Balancing State Power and Institutional Autonomy

A Historical Study of Governance Tensions in American Higher Education

Freda Asante
Ohio University
Maxwell Boateng
University of Wisconsin Milwaukee

Abstract

This paper explores the deeply embedded and historically persistent tension between state authority and institutional autonomy in American higher education. It tracks the evolution of governance relationships among colleges, universities, and government entities, following their development from the colonial period through the transformative nineteenth-century land-grant movement, and into the era of mass higher education following World War II. The analysis is anchored in Functionalism as the primary theoretical lens, while also incorporating insights from Institutional Theory and the ongoing public versus private good debate in higher education. The central argument asserts that as higher education's public purposes and roles have expanded, state involvement has consistently increased, particularly when governments perceive colleges and universities as instruments for fostering economic development, ensuring national security, or advancing social mobility. Concurrently, colleges and universities have

Freda Asante is a doctoral student and graduate assistant in the Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs in the Patton College of Education at Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. Maxwell Boateng is a doctoral student and teaching assistant in the Department of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee. Email addresses: fredapomaa2@gmail.com & boaten36@uwm.edu

© 2026 by Caddo Gap Press

crafted organizational and professional strategies to defend academic freedom and institutional self-governance, even as they respond to new layers of oversight and accountability. Finally, the paper connects these historical trajectories to current policy debates, such as performance-based funding, political incursions into university governance, and declining state investment, and presents historically grounded recommendations for achieving a more effective balance between accountability and institutional autonomy. This analysis ultimately argues that understanding these long-term patterns provides a clearer foundation for addressing contemporary governance challenges.

Keywords: higher education governance, institutional autonomy, state authority, historical analysis, public-private good debate

Introduction

The history of higher education in the United States is characterized by a continuous negotiation between state authority and the autonomy of academic institutions. Colleges and universities have depended on governmental bodies for foundational elements such as charters, legal recognition, and financial support, while simultaneously insisting upon a sphere of academic freedom anchored in professional standards (Bastedo et al., 2016). Over time, the sector has been called to promote objectives like economic development, national security, social mobility, and the cultivation of civic values, which has, in turn, justified greater state oversight and increasing demands for clear, measurable results (Thelin, 2019).

This dual imperative, requiring both scholarly independence and public accountability, has led to ongoing debates regarding the governance of universities. As the scope and objectives of higher education have broadened, models of governance have been adjusted to reflect changing balances between governmental control and institutional autonomy.

Despite the enduring nature of these debates, there is a tendency in current policy discussions to portray governance tensions as new or unprecedented challenges. Present-day disputes, such as those involving funding models tied to performance, political influence over governing boards, and direct state involvement in academic matters, are often described as unique threats to institutional independence. This perspective can obscure the fact that similar conflicts have emerged during previous periods of higher education's expansion. Without an appreciation of historical context, policy solutions may emphasize immediate fixes that fail to grasp the complexities of institutional governance.

A historical approach offers a crucial corrective by highlighting that governance models in higher education have been renegotiated re-

peatedly, not definitively resolved. Throughout American history, periods marked by increased public investment in colleges and universities have also seen heightened expectations regarding accountability and public service. In response, these institutions have established professional codes, organizational forms, and governance structures that aim to maintain academic discretion while accommodating the requirements of external oversight. Understanding these recurring patterns sheds light on the persistence of governance tensions and the unintended consequences that often result from inflexible policy interventions.

This study seeks to contribute to ongoing governance debates by redefining institutional autonomy as a dynamic and historically contingent relationship, rather than a static right. Instead of treating state authority and institutional independence as mutually exclusive, the analysis underscores their interconnectedness within broader democratic and policy frameworks. By situating modern governance challenges within a long-term historical context, the importance of institutional memory, professional expertise, and negotiated authority for advancing the public mission of higher education becomes clear.

The paper explores governance tensions as a phenomenon deeply embedded in history, not merely as a contemporary concern. It examines three significant periods that transformed the relationship between higher education and government: the colonial and early national era, the nineteenth-century land-grant movement, and the post–World War II period of massification. Developments in the current era are interpreted as extensions of these earlier shifts, enabling a focused analysis of key historical turning points.

The central thesis posits that increased public investment and expanded missions in higher education are consistently accompanied by greater state oversight. Nevertheless, colleges and universities have responded by crafting strategies to safeguard autonomy in areas such as curriculum design, research, and internal governance (Richardson et al., 1998). Identifying these trends is vital for interpreting contemporary issues like performance-based funding, political interventions, and the ongoing negotiation between public and private interests (Li & Zumeta, 2015). To provide a framework for this analysis, the following section presents the theoretical perspectives that underpin the study, establishing a basis for understanding the evolution of governance tensions throughout American higher education's history.

