

## **Regional Cultural Policy Changes in the Context of New Public Governance: Developing a Creative Economy in Lithuania**

**Assist. doctoral student Audronė Pauliukevičiūtė**

*Kaunas University of Technology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Public Administration,*

*K. Donelaicio St. 20, LT-44239 Kaunas*

*audrone\_pauliukeviciute@yahoo.com*

### **Abstract**

This article analyzes concrete aspects of regional cultural policy in times of ever changing global environment. New Public Governance provides different opportunities to increase the level of efficiency in regional cultural policy implementation, also taking into consideration the developing of a creative economy through the creative and cultural industries. By describing main regional cultural policy issues and priorities in Lithuania it is essential to examine theoretical/methodological signs of New Public Governance. Using meta-analysis methodology the article focuses on the regional cultural policy changes in the context of New Public Governance in Lithuania also identifying most suitable ways for developing a creative economy in the country. Main methods of investigation: scientific literature analysis, descriptive analysis, meta-analysis, systematic evaluation, the theoretic simulation. Modernization of culture governance in Lithuania opens up new strategic possibilities for regional development by strengthening social integration and citizen participation in cultural policy formation, ensuring better cultural services, contributing to public private partnerships in different spheres of creative economy.

**Keywords:** regional cultural policy, new public governance, creative and cultural industries, creative economy.

### **Introduction**

Analyzing variety of management theories and scientific approaches it is not difficult to notice, that in modern research articles most famous theoreticians argue about the level of changes in the sphere of regional cultural policy formation and implementation. Nevertheless, the majority of the latest scientific opinions express the idea about the growing importance of regional cultural policy studies. Regional cultural policy is a part of public policy, formulated especially for cultural services and products delivery in the particular region, and the implementation of concrete region cultural priorities with regard to one or another social group's needs and expectations. Knowledge economy, technological development, multiculturalism and changing global environment provide new challenges for regional cultural policy. It is important to emphasize that regional policy can be cha-

racterized in two ways, depending on the defined or selected policy areas: a region could be seen as a part of the country also the whole country could be named as a part of the concrete region. Regional cultural policy can be described as a sum of procedures, designed to increase the potential of cultural identity. Mostly, different social and cultural problems arise in regional management level first, that is why it is important and relevant to analyze the regional cultural policy changes in different countries.

The context of New Public Governance reveals some very actual regional cultural policy factors and possible methods of its implementation in developing countries. Considering that modern administration methodology does not include any objectively investigated and adequately distinguished solutions related to regional cultural policy problems (such as lack of efficient use of resources, insufficient leadership, etc.), it is important to provide regional cultural policy transformation analysis, by emphasizing the role of performance management in all levels of organizations, too. Regional identity formation and preservation, fostering cultural heritage, enhancing the attractiveness of the region, the continues analysis of modern-day regional policy stage circumstances – all these dimensions and directions of regional cultural policy require a unique study, but recognizing the importance of supranational context in nowadays public governance practice, this article analyzes, firstly, theoretical/methodological background of the New (good) Public Governance, secondly, presents an overview of regional cultural policy transformation in Lithuania also describing its influence on developing a creative economy in the country. Relevance of the main problem discussed in this article is expressed as a question: what are main regional cultural policy changes in the context of New Public Governance?

The case study of Lithuanian regional cultural policy provides the ability to analyze strategic cultural development priorities helps to find out the root causes of creative economy framework in the country and describes what effects regional cultural policy brings to the state culture sector management nowada-

ys. The purpose of this article is to analyze regional cultural policy changes in the context of New Public Governance in Lithuania. The object of the work: Lithuanian regional cultural policy in the context of developing a creative economy. Tasks set for achieving the anticipated object: to examine theoretical/methodological framework of New Public Governance, to analyze regional cultural policy transformation in the context of New Public Governance in Lithuania, to identify regional cultural policy influence on developing a creative economy in Lithuania. Article covers following methods of investigation: scientific literature analysis, descriptive analysis, meta-analysis, systematic evaluation, the theoretic simulation.

### **Theoretical/methodological framework of New Public Governance**

Current stage of policy formulation and implementation processes is strongly enough influenced by New Public Governance theoretical assumptions. Main aspects and factors of New Public Governance are quite similar to the well known New Public Management paradigm: both are looking for private sector demands and seeking to focus on private sector organizational management knowledge and how to use it correctly in public sector; both believe in partnership (public private partnership approach) benefits, both try to debureaucratize organizations and support democratic point of view. New Public Governance also provides a system for decentralized policy, flexible performance management, decisions based on results, good and efficient networking. But one and the most important difference between the New Public Governance and New Public Management is the fact, that New Public Governance comes closer to the so called ethical governance.

