes. You couldn’t</td>
<td>~You couldn’t know when you would take classes. You couldn’t program yourself. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ It affected me because that movement caused a delay in our</td>
<td>~ It affected me because that movement caused a delay in our completion time, lasting additional five years. The conflict delayed the completion time for students, affected them. (Participant E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Many students had to go back to their towns and many did not come</td>
<td>~ Many students had to go back to their towns and many did not come back. (Participant E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I knew many people from Santiago that could not return to the university because they were frustrated. It was a negative manifestation of the conflict. …Fear…many parents would come from the country side to pick up their sons. (Participant E)</td>
<td>~ We enrolled…(but) we had to wait a whole semester to be able to start. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Classes would be shut down in the midst... due to the political conflict. (Participant F)</td>
<td>~ My friends and I were like twelve, and only five or six graduated in UASD. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Each time there was an incursion form the government they would close it for months and even a year. (Participant G)</td>
<td>~ Conflicts happened daily. We would be in class at 10 am, and suddenly representatives of different groups, flags in hands, inviting us to leave the classroom and go to the streets. (Participant H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Generally, if there was a conflict today, we would be left without class two to three days. (Participant H)</td>
<td>~ (The clashes within internal student groups) did much harm to university students. Because, one semester could last up to nine months. At times the university could last 10 days closed, one week closed, 15 days closed. (Participant H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Once, in a clash with the government, the university was closed for three months, the government and the army introduced war tanks inside the university. We lasted three months in a row with no class. (Participant H)</td>
<td>~ We entered by the midst of (19)75 and started graduating in (19)82. A five-year program. (Participant H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ We entered by the midst of (19)75 and started graduating in (19)82. A five-year program. (Participant H)</td>
<td>~ That epoch marked us politically, socially, in the development, we all spent additional three or four years to graduate. (Participant H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Day by day the uncertainty on whether we will have classes or not. That marked us much. (Participant H)</td>
<td>~ The lack of organization of the university registry was despairing. You passed a subject and then when you are about to finish the program they would tell you “you grade cannot be found”. (Participant H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ My younger brother started studying medicine and had to dropout, and went to a private university. (Participant H)</td>
<td>~ (The clashes within internal student groups) did much harm to university students. Because, one semester could last up to nine months. At times the university could last 10 days closed, one week closed, 15 days closed. (Participant H)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ Any semester could last up to a year, and more. You got used to that. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Once, the police occupied the campus for eight months. Lots of documents got lost. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~I lasted nine years in UASD. -And the degree had a five year-duration. -Plus, a year of core curriculum, six. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~We lasted a year-and-a-half attending to ninth semester only. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Living and studying in UASD was not knowing if class was going to be delivered day by day. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, there was class in the morning, until 11:30am, after that what you would find is demonstrations. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~My second semester lasted almost one year. …I finished my four-year degree in (19)76, in six years. …Two of my grades were lost, disappeared, and I had to take those subjects again. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~The conflict caused that many people could not educate. Only a few of us remained there to finish the program. Many students dropped out. They were losing their time. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ We the students that were there, felt very hurt, we didn’t feel welcome, we felt we were nobody. We perceived that the State didn’t want us to educate. For them it was more important that we didn’t study. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I should have graduated in five years…I entered in 1970, and graduated in (19)81. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Once, one semester lasted a year and a half. When the university was occupied due to the death of… A year and half later, due to the mediation of political parties, it was returned again to the authorities. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ When Caamaño disembarked in 73, there was another period, a single semester lasted for a year. And that happened various times. Loosing so much time, a degree completion could last between eight and ten years. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ But a lot of time was wasted. …It took me eight years to graduate instead of the expected five. …there were demonstrations very frequently. (Participant L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ …we could spend a week without class, or two months. (Participant L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ When Caamaño came they shut the university down with (army) tanks. (Participant L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

