

## **Kotter's Eight-Step Change Process Model and Students' Attitudes towards Fees Payment Policies in Public Universities in Uganda**

**Mukwenda, Hilary<sup>1</sup>**

©Uganda Martyrs University

**Abstract:** This study aimed at exploring the attitudes students in three public universities in Uganda hold towards tuition fees policies. It also investigated the relationship between Kotter's Eight-Step Change Process Model and these attitudes. Data was collected from 360 students drawn from Busitema University, Kyambogo University, and Makerere University. These were selected using stratified and cluster sampling. Data was collected using questionnaires and subjected to regression analysis. The findings show that many students have a low opinion of, and are opposed to, their universities' tuition policies. However, most of the steps in Kotter's Model were significantly (positively) related to the students' attitudes towards the policies. It was concluded that the model can guide efforts to enhance the effectiveness of tuition fees policies in the universities. Hence, the universities are urged to orientate enforcement of their fees policies towards the steps in the model.

**Key Terms:** Tuition fees, policy, Kotter's Eight-Step Change Process Model

### **Le modèle du processus de changement en huit étapes de Kotter et l'attitude des étudiants envers des politiques de paiement des frais académiques dans les universités publiques en Ouganda**

**Sommaire:** Cette étude avait pour but d'explorer les attitudes des étudiants de trois universités publiques en Ouganda envers les politiques de frais de scolarité. Elle a également étudié la relation entre le modèle de processus de changement en huit étapes de Kotter et ces attitudes. Les données ont été collectées auprès de 360 étudiants issus des universités de Busitema, Kyambogo et Makerere. Ceux-ci ont été sélectionnés à l'aide d'un échantillonnage stratifié et en grappes. Les données ont été collectées à l'aide de questionnaires et soumises à une analyse de régression. Les résultats montrent que de nombreux étudiants ont une mauvaise opinion de la politique de frais de scolarité de leur université et s'y opposent. Cependant, la plupart des étapes du modèle de Kotter étaient liées de manière significative (positive) aux attitudes des étudiants envers ces politiques. Il a été conclu que le modèle peut guider les efforts visant à améliorer l'efficacité des politiques de frais de scolarité dans les universités. Les universités sont donc

---

<sup>1</sup> Makerere University, [hmukwenda@yahoo.com](mailto:hmukwenda@yahoo.com)

invitées à orienter l'application de leurs politiques de paiement de frais de scolarité en fonction des étapes de ce modèle.

**Mots clé:** frais de scolarité, politique, Le modèle du processus de changement en huit étapes de Kotter

## Introduction

Globally, most Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have for a long time been providing public education free of charge to students (Kasozi 2009). Uganda in particular, has been traditionally providing public higher education free of charge to students. The cost of university education was entirely supported by the government prior to 1990s. However, due to growing enrollments, fiscal pressures and political objections to broaden access to higher education, it became forthcoming to introduce tuition in HEIs resulting into two schemes of publically and privately sponsored students (Uganda Government 2014).

These modes of sponsorship have led to the emergence of many equity problems. Uganda's higher education system is such that those who perform well afford tertiary education by way of accessing government or other bursaries and scholarship. Unfortunately, those who attend high class schools also tend to achieve high academic performance and access government sponsorship. Such schools are unaffordable for most students who come from humble families. Those who need support do not qualify for government support (bursaries and scholarships) tagged to good performance. On the other hand, students on private sponsorship scheme are required to pay functional and tuition fee to support the institution's core academic functions (Uganda Government 2014). In addition to tuition fees, public universities charge numerous fees under the cover of functional fee such as registration, examination, rules booklet, library, technology, guild sports, field attachment supervision, development caution, book bank, medical capitation, endowment and research fees. Other fees payable as and when required include: application, graduation, certificate, convocation, academic gown, recess term, re-mark, re-take, late fee payment, and verification fees. Most times, the list of fees charged in public universities in Uganda is more than the cost of some course under taken in some programmes of study. Tuition fees charged are differentiated by field of study and varies from one public university to another. Nevertheless, most fees payment policies in most universities in Uganda require every student admitted to a programme of study be issued a provisional admission letter until payment of the requisite fees. All functional fees and 60% of tuition fees for new joining students must be paid before the admission letter is issued; every continuing student is expected to pay fees due on the first day of a semester. However, in the event that a student is unable to pay full fees on the first day of the semester, the fees policy of most public universities requires payment of a commitment fee payable within the first three weeks of a semester. Deadline for payment of minimum deposit is the sixth week of a semester. A student who does not register by the 12th week can get de-registered (Makerere University 2016). A student registers but fails to pay 100% fees on the first day of a semester shall pay 100% fees within the first 12 weeks of the semester; a student who registers but fails to pay 100% fees within the first 12 weeks of the semester may be permitted to complete payment of the fees by the 15th week of a semester with a surcharge of 5% on the outstanding balance of fees due; student who may register but fails to pay full fees by the 15th week shall be de-registered (Busitema University 2018; Kyambogo University 2017; Makerere University 2016).