Theoretical Frameworks

This analysis is guided by Functionalism, which explains how governance in higher education evolves as institutional roles shift to meet collective needs (Durkheim, 1984). In the U.S., higher education's functions have moved from clergy and elite education to supporting modernization, mass credentialing, and research. As these functions have expanded, government intervention has increased (Parsons, 1951), and Functionalism helps explain why major societal changes bring new waves of state involvement.

Institutional Theory complements this view by analyzing how universities respond to external rules and expectations. Organizations in highly institutionalized fields, including U.S. universities, face pressures toward adopting similar structures for legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Multiple actors: legislatures, boards, accreditation agencies, and associations shape governance expectations. Universities often adopt formal structures to meet external demands while buffering core academic work from outside control (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). These dynamics help explain why universities adopt visible compliance structures while simultaneously working to protect academic decision-making.

The debate over higher education as a public versus private good adds a normative dimension. Labaree (1997) identifies competing goals: democratic equality, social efficiency, and social mobility. When higher education is viewed as a public good, reforms stress access, equity, and accountability; as a private good, focus shifts to tuition, debt, competition, and autonomy. These frameworks explain shifts between regulation and deregulation.

Together, Functionalism, Institutional Theory, and the public-private good debate provide a framework for understanding ongoing government influence, institutional adaptation, and intensifying governance tensions during periods of change. Building on these theoretical foundations, the following sections trace the historical development of governance tensions, beginning with the earliest American colleges.

Colonial and Early American Colleges: Autonomy within Narrow Functions

During the colonial and early national periods, higher education in the United States was small and exclusive. Institutions like Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary were chartered by colonial or royal authorities, but daily governance rested mainly with boards of trustees and religious organizations (Geiger, 2014). These colleges operated

with minimal oversight from centralized government, due to weak or undeveloped bureaucracies.

Their functions were modest: educating ministers, lawyers, and civic leaders, and transmitting religious and moral values to a small, homogenous population (Thelin, 2019). Broader concerns like access, mobility, or economic development had not yet influenced governance, so higher education attracted little political attention.

Within this context, norms of autonomy took root. Charters made colleges semi-independent legal entities with authority over regulations, faculty, presidents, and curriculum (Geiger, 2014). Trustees, not legislators, were seen as the locus of control, and faculty developed identities supporting academic authority. This set a template for American colleges: governance by board and president and protected scholarly decision-making.

According to Institutional Theory, these arrangements created baseline expectations about autonomy that later generations would defend. The belief that scholars, not politicians should address academic questions became central to American higher education, shaping resistance to later state intervention.

Because colleges served only elites and narrow needs, governance tensions remained muted; higher education did not yet occupy a central role in national policy (Thelin, 2019). Institutional autonomy in this era was largely possible because colleges were not tasked with large-scale public challenges. This early pattern of limited state engagement and emerging institutional autonomy set the stage for the far-reaching reforms and expanded governmental roles of the nineteenth century, examined in the next section.

The Land-Grant Movement and the Expansion of State Authority

The nineteenth century transformed higher education's relationship with government. The Morrill Act of 1862 authorized federal land grants for colleges focused on practical education for the "industrial classes" (U.S. Congress, 1862), linking federal support to an expanded public mission in agriculture, industry, and military preparedness.

Functionally, land-grant colleges responded to industrialization, westward expansion, and changes in agriculture, which created new demand for scientific and technical skills (Geiger, 2014). These colleges broadened opportunity beyond elites and contributed to regional growth, leading state governments to become more involved in shaping missions and governance.

Obtaining land-grant status required new governance relationships. State legislatures created or restructured governing boards and took a larger role in appropriations and priorities (Richardson et al., 1998). Many states centralized systems to coordinate growth and align roles (McLendon, 2003), increasing state leverage and raising issues of autonomy.

The land-grant movement intensified debates about higher education's purpose. Supporters saw these colleges as democratizing and practical; critics worried about neglecting classical ideals (Thelin, 2019). Social efficiency and mobility (Labaree, 1997) became dominant, challenging traditional democratic equality, and influencing governance and funding decisions.