List of Textural Descriptions for Sub-Theme 1.4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Good quality of education until then        | ~ Intellectuals would gather around and I liked it. (Participant A)  
~ The university had lost many of the best teachers, the star teachers. They left UASD and joined UNPHU (Universidad Nacional Pedro Henriquez Ureña). (Participant A)  
~ Participant A: “UASD was the university of the people, there existed ideals.” (Participant A)  
~ Great quality of education. (Participant B)  
~ I had the opportunity of joining intellectuals and veterans. (Participant C)  
~ It was the best time of my life with regards to learning. (Participant C)  
~ (Before) having a UASD diploma hung at the wall was a statement of superiority. (Participant D)  
~ We all had some kind of indoctrination (with regards to UASD education quality) … UASD, UASD, UASD. (Participant D)  
~ We felt that UASD was an open place, were you could release your curiosity. (Participant E)  
~ Much philosophy, political climate, reasoning about everything. (Participant E)  
~ UASD was the melting pot of all point of views. (Participant E)  
~ Attractive environment of thought… reading exchange, music. The lecturing dynamic was dialectic, shared, interactive. (Participant E)  
~ Even in the midst of the conflict the respect and transfer of knowledge took place with certain rigor. (Participant E)  
~ When we studied, our program was highly ranked. (Participant I)  
~ We felt we were well taught. (Participant I)  
~ Public college education was not bad. (Participant I)  
~ There was a time where the university was well ranked. (Participant I)  
~ (UASD had) the best teachers. (Participant K)  
~ There were very good teachers, we studied much. The level was quite high. (Participant L)  

Appendix L

List of Textural Descriptions for Sub-Theme 1.5
How Balaguer era UASD students describe their experience. Sub-Theme 1.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory of student drop out and/or faculty exodus.</td>
<td>~The university had lost many of the best teachers, the star teachers. They left UASD and joined UNPHU (Universidad Nacional Pedro Henriquez Ureña). (Participant A) ~What we experienced definitively altered or modified higher education, so much so, that…Universidad Nacional Pedro Henriquez Ureña (UNPHU) started welcoming faculty members that left UASD tired. I am sure that the same happened to PUCMM (Pontificia Universidad Catolica Madre y Maestra) (Participant B) ~Many students had to go back to their towns and many did not come back. (Participant E) ~I knew many people from Santiago that could not return to the university because they were frustrated. It was a negative manifestation of the conflict. …Fear…many parents would come from the country side to pick up their sons. (Participant E) ~A group of faculty members who didn’t agree with the left went into forming UNPHU (Universidad Nacional Pedro Henriquez Ureña). (Participant E) ~I had to leave UASD to enter into an emerging university. (Participant F) ~It (the conflict) affected me negatively because I had to leave UASD to enter into an emerging university. Which was formed as a consequence of the UASD conflicts. A lot of us left, in 77 and 78 there was an outburst of people who left UASD and INCE university was created. It was full of former UASD faculty members. Another group left UASD to enter UNPHU (Universidad Nacional Pedro Henriquez Ureña). (Participant F) ~I didn’t get to finish my program in UASD. I went abroad to finish at the midpoint. I had to star over my degree. (Participant G) ~My younger brother started studying medicine and had to dropout, and went to a private university. (Participant H) ~In the university, in 1966, they started the Renovation Movement, all those faculty members that had to run away from UASD (as a result), because they were going to be hurt, started UNPHU (Universidad Pedro Henriquez Ureña). (Participant I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Memory of student drop out and/or faculty exodus. | ~ And there was a big exodus to other universities. (Participant I)  
~ (Felt) Disappointment and all, from wanting to drop out and all. (Participant J)  
~ The conflict caused that many people could not educate. Only a few of us remained there to finish the program. Many students dropped out. They were losing their time. (Participant J)  
~ At the end of that decade other universities emerged, UNPHU was founded, other academies (too). When students realized they could not advance in UASD, many would transfer to those other places. (Participant K)  
~ The rightwing had created UNPHU in that moment, that had the teachers that didn’t agree with the revolution, they had created a university that counted on the support of the government. (Participant L)  
~ The leftwing takes power in the university and the teachers that substituted those who left had a Marxist Leninist conception. (Participant L) |
Appendix M