Despite government's effort to broaden access to Higher Education (HE), some would-be students have been denied an opportunity to access HE because of their inability to meet fees payment policies. The fees payment policies of most universities in Uganda set the cost of education too high to be afforded by students from ordinary family; yet the plight of private self-sponsored students hailing from humble economic background is already worrying. They have to meet both pedagogical and non-pedagogical expenses on transport, meals and accommodation which negatively impact on their concentration to studying. Access to most university services and benefits as well as legal status as student in public

universities is pegged/contingent upon payment of tuition in a timely manner (Uganda Government 2014). This implies that failure to pay fees (in part or full) can be a cause to bar a prospective student to seek admission (letter) and registration. If payment of amounts owed to the public university in Uganda is not made when due, the university has the right to administratively withdraw a student, withhold student grades, academic transcripts, certificates, and examinations results; and may also result in denied attendance in lectures. Consequently, students from many lower income families find it impossible to afford higher education without assistance.

Against that background, students are opposed to the fees payment policies used in public universities in Uganda (Daily Monitor 2019; Kashaka n.d.; Warom n.d.). Changes in the payment requirements contained in the current fees policies of most universities in Uganda have been viewed as unfair and aloof to the education needs of Ugandans seeking to attain university education (Uganda Government, 2014). The aloofness has created vacuum which has culminated into low graduation rates. It has resulted into demonstrations and strikes that have attracted military interventions in the affairs of running public universities in Uganda (see, e.g., Daily Monitor 2019; Kashaka n.d.; Warom n.d.). Military interventions have tended to undermine university autonomy and have depicted university managers as arrogant, and acting oblivious to expected roles of the university. Therefore, the inability to effectively implement fees payment policies in most of Uganda's public universities has prompted the researcher to investigate whether Kotter's Eight-step process change model can be of some help in settling the students' unrest arising from complaints on fees payment policies in public universities; and in enabling both university management and students to successfully transit from free-of charge provision of education (non-fee payment) to fees payment culture.

Kotter's Eight-step process change model has been used in major corporations around the world to aid organization's change initiatives (Kotter 2008; 2009). The Eight-Step Model of Change was developed by John Kotter basing on research of 100 organisations which were going through a process of change. Kotter proposes that change can be effectively managed through eight steps of: creating a sense of urgency, forming powerful guiding coalitions, developing a vision and a strategy, communicating the vision, removing obstacles and empowering employees for action, creating short-term wins, consolidating gains and strengthening change by anchoring change in the culture (Kotter 1996). Accordingly, creating urgency can be done through convincing reasons supporting the intended change. Similarly, *forming powerful guiding coalitions* can be achieved through identification, involvement, and enhancing commitment of the change agents and key, active, and influential stakeholders from various units of the organisation to work together as a team to accomplish change objectives. *Developing a Vision* can be achieved by determining the core values, and designing strategies for realising a change in an organization. This implies creating a vision, clearly stated and communicated in a powerful and convincing manner. *Removing Obstacles* can be done by continuously checking for barriers or people who are resisting change; being proactive while implementing change; and by ensuring that the organizational processes and structure are in place and aligned with the overall organizational vision; as well as rewarding people for endorsing and supporting in the change process. *Creating Short-Term Wins* can be done by giving a feel of victory in the early stages of change, creating many short term targets instead of one long-term goal; and rewarding the contributions of people who are involved in meeting the targets. *Consolidating Gains* can be achieved by engaging in continuous improvement; and by analysing individual success stories and improving from those individual experiences. Finally, *anchoring change in the corporate culture* can be done by ensuring that the change becomes an integral part of the organizational culture and is visible in every organizational aspect.