Land-grant universities did not become mere instruments of state policy. Many blended applied and liberal arts curricula, arguing that effective citizenship required both (Geiger, 2014). Faculty and administrators built professional communities and standards, creating independent authority and defending academic autonomy even as state oversight expanded. The emergence of land-grant institutions thus reconfigured state-higher education relations, a process that would accelerate and become even more complex in the post–World War II era, as discussed below.

Post–World War II Massification and Federal Regulatory Power

The postwar period brought a major shift in American higher education governance. The GI Bill of 1944 led to surging enrollments and accelerated the move from elite to mass higher education (U.S. Congress, 1944; Thelin, 2019). The Higher Education Act of 1965 expanded federal grants and loans, embedding federal policy more deeply in institutional finance and structure.

Through a functionalist lens, these changes reflected the belief that higher education was essential for economic growth, social stability, and national competitiveness. Universities were expected to accommodate more students, drive innovation, and contribute to national defense, making governance a federal as well as state concern (Thelin, 2019).

With increased federal and state investment came more oversight. Colleges and universities had to comply with regulations on financial integrity, non-discrimination, and academic quality to receive aid and research funding. Accreditation, originally voluntary, became a key gatekeeper for federal funds. States created or strengthened coordinating boards to manage growth and budgets (McLendon, 2003).

These shifts intensified governance tensions. Public investment

enabled expansion and diversification, but funding conditions required adaptation of structures and policies to meet external standards. As Institutional Theory suggests, growth in compliance and research offices reflected both substantive and symbolic responses to regulation, buffering core academic activities (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). The expansion of federal oversight thus transformed governance expectations, linking autonomy more directly to accountability for access, equity, and national priorities.

Normative questions also became more complex. Federal aid and access reinforced higher education as a public good, but rising tuition and debt underscored its private investment character (Labaree, 1997). This fueled ongoing debates about who should pay, what outcomes matter, and how much autonomy institutions retain in admissions and pricing. The postwar era's expansion of state and federal oversight laid the groundwork for contemporary governance dynamics, which are synthesized and contextualized in the following section.

Synthesis: Recurring Patterns of Investment, Oversight, and Adaptation

Across the colonial, land-grant, and post–WWII eras, common patterns emerge in American higher education governance. Expansions in social function consistently attracted more state intervention. When colleges served only elites, oversight was minimal; as higher education became central to economic and social policy, institutions were drawn into the regulatory orbit of the state (Geiger, 2014; Thelin, 2019).

Public funding has always brought formal accountability. The land-grant system tied federal support to requirements on mission and service; the postwar growth of aid introduced new expectations for equity and performance (Li & Zumeta, 2015). These accountability mechanisms have evolved, but the principle that public investment must be justified remains constant.

As oversight intensified, institutions developed new strategies to protect autonomy. Land-grant colleges preserved liberal learning alongside practical curricula; postwar universities created administrative structures to manage demands while maintaining faculty control over teaching and research. This reflects Institutional Theory's insight that organizations adopt visible compliance structures to satisfy external expectations while buffering core functions (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

Normative debates over higher education's purpose: balancing democratic equality, efficiency, and mobility have shaped funding and

governance. When seen as a public good, oversight and investment rise; when private benefit is emphasized, arguments for autonomy and privatization gain traction (Labaree, 1997). Having established these recurring patterns, the analysis now turns to present-day policy challenges that reflect and amplify historical tensions between state authority and institutional autonomy.

Contemporary Policy Challenges

Current debates in higher education governance mirror longstanding patterns. In many states, public appropriations per student have declined, while expectations for enrollment, completion, and labor-market alignment have risen (Li & Zumeta, 2015). Performance-based funding ties budgets to outcomes like graduation rates and degrees in high-demand fields (Tandberg, 2010).

From a functionalist perspective, these models reflect the expectation that higher education should boost economic competitiveness. However, resource scarcity and institutional stratification can result in unintended effects, penalizing colleges serving high-need students and raising questions about equity and social mobility (Li & Zumeta, 2015). These pressures revive historical debates over whether public investment justifies stronger state steering and what forms of oversight best support institutional effectiveness.

Political intervention in governance has become more visible, with efforts to change boards, limit diversity initiatives, or regulate curricula. Such actions, reflecting broader cultural conflicts, raise direct concerns about academic freedom and institutional autonomy (Kezar & Eckel, 2004).

At the same time, tuition and student debt have grown, increasing demands for clear outcomes and consumer-oriented services. Institutions now face accountability not only to governments and professions, but also to students as customers (Richardson et al., 1998). The result is a hybrid identity: public agency, market actor, and academic community each with its own logic of accountability and autonomy. In light of these contemporary issues, the paper now offers recommendations grounded in historical patterns to help inform more effective governance strategies.