List of Textural Descriptions for Sub-Theme 2.1
Table 11
How students interpret what they experienced and believe about those interpretations? Sub-
Theme 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard experience</td>
<td>~ (felt like) Scared rabbit (Participant A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ Fearing to be impacted. (Participant A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ There were many abuses and distortion. (Participant B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ Traumatic, difficult, violent, those were violent years. (Participant B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ We saw such a violent harassment. (Participant B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ Those were very violent clashes. (Participant B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ Extremely complex and extremely radical politics. (Participant B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ It was a trauma for the society, it was a trauma for the university, … it was a difficult experience to me. (Participant B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ Being student in UASD meant risk. (Participant C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ It was extremely risky to be young, to be student and to study in UASD. (Participant C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ (sense of) Unrest in the university was something very common. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ It was confusing. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ That time of Balaguer brought as consequence that the students trained those years are professionals with many missing lessons, and even trauma. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ UASD made me lose control, it caused me depression. The crazy schedules, the kilometric lines, the filthiness, the lack of hygiene in classrooms, lack of hygiene in restrooms. It affected me. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ (The memory of conflict) It causes me a lot of sadness…. It created me an unbalance. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ I had always been an excellent student, but in UASD I reached a point where I was not even willing to study. Due to the conflict inside campus and inside yourself. To stop willing to attend, lose motivation. You lose concentration due to the shouting while attending classes. The police would occupy and you can’t go either. It limited you, really. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard experience</td>
<td>~ Being a good student, always obtaining low grades in UASD frustrated me. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ It was a very delicate time. (Participant G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ There are things that shouldn't have happened, unjust events that should have never had taken place. All this could have been another story. (Participant G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ Very critical moments were lived, really. (Participant H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ It (the conflict) was unbearable (to the neighbors), the university shares three of its limits with houses. (Participant H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ The truth is it (conflict) was hard for us. (Participant H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ How could you take classes in such environment? all nervous? (Participant I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ It was hard. (Participant I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ We felt in danger. (Participant J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ Those were truly difficult times. (Participant J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ Do you feel in danger, feared for your life in campus? -Yes, when there were protests. (Participant K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ One would accept the danger as part of daily life. (Participant K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ It was very hard (for my family). They tried to keep me studying in daytime. I think that they were constantly mortified. (Participant L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ One could get killed anytime as they killed her. (Participant L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N

List of Textural Descriptions for Sub-Theme 2.2
Table 12

How students interpret what they experienced and believe about those interpretations? Sub-Theme 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ These conflicts bring the best of you. (Participant A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I lost fear to visit slums, my classmates lived there. (Participant A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ It was a growing experience. (Participant B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Having to share day by day with leftwing people and with ideas very different to ours brought growth to me. (Participant B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I gained experiences. (Participant B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Learn that if you mistake there are consequences. (Participant B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The lived experience left it footprint, and such footprint was positive. (Participant B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The university life was a school of many learning points. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I learned responsibility… and the worth of freedom… expresses myself, to have initiative, to propose. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ It (the experience) gave me the opportunity of growth. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ There are two stages in my life that I highly regard. The first is my participation in the War of April…That marked me…and the experience in UASD. What I am today is the fruit of those two stages. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ It (seen the problem from the inside) leads you to certain radicalization. When you see it in retrospective, from the outside, being able to incorporate in an analysis all the elements…internal and external factors… you mature in your point of view. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ (With maturity) One acquires a more holistic vision, of more rationality, where emotion gives room to reason. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ You learn to make synergy. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I acquired a set of values that turn into part of my personality: Responsibility, solidarity, honesty, concept of fatherland, worth of true democracy. The exercise of a popular sovereignty. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I feel I am a result of that time. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ It was one of my most extraordinary life experiences, it helped me transform. (Participant E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ It made me change my perception of life itself. (Participant E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ One sees the truth in the bottom, when one starts maturing… (Participant E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ The conflict helped me to learn how to self-educate. (Participant F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ We are always talking about human rights. Those of us who studied in UASD, although we didn’t graduate, became more socially empathic. (Participant F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ That generation is marked by a pursuit of quality. We were a very battling and competitive group. …people with principles. Those difficult times help to that conception of the human being that had to change, society had to change. (Participant G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I learned that we have to look for justice somehow. (Participant G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The conflict helped me, really, to have another vision of politics. Definitively. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Everybody who studied in UASD says they have a real life post graduate study. …it helped me see life in another way. It helped me learn when something was truth or not. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ It made you wiser? -Yes. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Being there taught me to see life in another way. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The crisis helped me analyze things from another point of view. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Former UASD students that are now very well off, when addressing some issues, you realize that got some trait from their experience. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The values that I found in UASD, is that no matter the problems you are living, you have the capacity to overcome that situation. I learned that, to me that value is very important. Bravery, face life, and the most important… to fight for what you want. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ That experience allowed me to develop, be a person with many values, honesty, responsibility. …it gave me an extraordinary vision. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ In that time, we were repressed and obliged in all things. …I don’t like to be imposed anything on me (now). If someone is going to impose something on me I rebel. Those people with whom I have shared, we deal with the same feeling. No imposition, nothing forced. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maturing and transforming experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ I got to develop in ethical and moral values that I didn’t know practically. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ We could appreciate better those currents of freedom, solidarity with the world. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ We realized that our cause was not only national, but a broader cause. The oppression of the poor of the world those persecuted, those marginalized. We learned how to think broader. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ We learned to overcome obstacles. We grew as persons. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ We learned to live in that way, where the social component is important. The way of thinking, the way of seeing life is marked by the experience as youth that one had in that time. (Participant L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix O