## Literature Review

**Tuition Fees Policy:** A fee, generally refers to a charge levied to recover all or most of the expenses associated with a particular institutionally provided good or service. Tuition is distinguished from other fees. For example, charges to cover some or all of the costs of food and lodging, or of health and transportation services, graduation, library or other functional fees. The word 'tuition' means instruction,

and a fee charged must therefore be called a tuition fee. A tuition fee generally refers to a mandatory charge levied upon all students (and/or their parents/sponsors) covering some portion of the general underlying costs of instruction (Asuamah & Kumi 2012 ).The policies by which tuition fees are established are critical in influencing whether or not a given policy will be accepted or rejected by the publics of the policy (directly and indirectly affected persons); and this has potential impact on higher education accessibility and the implications to equity and social justice. Study findings indicate that tuition fees may discourage the participation of students from low-income families, rural areas or ethnic minorities due to the negative impact in terms of social equality and benefits (Bain, 2001; Johnstone 1992).

A number of studies from the UK and the Netherlands have examined how moderate tuition affects enrollment decisions in Europe (Hubner 2012; Neill 2009; Canton & de Jong 2005; Galindo-Rueda, *et al.* 2004). The limitation of these studies is that they examined tuition effects by comparing enrollment rates before and after tuition reforms and did not have comparison groups that were affected by changes in tuition along the way having enrolled on a given programme of study. Moreover, the findings of the aforementioned study are silent on the completion rate of those who enrolled on the different programmes and on whether the students remained stable after increasing tuition fee and introducing new tuition fee policies. Hence, this study addresses the aforesaid gap by establishing how Kotter's eight-step change process model is related to students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda.

**Kotter's Eight Steps for Change Process:** Kotter's eight-step process summarizes steps that are crucial for successful change implementation. The eight steps are: establishing a sense of urgency, creating a guiding coalition, developing a vision and strategy, communicating the change vision, empowering a broad base action, generating short-term wins, consolidating gains and producing more change; and anchoring new approaches in the culture (Kotter, 1996). However, Kotter (2014) has modified the description of eight steps as: creating a sense of urgency; building a guiding coalition, forming a strategic vision and initiatives; enlisting a volunteer army; enabling action by removing barriers; generating short-term wins; sustaining acceleration; and instituting change.

Accordingly, **creating a sense of urgency** is concerns raising the urgency why change initiative is necessary; and a true sense of urgency is when people think that actions need to be taken on an issue now, not later. **Building a guiding coalition** requires an organization to assemble a specific group of leaders with enough power to chief the change effort and encourage the group to work together as a team. A guiding coalition must have: authority, knowledge, credibility and leadership talent for change to occur. Accordingly, the guiding coalition group must have enough authority in the organization so that others cannot block progress; the group must have sufficient knowledge from different points of view and should have a broad understanding of the organizational structure as well as knowledge of core tasks that are relevant to the task at hand, which will result in informed decisions; the group has to have enough credibility and Individuals that form the group must have good connections with others in the organization in order for decisions to not be questioned. Finally, an excellent guiding coalition will have the capacity to make change happen despite resistance from others.

**Forming a strategic vision and initiatives** is necessary for successful change initiative as it can motivate people to take action, and it can also serve as coordination of actions of different people; and Kotter (1996) also emphasized multiple platforms to communicate the vision for transformation effort to go on smoothly. After forming a strategic vision and initiatives it is necessary to **enlist a volunteer army** to have change implemented. For change to occur, massive numbers of people must rally around a common opportunity Therefore, the focus of this step is in getting more people to interact and participate for massive change to occur. Having enlist a volunteer army of change, the next step in the change process is to **enable action by removing barriers**. Removing barriers can empower people to execute the vision and help change move forward. Kotter (1996) points out structure, skills, systems, and supervisors as main obstacles to successful implementation of change. Accordingly, organizational structures can hinder change to move forward where the internal structure can be at odds with the vision. When changes occur,

new skills or different skills may be needed. Systems also must align with the new vision. Supervisors may hinder changes, so it is important to identify the people resisting the change and help them see what is needed. Supervisors who do not support their subordinates can create significant consequences for disempowering people.