According to Potucek (2004, p. 93) from the experience of different Central and Eastern European countries, ten criteria for good governance can be defined. All of these criteria from the author's of this article point of view are very important in the field of culture governance (including regional cultural changes) modernization (in the current stage, a clear transformation of New Public Management into the "good" public management is identified). The first factor contributing to good governance is an analytical basis for decision-making. Such an analytical basis consists of the "cognitive environment" which allows decision-makers to find comprehensive evidence about public policy problems, their determinants. Communication in the public space represents the second important factor contributing to good governance. The need for strategic thinking and governance, or the coordinated and renewable search and establishment of priorities for a particular state and society through an

on-going dialogue, is also included in the context of ten criteria for good governance.

The democratic mediation of interests represents the fourth factor of good governance. Political parties do and should undergo a process of internal transformation (the fifth factor in good governance). The accountability of the government, the interweaving of politics, the market and the media and an appropriate approach to social exclusion are next criteria of good governance, which also can not be implemented without education in public policy and administration. The tenth and final factor for good governance involves the consideration of the global context of policy-making (Potucek, 2004, p. 98). As it was mentioned before, policy changes provide new procedures and methods used in decision making processes. These methods also include performance measurement. Performance measurement is only useful if it improves policy or management. Clearly, performance data must be reliable and should cover the dimensions of performance that really matter. Performance management has often been considered to be about the "hard" data. If an organization does not measure its performance, it will only tentatively understand what its impact in society is, and consequently its ability to respond appropriately will erode. Therefore, it is important to develop performance measurement systems in order to know at least a little more and to develop performance management systems in order to have a little more control over performance (Bouckaert and Dooren, 2009, p. 162). The strategic nature of New Public Governance is defined by modern state financial-economic possibilities, quality characteristics of all resources coordination, inter-sectoral interaction of effective new planning, organizing, supplying of information technologies, all kinds and levels of organizations, organizational behavior and levels of governors and managers competency. All the listed circumstances and conditions for effective strategic New Public Governance institutionalization in the activity of public structures can be linked into scientific-systemic determinants (Rai-pa, 2011, p. 168). Demand for reform of public management has become a call with which public managers at all levels of government are very familiar. They are besieged with calls by elected officials, candidates for public office, senior executive branch officials, members of public and private organizations lobbying for their interests, and by private citizens who see that changing the way governments operate is the solution to host of public ills. On the one hand, the manager is told that wasting the taxpayers' money must stop; on the other hand, the public manager is told to do more with less. A cry heard around the globe is that government must change (McNabb, 2008, p.

15). Theoretical properties of New Public Governance summarize main directions of government changes in the context of ever growing requirements for public sector institutions. Often we hear the emphasis on the public sector bureaucratic system. Traditionally, bureaucracies have been seen as machine-type organizations with strict intra-organizational boundaries and task divisions. Modern public management (by implementing the New Public Government theoretical postulates), however, is multilayered, multidisciplinary and collaborative. Public managers are challenged to structure their organizations along lean processes that allow for responsive, cost-effective and timely government services. Administrative processes are clearly one area that continues to harbor great potential for optimization (Schedler, 2009, p. 195). In the public sector, process analysis is also the field of important analysis and should not be based only on efficiency arguments. In many cases, the shape of processes is predefined by legal norms. These guarantee legal rights of citizens in their contacts with the government (Schedler, 2009, p. 183).

Theoretical/methodological framework of New Public Governance consists of main theoretical approaches, such as the governance theory, or the network governance model (focusing on linkages among public service suppliers; and, in so doing, responds to complex citizen needs). The goal of this model is to combine a high level of public private collaboration with a robust network of service providers. New Public Governance entrenches the idea of a responsible, well-organized, meeting citizens' needs management, which effectiveness and efficiency may depend on the concrete context, traditions and the way recourses are managed. At the time when processes of market internationalization and globalization of economies of individual countries are actively developing it is very important to reorganize national economic systems following those processes, and direct them towards economies of developed countries. This would secure equal possibilities for economic activities of underdeveloped countries in competition as well as equal social environment (Graužinis, 2001). Methodological aspects of New Public Governance lead to quantitative and qualitative parameters of the modern public theory, such as main instruments of New Public Governance, possible determinants and, of course, main definitions, their quantitative and qualitative analysis by studying cases of different countries and their system of social, political or cultural development. Theoretical/methodological framework of New Public Governance could be seen as a system of arguments about New Public Governance possibilities to grow as a unique and modern theory (maybe sometimes it will even consist of

the parts that are main elements of the particular paradigm). Also nowadays theoretical/methodological framework of New Public Governance shows ways and opportunities for using it in the particular sector or country environment. Speaking about the culture sector development, it is important to notice, that New Public Governance also deals with the regional cultural policy changes, because changing conditions of theoretical background change policy issues, priorities, and, of course, may lead to global regional policy transformations.

Effectiveness of culture governance in Lithuania could be promoted through the logical and coherent implementation of different activities based on the ten mentioned above main criteria of good governance as well. It is important to emphasize that the imbalance between established different modes of governance also New Public Management paradigm and the New Public Governance practice depend on the external conditions partly affected by different political, economic, social and cultural factors. Regional cultural policy transformation requires deeper methodological study and continues scientific research in the field of New Public Governance practice.