List of Textural Descriptions for Sub-Theme 3.1
Table 13

*How have any attitudes held by the Balaguer era UASD students influenced their attitudes about higher education? Sub-Theme 3.1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ In some way or another (the conflict) had to have an impact in the development of university teaching. In fact, the trauma of the Fight for the Half a Million, combined to the trauma of the Abril Revolution, combined to the trauma of the assassination of dictator Trujillo, that were very dramatic and closed political events, combined with the 1965 military intervention of the United States. (Participant B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ What we experienced definitively altered or modified higher education, so much so, that...Universidad Nacional Pedro Henriquez Ureña (UNPHU) started welcoming faculty members that left UASD tired. I am sure that the same happened to PUCMM (Pontificia Universidad Catolica Madre y Maestra). (Participant B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Definitely yes, off course, it (the conflict) affected, and modified the world of teaching, definitely. (Participant B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The current crisis of education quality and organizational quality in UASD is a consequence of those years? -I think so …The counter insurgency plan …aimed at destroying our education system. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Over the destruction of that educational system, an anarchy overcame. The quality (in education) was destroyed. The State tries to recover the system but you see that the quality of education has dropped to the bottom. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ What we have today is a consequence of what happened back in that time. (Participant C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Do you think the current state of (poor) quality in higher education is a consequence, maybe indirect, of that conflict of the twelve years? -Yes, totally agree. To study in UASD nowadays is no reason for pride right now. (Participant D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The current state of education quality in UASD is a consequence of those years of conflict? -Yes, yes, yes, it is part of the outcome of that conflict. That conflict produced a deterioration of the quality. (Participant E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The conflict affected negatively current public HE System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ The university, with that conflict destroyed, to a certain extent, what it meant before to graduate from UASD. (Participant E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The problem of UASD during those 12 years, I think it has never seized having problems, because it became too politic, and it remained too politic, politics inside the university is I think one of the worst problems it has. (Participant F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I think that in fact it (the conflict) has had an impact (in the current state of affairs), because in those 12 years is where UASD started being that politic. (Participant F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ -Do you consider that there is a crisis in the quality of public higher education? –Yes, there is a crisis. …there is corruption, there are groups, there is people that don’t let others work because they have power. -Is there some kind of relation between that current crisis that you describe and the conflict of the 12 years? -Let’s say that on one side yes. (Participant G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The conflict facilitated the business of private higher education. There is very strong commercialization. In fact, that creates a professional elite. (Participant G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Do you think that the period of conflict affected the reputation of the institution afterwards? Affected the trust in the public higher education system? -Definitely. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The governments of Dr. Joaquin Balaguer harmed the university greatly. Definitely. Not only to the university but to all the education system of the country. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Do you think the way that people regard higher education nowadays is the result of that conflict? –Yes, here there is people that still say “my son will not study there”. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ There is people who still keep that attitude. I speak to people who say “how will I put my child in UASD?” -So there is a work in the culture? –Product of that (12 year) crisis. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The State has not been consequent with the deterioration of the higher education system? It hasn’t been, it hasn’t supported it. …the operations there (UASD) were very deficient, with regards to other universities. -Is that a consequence of that period of conflict? Off course, yes. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The conflict affected negatively current public HE System | ~ Do you think that the current state of public education is a consequence of the conflict somehow? Yes, there is a heritage of that conflict. (Participant k)  
~ The university experimented the lowering of the quality level in two ways: By entering faculty members that didn’t have the capacity, and when teachers without quality entered the national education system. (Participant L)  
~ Balaguer allowed, in a calculated manner, that the quality of national education lowered. (Participant L)  
~ Those policies of Balaguer during the 12 years, that took place in that context of the conflict… affected the system until nowadays? –Yes, they affect the system. (Participant L)  
~ Quality has been lowering throughout time until now that we have reached the bottom. (Participant L) |
Appendix P