**Generating Short-term Wins** help to reward and to show people that the sacrifices made are worth it; as well as to test the vision and strategies where it might need fine-tuning and help to build momentum to overcome resistance to change. On the other hand, **sustaining acceleration** is based on the premise that resisting change process is complicated and takes time, thus having leaders and managers that drive the change is important. Finally, **instituting change** is process to have changes anchored in the organizational culture. Accordingly, two factors are particularly important when institutionalizing change in the organizational culture: i) to show people that the change has helped improve performance; and ii) to make sure that the next generation of managers personifies new approaches. It is therefore hoped that change will stick when it becomes "the way we do things around here" (Kotter 2014; 1996; 1995).

## Methods

Data for this study was collected from 360 respondents hailing from three public universities in: Busitema, Kyambogo and Makerere. Selection of these universities depended on the fact that they have the largest student population (NCHE 2019). Data was collected to be generalized to the entire student population in the public universities in Uganda. In each university, participants were chosen using stratified sampling technique; and this ensured that data were collected from both male and female graduate and undergraduate students across all the years of study. Of the students that participated in the study, 59% (n=211) were females; while 41% (n=149) were males. The study participants consisted of 84% (n=302) undergraduate and 16% (n=58) graduate students. Of these, 39% (n=141) were in their third year of study, 27% (n=98) were in second year, 26% (n=94) were in their first year, 7% (n=23) were in the fourth year, and 1% (4) were in the fifth year. The questionnaire used consisted of 3 background variables (gender, level education, and year of study); 8 items on students' attitudes; 9 items on creating urgency, 2 items on forming coalitions, 2 items on developing vision and strategy, 2 items on communicating vision, 5 items on removing obstacles, 2 items on creating short-term wins, 2 items on consolidating gains, and 4 items on anchoring tuition policy into university culture. Data were analyzed using means and standard deviations, Pearson correlation analysis and regression analysis. The students gave their informed consent prior to data collection and were assured that their participation was voluntary, and that their choice to participate would not affect their studies at the respective universities. Thereafter, respondents were requested to complete the questionnaire during their free time and in a setting of their choice.

## Results

This study aimed at exploring the nature of the relationship existing between Kotter's eight-step change process model and students' attitudes towards fees payment policies in public universities in Uganda. To do this, responses to items of Kotter's eight-step change process and students' attitudes towards fees payment policies were established first prior to exploring correlation between the variables. Hence, the results of the study are presented according to univariate, bivariate and multivariate analyses.

**Univariate Analysis Results:** The mean and standard deviation scores were used to obtain responses to items of Kotter's eight-step change process; and to explore attitudes of students towards fees payment policy as indicated in Table 1 and 2.

**Table 1. Mean and Standard Deviation Scores on Students' Attitudes towards Fees Policy**

Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Fairness of fees policy	360	2.46	1.374

Policy provides for both full and partial payment options	360	3.25	1.264
Collecting fees in accordance with university fees policy	360	3.27	1.166
Provision for variety of payment modes	360	3.33	1.271
Satisfaction with provision for payment in instalments	360	3.53	1.416
Support for exclusion of fees defaulters	360	2.10	1.349
Exclusion of defaulters from lectures	360	1.88	1.153
Exclusion of defaulters from graduation ceremonies	360	2.54	1.433

Table 1 reveals that students had low attitude towards fee payment policies in public university with mean scores ranging from 1.88 to 3.53. The mean rating of half of the items (4 out of 8 = 50 %) are below the mid-point of 3.0; while the other (50 %) were found to be slightly above the mid-point of 3.0 on the rating scale. This implies that the current fee payment policies in public universities are not popular among the students. Nevertheless, the students' attitudes could partly be explained by their ability to pay, marital, and other financial obligations, burden of paying, availability of financial resources, and family background.