Historically Informed Recommendations

Historical analysis offers key principles for balancing public interests and institutional autonomy. If government expects higher education to expand access, completion, and research, funding must be ade-

quate, stable, and aligned with these goals. Persistent disinvestment coupled with rising performance demands creates untenable pressures on colleges (Li & Zumeta, 2015). Accountability mechanisms should match resource commitments and recognize that some public goods, like basic research, may not fit short-term metrics.

Clear boundaries are needed between state authority and academic self-governance. States can set broad policy, funding criteria, and ensure financial integrity, but should not dictate curricula, research, or personnel for ideological reasons. Historical experience shows that public purposes and professional autonomy can coexist when government respects academic judgment (Geiger, 2014).

Internal governance that integrates academic values with public responsibility is essential. True shared governance allows faculty, staff, and students to participate meaningfully in mission, strategy, and resource decisions (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). This engagement improves institutional communication and the design of reforms that support quality education.

Policymakers and leaders should recognize the multiple, sometimes competing, purposes of higher education. Reducing governance to private investment or workforce needs distorts institutional behavior and undermines civic and cultural roles. Acknowledging higher education's diverse objectives supports more balanced decisions about funding, regulation, and autonomy. In summary, these recommendations provide a bridge from historical analysis to present-day action, a connection that is further reinforced in the concluding section.

Limitations of This Study

Several limitations define the scope of this study's contribution. The analysis is based on historical interpretation and theoretical synthesis rather than original empirical data, which restricts insight into how individual institutions currently navigate tensions between state authority and institutional autonomy in practice. The emphasis on macro-level relationships between governments and higher education institutions results in only indirect consideration of the roles of internal governance actors, including faculty bodies, students, and professional associations. Furthermore, the analysis focuses on public institutions, where state authority is most apparent, and does not comprehensively address how similar governance tensions may manifest within private nonprofit institutions that increasingly rely on public funding through federal aid and research support. These limitations clarify the analytical boundaries of the study rather than undermine its core argument.

Directions for Future Research

Subsequent research may extend this historical framework by employing comparative and empirical methodologies to investigate governance tensions across diverse institutional and political settings. Comparative case studies of public universities under varying state governance models could enhance understanding of how autonomy and accountability are negotiated in practice. Additionally, research examining internal governance structures may clarify how faculty, boards, and shared governance processes mediate external political pressures. Further inquiry should address governance dynamics that transcend the public–private divide, especially as private nonprofit institutions increasingly depend on public funding and regulatory oversight. Moreover, ongoing developments such as artificial intelligence, online education, enrollment decline, and evolving labor-market expectations require sustained scholarly attention, as these factors are likely to introduce new functional demands that reshape the relationship between the state and higher education institutions.

Conclusion

The relationship between state authority and institutional autonomy has persistently shaped American higher education. From colonial colleges to land-grant universities and the development of mass public and research universities after World War II, governance structures have evolved in response to shifting social roles and political dynamics.

With every expansion of higher education's public function, new types of state involvement have appeared, prompting additional questions about governance. Institutions have responded by employing professional norms, organizational strategies, and academic expertise to safeguard autonomy. The ongoing negotiation of this balance has significant consequences for educational quality, equity, and the broader democratic society.

A historical perspective allows leaders in higher education to move beyond nostalgia for complete autonomy and uncritical acceptance of bureaucratic control. The aim is not to abolish conflict, but to manage it so that universities can fulfill their public responsibilities while maintaining their distinctive contributions. This requires attention to evolving institutional roles, respect for academic processes, and sustained public dialogue about the purposes and governance of higher education. Achieving a sustainable balance between state authority and institutional autonomy depends on awareness of historical precedents, current policy challenges, and the democratic values that have long influenced governance in American higher education.

Rather than viewing governance tension as a momentary problem, this analysis treats it as a persistent structural feature. Recurrent conflicts between state power and institutional autonomy have surfaced when higher education's social purposes have expanded, whether through broader access, economic development mandates, or national security concerns. These tensions should not be regarded as evidence of institutional failure, but as indicators of higher education's inherently political character as a public institution within a democracy.

This perspective questions simplistic narratives that frame autonomy and accountability as oppositional. Historically, autonomy has not meant total isolation from public oversight, nor has accountability implied complete state control. Governance has developed through negotiated arrangements in which institutions seek legitimacy, resources, and public trust while upholding professional standards and academic expertise. Recognizing this interdependence can help reframe current governance debates, moving away from zero-sum thinking and toward more nuanced institutional strategies.