List of Textural Descriptions for Sub-Theme 3.2
Table 14  
*How have any attitudes held by the Balaguer era UASD students influenced their attitudes about higher education? Sub-Theme 3.2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The university gradually turned worthless...mediocrity has it trapped and isolated. (Participant A)</td>
<td>~ The quality (in education) was destroyed. The State tries to recover the system but you see that the quality of education has dropped to the bottom. (Participant C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The public education has deteriorated so much, while private education has more prestige than public education.... (Participant C)</td>
<td>~ To study in UASD nowadays is no reason for pride right now. (Participant D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The pride of studying in UASD got lost. (Participant D)</td>
<td>~ That conflict produced a deterioration of the quality. (Participant E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The quality (in education) was destroyed. The State tries to recover the system but you see that the quality of education has dropped to the bottom. (Participant C)</td>
<td>~ The institution has to be more responsible rising the academic level...It has to understand the trend of higher education in the world. The university needs to make a turn on its image and its quality to be able to compete. (Participant E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The public education has deteriorated so much, while private education has more prestige than public education.... (Participant C)</td>
<td>~ Enrolling in UASD will not contribute satisfactory levels of personal-academic education, social network, and respect for himself as professional. (Participant E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ To study in UASD nowadays is no reason for pride right now. (Participant D)</td>
<td>~ The university, with that conflict destroyed, to a certain extent, what it meant before to graduate from UASD. (Participant E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The pride of studying in UASD got lost. (Participant D)</td>
<td>~ One positive side of UASD is that, as it has such a great mess, students, if looking to move forward in their careers, must organize. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ That conflict produced a deterioration of the quality. (Participant E)</td>
<td>~ UASD has to revise all of its processes and focus on education. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The university, with that conflict destroyed, to a certain extent, what it meant before to graduate from UASD. (Participant E)</td>
<td>~ UASD remains with a mess in terms of class schedule, kilometric waiting lines. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ One positive side of UASD is that, as it has such a great mess, students, if looking to move forward in their careers, must organize. (Participant F)</td>
<td>~ -You don’t trust the public higher education system? –No, too massive, our cohort had 80 to a 100 students. It was crazy. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ UASD has to revise all of its processes and focus on education. (Participant F)</td>
<td>~ -Do you think that the current generation, with a borrowed memory of the conflict... shows distrust... towards public higher education? –...I think so. UASD has to revise all of its processes and focus on education. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Higher Ed. system lacks quality and/or not trustable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ Do you consider that there is a crisis in the quality of public higher education? — Yes, there is a crisis. …there is corruption, there are groups, there is people that don’t let others work because they have power. (Participant G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Each person determines how well prepared will be. But definitively there is a difference. …there is still much to do in the country at the academic level. (Participant G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ That generation of yours …distrusts the higher education system? - Distrust in the public higher education system, yes, definitely. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Do you think the way that people regard higher education nowadays is the result of that conflict? — Yes, here there is people that still say “my son will not study there”. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Public college education was not bad. …that is lost, but there was a time where the university was well ranked. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ There is people who still keep that attitude. I speak to people who say “how will I put my child in UASD?” – So there is a work in the culture? – Product of that (12 year) crisis. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The school were I studied (in UASD)… I would not recommend it to any of my family members. Unfortunately. Its faculty members don’t have the quality of those we had. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ What other measure should be taken as complement to improve the quality of higher education in those places where it is necessary? - The academic level of teachers. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ …Were the education is decimated, and on top of that, look now, they said more student demonstrations are coming. Forget about it. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ First, the quality of teaching is not the same (as before). Second, there is a social fear, to call it somehow, with that. It is my university, but reality is reality. There are teachers that go, mark their attendance and then leave (without teaching). You don’t want that for your children. … when I say that is because of the quality of teaching, the lack of resources. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ And even if the climate is quieter now, people still maintain that, what was experienced there was hard. It was only two generations ago; the people keep it present. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Higher Ed. system lacks quality and/or not trustable</td>
<td>~ Is necessary to inform the people better about the potential of public higher education as a tool for human and social development? The population understands that? –No, not yet. I feel not. A work has to be done to inform, so that the people know better. (Participant J)  &lt;br&gt;~ Political groups that use the university to employ family members, …use the university for their political activities. Nepotism. Difficulties for new teachers. …you have to be well connected. (Participant K)  &lt;br&gt;~ -Is the difficulty for completing a degree in UASD a heritage of that conflict? -I understand that there is a strong component of that time. (Participant K)  &lt;br&gt;~ Quality has been lowering throughout time until now that we have reached the bottom. (Participant L)  &lt;br&gt;~ It is a process of deterioration in which UASD is affected. (Participant L)  &lt;br&gt;~ We have reached the bottom. (Participant L)  &lt;br&gt;~ Nowadays let’s say it is not trustworthy (the public higher education system). (Participant L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Q