The mean and standard deviation scores were also used to explore the extent to which the Kotter's eight-step Change Process Model is applied to fee payment policies in public universities in Uganda as presented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Responses to Items of Kotter's eight-step Change Process**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>Creating Urgency</b>			
Realising urgency of paying fees in good time	360	2.38	1.351
Publishing fees information on webpages	360	3.07	1.337
Availability of fees documents in different media	360	3.48	1.222
Highlighting potential threats of non-compliance to fees policy	360	2.95	1.341
Identifying repercussions of non-compliance to fees policy	360	2.86	1.247
Exploring options to facilitate compliance to fees policy	360	2.51	1.253
Generating effective interventions to enhance compliance to fees policy	360	2.27	1.172
Engaging in honest discussions to foster compliance to fees policy	360	2.27	1.204
Involving students in implementing fees policy	360	2.21	1.250
<b>Forming Powerful Guiding Coalitions</b>			
Using prominent persons to convince students to comply to fees policy	360	1.99	1.212
Working as team while implementing fees policy	360	2.05	1.137
<b>Developing a Vision &amp; Strategy</b>			
Having clearly stated vision for effective implementation of fees policy	360	2.42	1.196
Having known strategy for implementing of fees policy	360	2.53	1.139
<b>Communicating the Vision</b>			
Clearly communicated vision for implementing of fees policy	360	2.26	1.210
Having a convincingly communicated vision for fees policy implementation	360	2.29	1.174
<b>Removing Obstacles</b>			
Aligning fees policy with university vision	360	2.84	1.359
Having continuous checks for barriers to successful fees policy implementation	360	2.78	1.268
Having effective mechanism to check fees defaulters	360	2.67	1.309
Incentives for students meeting fees obligations on time	360	1.91	1.078
Proactive measures to check fees defaulting	360	2.16	1.188
<b>Creating Short-Term Wins</b>			
Celebrating short-term wins	360	2.12	1.118
Rewarding personnel facilitating compliance to fees policy	360	2.30	1.219

Consolidating Gains			
Having mechanisms for consolidating gains in compliance to tuition fee policy	360	2.46	1.235
Determination in continuous improvement in enforcing fees policy	360	2.74	1.266
Anchoring tuition fee policy into university Culture			
Incorporating payment of fee in the university culture	360	2.88	1.322
Appreciation of changes in fees payment modes	360	2.94	1.319
Provision of regular updates	360	3.32	1.987

Table 2 reveals that Kotter's model is moderately applied to the implementation of fees payment policies in public universities in Uganda with average mean scores ranging from 2.02 to 3.05 of the various steps involved in Kotter's eight-step process change model. With the exception of the items on anchoring payment of fees in the university culture with average mean score of 3.05, the rest of the items are below the mid-point of 3.0 on the rating scale. It is followed by creating urgency with average mean score of 2.67; consolidating gains with average mean score of 2.60; developing a vision and strategy with average mean score of 2.47; removing obstacles with average mean score of 2.47; communicating vision with average mean score of 2.27; creating short-term wins with average mean score of 2.21; forming powerful guiding coalitions with average mean score of 2.02 in the descending. This implies that more emphasis is on anchoring payment of fees in the university culture than the rest of the steps. This may be explained by the universities' over emphasis to fix deadlines, surcharges, and to compel students to meet their fees obligations on the timely basis. For instance, it is a common practice in public universities that a student may not be registered until all financial obligations to the university have been settled; and a student who has not fulfilled all financial obligations is barred from registering for the next semester or obtaining any transcripts from the university.

**Bivariate Analysis Results:** Pearson (r) Correlation coefficient was used to explore relationship between the two variables as indicated in Table 3.

**Table 3: Correlations of Students' attitudes & Kotter's Eight-Step Change Process Model**

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1=Creating urgency	Pearson Correlation	1								
	Sig. (2-tailed)									
	N	360								
2=coalitions	Pearson Correlation	.413**	1							
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000								
	N	360	360							
3=Developing vision	Pearson Correlation	.331**	.456**	1						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000							
	N	360	360	360						
4=Communicating vision	Pearson Correlation	.468**	.334**	.557**	1					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000						
	N	360	360	360	360					
5=Removing obstacles	Pearson Correlation	.335**	.464**	.398**	.394**	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000					
	N	360	360	360	360	360				
6=Short-term wins	Pearson Correlation	.089	.260**	.346**	.307**	.464**	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.093	.000	.000	.000	.000				
	N	360	360	360	360	360	360			
7=Consolidating gains	Pearson Correlation	.315**	.215**	.310**	.487**	.481**	.463**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000			
	N	360	360	360	360	360	360	360		
8=Anchoring tuition fee policy into university culture	Pearson Correlation	.340**	.169**	.296**	.419**	.384**	.280**	.659**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		
	N	360	360	360	360	360	360	360	360	
9=Students attitudes	Pearson Correlation	.260**	.153**	.115*	.190**	.126*	.111*	.275**	.240**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.004	.029	.000	.017	.035	.000	.000	
	N	360	360	360	360	360	360	360	360	360

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).