The historical record also underscores the mediating role of professional expertise in governance relationships. Faculty norms, disciplinary standards, and shared governance structures have long acted as buffers against excessive political intervention, even as institutions remain accountable for public funding. When these professional foundations are weakened by politicized appointments, mandated curricula, or managerial overreach, institutions' ability to fulfill both public and scholarly missions is diminished.

From a democratic viewpoint, governance tensions bring core questions about authority, trust, and legitimacy to the forefront. Public oversight is justified by the use of taxpayer resources and the societal impact of higher education, yet excessive intervention can undermine the independent and critical functions that warrant public investment. Historically informed governance requires not only clear regulation but also a normative commitment to academic freedom as a public good.

Recent policy reforms often fail to account for the long-term effects of governance changes made in response to short-term political pressures. Outcome-based funding, performance metrics, and centralized oversight may promise efficiency and transparency, but they can also restrict institutional missions, stifle innovation, and intensify institutional stratification. Historical analysis demonstrates that effective governance systems are those that allow flexibility and adaptation while maintaining accountability mechanisms that reflect the complexity of educational outcomes.

Institutional leaders are pivotal in navigating these tensions. Pres-

idents, governing boards, and senior administrators act as intermediaries between external political authorities and internal academic communities. Historically, effective leadership has meant translating public expectations into institutional strategies without compromising core academic values. This balancing act is especially challenging in polarized political environments, underscoring the need for leaders who are historically informed, politically adept, and committed to shared governance.

Public dialogue is also essential for sustaining legitimate governance. The governance of higher education has never been merely technical; it reflects societal debates over beneficiaries, purposes, and the distribution of higher education's benefits. Involving the public in these discussions, rather than relying solely on policy mandates, strengthens democratic accountability while preserving institutional autonomy.

Looking to the future, emerging issues such as technological advancements, demographic changes, and financial uncertainty are likely to intensify governance tensions. As institutions adapt to artificial intelligence, online learning, and shifting enrollment patterns, new demands will reshape the relationship between higher education and the state. Historical trends suggest that such transformations will again provoke debate over authority, oversight, and institutional independence.

In summary, the central lesson of American higher education governance is not the elimination of conflict, but its continual renegotiation. Sustainable governance requires acknowledging higher education as both a public institution and a professional enterprise, accountable to democratic society and protected by academic freedom. Grounded in historical awareness, this negotiated balance remains the most promising path for sustaining the educational, civic, and democratic contributions of higher education in an era of uncertainty.

References

Bastedo, M. N., Altbach, P. G., & Gumport, P. J. (Eds.). (2016). *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges.* Johns Hopkins University Press.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983) The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*, 147-160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

Durkheim, E. (1984). The division of labor in society. Free Press. https://mypaperhub.com/Durkheim-Emile-The-Division-of-Labour-in-Society.pdf

Geiger, R. L. (2014). *The history of American higher education: Learning and culture from the founding to World War II,* Princeton University Press. https://www.torrossa.com/en/resources/an/5643104

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2004). Meeting today's governance challenges: A

synthesis of the literature and examination of a future agenda for scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75*(4), 371-399. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2004.11772264

Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*(1), 39-81. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312034001039

Li, A. Y., & Zumeta, W. (2015). State support for higher education. In *The Palgrave international handbook of higher education policy and governance* (pp. 463-482). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-137-45617-5_25

McLendon, M. K. (2003). Setting the governmental agenda for state decentralization of higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 74*(5), 479-515. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2003.11778887

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340-363. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/226550

Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Free Press. https://self.gutenberg.org/wplbn0001282298-the-social-system-by-parsons-talcott.aspx

Richardson Jr, R. C., Bracco, K. R., Callan, P. M., & Finney, J. E. (1998). *Designing state higher education systems for a new century. Series on higher education*. Oryx Press. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED425679

Tandberg, D. (2010). Interest groups and governmental institutions: The politics of state funding of public higher education. *Educational Policy, 24*(5), 735-778. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904809339163

Thelin, J. R. (2019). *A history of American higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press. https://books.google.com/books?id=pmqBDwAAQBAJ

U.S. Congress. (1862). *Morrill Act of 1862,* 7 U.S.C. § 301.

U.S. Congress. (1944). *Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944*, Pub. L. No. 78-346, 58 Stat. 284.