List of Textural Descriptions for Theme 4
Table 15

*How do Balaguer era UASD students influence and share their experiences, attitudes, and beliefs about higher education with others in their families and community? Theme 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ May daughter studied Industrial Engineering in XXXXX (name of private university) (Participant A)</td>
<td>~ I have a son who’s studying Industrial Engineering now in XXXXX (name of private university) (Participant A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ This generation can’t even remotely imagine what we passed through, and what it costed to us to complete our degree at the university, the one-to-hundred scale is not sufficient to grade it. Falls short (Participant B)</td>
<td>~ I insist with my (private university) students to learn to appraise their opportunity. I do not see how they can even a reference of what we had to pass through. (Participant B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I share to my family: Private education is superior to public education. …They lack training. (Participant D)</td>
<td>~ I have three daughters, they didn’t go to UASD, instead they enrolled in XXXXX and XXXXX (private universities). They didn’t go to UASD because still is perceived that there are delays and low academic level. (Participant E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ My son (name) who is now finishing high school in (high school name), no one can convince him to go to another university but XXXXX (private university name), I transmit to him this myself. (Participant E)</td>
<td>~ I explain to him the reasons why enrolling in UASD will not contribute satisfactory levels of personal-academic education, social network, and respect for himself as professional. The university, with that conflict, destroyed to a certain extent what it meant before to graduate from UASD. (Participant E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ If a close one asks me if it’s a good idea for their kids to enroll in UASD, I always say don’t do it. (Participant F)</td>
<td>~ UASD remains with a mess in terms of class schedule, kilometric waiting lines. –You wouldn’t recommend UASD to a son or daughter? -No, not at all. I have had close relatives that have started studies in UASD and have had to quit. (Participant F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ The school were I studied (in UASD)... I would not recommend it to any of my family members. Unfortunately. Its faculty members don’t have the quality of those we had. Unfortunately. So much so, that none of the off spring of all of our colleagues have studied in UASD, they have studied in private universities. Because the deterioration has been much, academically. (Participant H)</td>
<td>~ You mentioned people that would not recommend UASD to their children. Are you one of those people? –No. I would not have any problem. …Individually can afford private universities and that know what it (importance of education) means, prefers that (private university). And won’t go there, where the education is decimated, and on top of that, look now, they said more student demonstrations are coming. Forget about it. (Participant I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ First, the quality of teaching is not the same (as before). Second, there is a social fear, to call it somehow, with that. It is my university, but reality is reality. There are teachers that go, mark their attendance and then leave (without teaching). You don’t want that for your children. …when I say that is because of the quality of teaching, the lack of resources. And even if the climate is quieter now, people still maintain that, what was experienced there was hard. It was only two generations ago, the people keep it present. (Participant I)</td>
<td>~ I have a daughter who graduated in UASD. Exactly I four years. …If you can afford a college I would recommend you not to enroll into the university (UASD). Because there are still not good remains. And as for the practical elements, I understand that private universities are in better condition. (Participant K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I would recommend them to enroll into another university. Now, a person with no resources, there is where he/she has to go. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational rupture: Would not recommend UASD/Offspring did not study in UASD</td>
<td>~ Would you recommend UASD to your family, your offspring so they study there? Yes, but it depends with whom they study, not all teachers are the same, not all faculties are the same. I teach mathematics there. The school of mathematics has kept the highest level nationwide. But I tell that there are other faculties that have levels…the shamelessness is incredible. UASD doesn’t have an institutional quality control. (Participant L) ~ I have three sons, all three graduated in XXXXXX (private university name) … because in the time they reached college age, the outbursts were still very frequent, neither them nor I wanted them to lose their time. ….It was a sacrifice to me. But it was safer and faster. Not because UASD was worse or better (in quality). (Participant L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix R