Table 3 reveals that there is significant positive relationship between all the eight steps of Kotter's change process model and students' attitudes towards fee payment policies in public universities in Uganda. In comparison, consolidating gains ( $r = .275$ ) is more positively related to students' attitudes towards fee policy than the rest of the steps involved in Kotter's change process model.

Table 3 further reveals that consolidating gains is followed by creating urgency ( $r = .260$ ); anchoring payment of tuition fee in the university culture ( $r = .240$ ); communicating vision ( $r = .190$ ); forming coalitions ( $r = .153$ ); removing obstacles ( $r = .126$ ); developing vision and strategy ( $r = .115$ ); and creating short-term wins ( $r = .111$ ) in being positively related to students' attitudes towards fee payment policies. This suggests that the enforcement of fee payment policies in public universities in Uganda is more concentrated on consolidating gains by putting in place mechanisms for fostering compliance to fees payment policies than anything else.

**Multi variate Analysis Results:** To corroborate Pearson Correlation and specify the predictors of students' attitudes towards fees payment policies, regression analysis was conducted; and Regression results are reported in Table 4, 5, and 6.

**Table 4. Model Summary of Relationship between Kotter's Eight-Step Change Model and Students' Attitudes towards Fee Policy**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.343 <sup>a</sup>	.118	.097	5.30895

a. Predictors: (Constant), anchoring fee policy culture, coalitions, short-term wins, creating urgency, developing vision strategy, removing obstacles, communicating vision, consolidating gains

Table 4 indicates that regression analysis of relationship between students' attitudes and aspects of Kotter's Eight-Step Change Process Model yielded eight predictors (in the order of: anchoring fee policy culture, forming coalitions, creating short-term wins, creating urgency, developing vision strategy, removing obstacles, communicating vision, consolidating gains) all accounting for 97 per cent in the variance of students' attitudes towards fees payment policies in public universities in Uganda.

**Table 5: ANOVA Summary of Relationship between Kotter's Eight-Step Change Process Model and Students' attitudes towards Fees Policy**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	1318.040	8	164.755	5.845	.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	9892.935	351	28.185		
Total	11210.975	359			

a. Dependent Variable: students' attitudes

b. Predictors: (Constant), anchoring fee policy culture, coalitions, short-term wins, creating urgency, developing vision & strategy, removing obstacles, communicating vision, consolidating gains

Results in Table 5, reveal that anchoring fee policy in the university culture, forming coalitions, creating short-term wins, creating urgency, developing vision and strategy, removing obstacles, as well as communicating vision and consolidating gains are all significant predictors for students' attitudes towards fees payment policies in public universities in Uganda.

**Table 6: Coefficients of Relationship between Relationship between Kotter's Eight-Step Change Process Model and Students' attitudes towards Fees Policy**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	<i>B</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Beta</i>		
1 (Constant)	15.573	1.305		11.930	.000
Creating urgency	.155	.053	.180	2.908	.004

Forming coalitions	.199	.168	.074	1.181	.239
Developing vision & strategy	-.090	.177	-.034	-.512	.609
Communicating vision	.006	.189	.002	.030	.976
Removing obstacles	-.112	.086	-.086	-1.302	.194
Creating short-term wins	.041	.173	.015	.239	.811
Consolidating gains	.502	.193	.198	2.595	.010
Anchoring fee policy into university culture	.105	.097	.075	1.086	.278

a. Dependent Variable: students' attitudes

Table 6 shows that the regression Coefficients and t-test measuring the relationship between Kotter's Eight-Step Change Process Model and students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy led to six positive and two negative numbers. In particular Table 6 reveals that creating urgency, forming coalitions, communicating vision, creating short-term wins, consolidating gains, and anchoring fee policy into the university culture are significant and positive; while developing vision and strategy as well as removing obstacles are negatively related to students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda. These perceptions could, perhaps, be explained by the minimal involvement of students in the universities' strategic planning activities. This implies that the different cohorts of students should be maximally involved in in strategic planning thrusts involving implementation of tuition fee policy in public universities.

### Discussion and Implications

Creating urgency was found to be significantly and positively related to students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda ( $\beta = .155$ ;  $r = .260^{**}$ ). This implies that public universities in Uganda made some effort in creating a feeling of necessity among students and making them believe that the tuition fee policy is necessary and worthwhile. This suggests that a sense of urgency had been created regarding the fee policy in public universities in Uganda. However, the strength of the Beta and Pearson correlation values imply that more needs to be done in the area of creating urgency for the student to nurture favorable dispositions and attitudes towards tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda. This would in turn make it possible for university management to implement tuition fee policy with greater effectiveness and on sustainable basis.

Forming Coalitions was also found to be significantly and positively related to students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda ( $\beta = .199$ ;  $r = .153^{**}$ ). This suggests that there was a powerful coalition guiding on issues of tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda. However, the relatively lower Beta and Pearson correlation values imply that there is need to bring on board many more prominent persons to help university management in convincing students and/ or sponsors to comply to the prevailing tuition fee policies of public universities in Uganda. The use of influential people in implementing tuition fee policies can result into an active resource mobilization, and formidable team on which the university management can rely on in matters of fees policy enforcement and resource mobilization. Therefore, the university management should consider selecting staff and other interested stakeholders with experience and expertise to implement and review tuition fee policy to suit the needs of their clientele.

Furthermore, *communicating vision* was found to be significantly and positively related to students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda ( $\beta = .006$ ;  $r = .190^{**}$ ). This implies that leadership in public universities in Uganda have been fairly good at articulating the vision of their universities. However, the relatively lower Beta and Pearson correlation values imply that university management needs to do a lot more. In order to realize the university vision, it must be deeply instilled in the organization, being owned and shared by everyone involved in the organization through effective communication media. Communication competencies are essential for successful implementation of tuition fee policy. Hence, those charged with the responsibility of implement university policies should

have communication competencies such as interpersonal skills, personal enthusiasm, stimulating motivation and commitment, and effective transmission of information on the need to pay the charged tuition fee. This requires improvement in ICT to make communication faster and easier between students and university management. This can enable students to become aware of the nitty gritty of the tuition fee policy requirements. Communication competencies can be augmented by reliable information infrastructure such as internet to get timely updates of tuition fee policy requirements. However, employees with solid ICT skills are still scarce; which means universities still need to increase their investment in training employees.

Similarly, *creating short-term wins* was found to be significantly and positively related to students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda ( $\beta=.041$ ;  $r=.111^*$ ). This suggests that there was some degree of agreement among students; and that there were some short-term wins taking place in public universities in Uganda. However, the relatively lower Beta and Pearson correlation values imply that university management was not faring well in respect to facilitating celebration of short-term wins in regard to tuition fee policies compliance in public universities in Uganda. The limited activities around celebrating short-term wins in public universities in Uganda can be attributed to lack of top management support, organizational politics and culture; as well as absence of a working teams to create momentum for creating short-term wins aligned to policy implementation and resource mobilisation.

In addition, *Consolidating Gains* was found to be significantly and positively related to students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda ( $\beta=.502$ ;  $r=.275^{**}$ ). The relatively higher Beta and Pearson correlation values imply that public universities in Uganda was doing better in the area of consolidating gains. This implies that the management of public universities in Uganda has put in place mechanisms for consolidating gains in regard to compliance to tuition fee policies; and is determined to continue improving on what has been achieved in that area.

Furthermore, *anchoring* tuition fee policy into university culture was found to be are significantly and positively related to students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda ( $\beta=.105$ ;  $r=.240^{**}$ ). The relatively higher Beta and Pearson correlation values imply that public universities in Uganda are faring quite well in institutionalizing tuition fee into the universities' corporate culture.

However, at regression analysis level, developing vision and strategy was found to be negatively related to students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda ( $\beta = -.090$ ; t-value =  $-.512$ ). This implies that the process for developing vision and strategy for enforcing tuition fee policies in future is less valued by the students in public universities in Uganda. Part of the explanation is due to the fact that students are not fully involved in strategic planning processes in public universities. Hence, vision development is less understood by students in public universities; and therefore something should be done to positively enhance students' attitudes towards tuition fee policies in public universities in Uganda. Likewise, regression analysis results reveal that *removing obstacle* to policy implementation was found to be negatively related to students' attitudes towards tuition fee policies in public universities in Uganda ( $\beta = -.112$ ; t-value =  $-1.302$ ). The negative but non-significant regression coefficient results imply that the higher the effort of removing obstacles, the lower the students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy. This implies that the linkage between removing obstacles and students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy has to be handled with great care depending on what the university management is interested in addressing. Hence, the effort towards removing obstacles to policy implementation has to be done selectively depending on students' attitudes towards tuition fee policy which management would like to curtail or boost from time to time. For example, a decrease in pressure for demand for tuition payment by university management can increase students' trust and development of positive image of university management. This can in turn lead students into becoming responsible and responsive to the policy demands.