List of Textural Descriptions for Theme 5
Table 16

*How students interpret what they experienced and believe about those interpretations? Theme 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception that UASD has improved recently</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~ The university has changed much and for better. (Participant D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Nowadays, the university is trying ...to elevate the academic level a little bit more. (Participant E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ I understand that the Ministry of Higher Education has aided much and has tried to make UASD overcome those hurdles. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ The recent governments have helped and invested much to UASD’s infrastructure. (Participant H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ (President XXXX) invested much there. (Participant I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ To me in this moment the university is living an extraordinary experience. Notice that there are almost no demonstrations, protests are taking place in a different way, more sporadic. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ …they are advertising outwards to make people know the worth of the university. (Participant J)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ This is a period of certain stability. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ From the academic point of view it has improved. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ (There is) Better development of faculty members. (Participant K)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ They are taking the steps to reverse a process that took us to the bottom. (Participant L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix S

Comparison of Results to Existing Studies
Table 17

Comparison of Results to Existing Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Results Between this Study and Previous Research</th>
<th>Previous Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Lived experience of danger and delay**

~ The aggression came from the State and multiple parties.

| Affirms: | Bethell (1990) and Kryzanek (1977) who describe both conflicting factions as equally proactive, but do not specify that the left was divided and clashed internally. In addition, both studies miss to elaborate on the effect of the conflict over normal enrolled UASD students. Franco (2007) explains the situation of menace from the State as well as from leftist rival parties inside UASD. |

~ Memory of life-threatening danger and persecution.


~ Degree duration was uncertain.

| Adds to: | Franco (2007) that describes a climate of violence against students and government political opposes inside UASD campus, as well as a strategy of repression through suspending university activity. |
| Table 17—Continued |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| **Comparison Results Between this Study and Previous Research** | **Previous Research** |
| ~ By the time of the conflict there was still a good quality of education. | Adds to: Franco (2007) that explain how the conflict made well-prepared faculty members fear to work in UASD, and this made room to less prepared but willing individuals who in addition had to sympathize with an internal political faction. |
| ~ Recurrent memory of student drop out and/or faculty exodus. | Adds to: Pimentel (2002) who mentions faculty member exodus. Franco (2007) that provides an account on how faculty members were expelled out of UASD and the formation of UNPHU comprised of that group. |
| **Life-transforming experience** | |
| | Affirms: Neal (1998) that highlights sudden changes in the “qualities of social relationships” as causes for trauma, producing new sentiments of “danger, chaos and crisis of meaning.” (p. 3). |
| ~ Valued as maturing and transforming experience. | No previous research found. |
| | Affirms: Langerbacher and Shain (2010) that reported that resulting memories of much traumatic events became “power motivating forces for Americans almost overnight” (p. I). |
Table 17—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Results Between this Study and Previous Research</th>
<th>Previous Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Experience influences perception of public higher education**

~ Perception that conflict affected negatively current public higher education system.

No previous research found.

~ Perception that public higher education system lacks quality and/or not trustable.


**Influential over next generation**

~ Would not recommend UASD/Offspring did not study in UASD

No previous research found.

**The State has responded to repair public HEd System**

~ Perception that UASD has improved recently