## Conclusion

Kotter's change model can be useful in enhancing the effectiveness of tuition fee policy in public universities in Uganda. Therefore, the study is applicable to all students who pay tuition fees: self-paying students, sponsored students, and those on student loans scheme. The current study has helped to explore students' attitudes towards tuition fee policies in public universities in Uganda; and further assisted in establishing how specific steps involved in Kotter's change model related to students' 'attitudes towards tuition fee policies in public universities in Uganda. These findings can aid public universities' management in effecting policy reviews for improvement and corrective action(s) tuition fee policies in Uganda. In particular, university management should employ Kotter's Eight-step change process model to entrench provisions that spells out tuition fee limits based on predictable formulas that are easy for university community members and members of the general public to understand. Once the formula is clear, there will be no reason for management of public universities to seek permission to raise tuition at higher rates as it is the current practice in Uganda.

## References

- Asuamah, S.Y. & Kumi, E. (2012). Attitudes Towards Tuition Fees Payment in Tertiary Education: A Survey of Sunyani Polytechnic Marketing Students in Sunyani Ghana. *International Review of Management and Marketing* Vol. 2(4), pp.231-240.
- Bain, O. (2001). The Costs of Higher Education to Students and Parents in Russia: Tuition Policy Issues. *Peabody Journal of Education*, Vol. 76, pp. 57–80.
- Busitema University (2018). Notes for new students 2018/2019. Busitema University, Office of Academic Registrar.
- Daily Monitor (Wednesday, October 30, 2019). Students' protest forces Makerere to revise fees policy. Available online at: <https://www.monitor.co.ug/uganda/news/national/students-protest-forces-makerere-to-revise-fees-policy-1856370>.
- Hubner, M. (2012). "Do tuition fees affect enrollment behavior? Evidence from a natural Experiment in Germany". *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 31(6), pp.949-960.
- Johnstone, D. B. (1992). "Tuition fees." *The Encyclopedia of Higher Education*, Vol. 2, pp.1501–1509.
- Kashaka, U. (n.d.) Government clarifies on 15% fees increment at Makerere University. *New Vision*. Available online at: <https://www.newvision.co.ug/news/1509754/gov-clarifies-fees-increment-makerere-university>.
- Kasozi, A. B. K. (2009). *Access to and Equity in Higher Education in Uganda: Whose Children Attend University and are Paid for by the State?* Paper presented at a public lecture on access to and equity in higher education in Uganda held at the Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Kampala on 5/02/2009, <http://ahero.uwc.ac.za/index.php?module=cshe&action=downloadfile&fileid=36807145012339262082233>.
- Kotter, J. P. (2009). "Leading Change: Why transformation efforts fail". *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, Vol. 73(3), pp.42-48.
- Kotter, J. P., & Schlesinger, L. A. (2008). "Choosing Strategies for Change". *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 86(7/8), p.130.
- Kotter, J.P. (1995) 'Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail'. *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 73(2), pp.59-67.
- Kotter, J.P. (1996) *Leading Change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kotter, J.P. (2014). *Accelerate: Building strategic agility for a faster-moving world*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Kyambogo University (2017). *Kyambogo University Fees Policy of 2017*. Kampala: Author.
- Makerere University (2016). *Makerere University Fees Policy of 2016*. Kampala: Author.
- NCHE (2019). *The State of Higher Education and Training in Uganda 2018/19*. Kampala: Author.
- Neill, C. (2009)." Tuition Fees and the Demand for University Places." *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 28(5), pp.561-570.

Uganda Government (2014). Higher Education Students Financing Board Act of 2014. Entebbe: UPPC.  
Warom, F. (n.d.) Makerere Students Protest Tuition Increment, Over 15 Arrested. *Campus Bee*. Available online at: <https://campusbee.ug/news/pictures-makerere-students-protest-tuition-increment-over-15-arrested/>.