### **Regional cultural policy transformation in the context of New Public Governance in Lithuania**

There is a lot of controversy over the national regional policy. We should speak about regional policy in case the government patronizes certain regions while other regions are in a state of neglect. Social, political, economic and ecological development in a region is concurrent with regional policy, which takes forms of prognostication, programming and planning. The aims and goals of regional policy could be grouped by two criterions: regional solidity and regional oneness. The aims and goals of regional policy have been changed in many countries and serve as the means of economic development of the whole country (Simanavičienė and Kilijonienė, 2005, p. 40). M. Cuddy (1998), J. N. Gladki (1998), A. I. Cistobajev (1998), M. P. Todaro (1997), S. J. Jauhiainen (2000), E. J. Blakely (1989), R. Bagdzevičienė (2000, 2001, 2002), D. Štreimikienė (2001, 2002), S. Vaitiekūnas (2001), M. Maniokas (1999), K. Maniokas (2002), S. Siupsinskas (2004), V. Damašienė (2002, 2003), R. Dumčius (2004), P. Auštrevičius (2003), A. Graužinis (2001), R. Kriščiūnas (2004) and other authors analyzed and wrote about the problems of regions and regional development and policy. No efficient system of how to measure social and cultural achievements in regional policy has been designed. The phenomenon of formation and implementation of regional cultural policy is highlighted in these documents: a new

programme of the European Union (EU) “Culture” (2007-2013), which establishes a vision of culture changes within seven years and shows the importance of development and protection language diversity as the main expression of democracy; the “Convention concerning the protection of World Culture and Natural Heritage” (1972); “Convention of Protection of Non-material Culture Heritage” (2003) of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and any other essential documents establishing features of regional policy of world cultures (“European Culture Convention” (1954); “European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages” (1992); “European Convention for the Protection of Audiovisual Heritage” (2001); UNESCO “Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Culture Expressions” (2005)). If implementation of cultural policy is understood as a component of culture management where establishment of political objectives and tasks in the field of culture is presented in practice (in programmes and projects), theoretical/methodological changes in regional cultural policy should also always be observed.

There are a lot of well known cultural policy researchers: J. Bonniel (France), B. Chládková (Czech Republic), F. Colbert (Canada), F. Donato (Italy), C. Ortega (Spain), J. Pitkanen (Finland), P. Strandman (Finland), P. Vartiainen (Finland), S. Waradzinova (Slovakia), I. Schwarz etc. Analysis of cultural policy as the area of public policy is inevitably related to analysts of public policy: W. N. Dunn, W. Parsons; E. Lane, Ch. E. Lindblom. The works by M. Weber, R. Denhardt and H. Simon are also important theoretical/methodological grounds for assessment of changes in regional cultural policy. In general, main categories of cultural policy were analyzed by a number of authors in their works: H. Rauhe, Ch. Demmer, H. P. Reinecke, A. J. Wiesand, A. Foglio, G. C. Beyens. Some main researchers who have described multiculturalism and cultural migration phenomenon: F. Fukuyama, P. J. Katzenstein, P. Werbner, D. Hebdige, J. Horton, T. Modood, W. Kymlicka, S. Okin, Ch. Taylor, H. Rae, G. Baumann, E. Roosens, Th. Banchoff. Regional cultural policy and creative industries were as a main research object in the works of A. C. Pratt, Ph. Kern, J. Primorac and many more. K. Schedler and I. Proeller described public management as a cultural phenomenon and C. Andrew, M. Gattinger, M. S. Jeannotte and W. Straw in their works analyzed cultural citizenship issues. Despite the fact that regional cultural policy quite often is a common field of research, there are not so many articles, based on meta-analysis and theoretic simulation.

American Society for Public Administration latest book series on public administration and public policy include a study of new face of government by

famous researcher D. E. McNabb (2008), where he depending on Sandia National Laboratory study results, different transformation literature, case analysis, and interviews with private sector managers, highlights five important change success factors in public sector governance:

- effective, fully committed leadership that extends beyond just the top leaders;
- organizationwide acceptance of the idea that crisis looms for a organization and an agreed-upon sense of urgency for resolution of the crisis before it destroys the organization;
- a common vision of what the transformed organization will be like in the near – to long-term future (five to ten years) and development of the strategic plans that will guide the organization to achieving the goal;
- the resources and will to make tough choices necessary for successful implementation (execution) of the actions and activities spelled out in the strategic transformation plan;
- identifying and applying the appropriate goal-achievement measurements (metrics), including progress measurements form the first common description of the crisis at hand, through agreeing upon the ultimate vision and the plans needed to move the organization along the path of transformation, and ultimately to implementation of the planned transformational changes (McNabb, 2008, p. 19-20).

These change success factors in public sector governance explain the environment of regional cultural policy. Most regions in the context of New Public Governance are modernized and developed in a lot of countries according to their specificity and formulated goals for the strengthening of region’s identity, economy and other parts of the policy. Countries in the modern stage of governance are facing the challenge of adapting their public cultural service to a new environment, which has emerged as a result of changes in the political and economic system, new expectations and demands of citizens and requirements for regional policies to comply with growing standards of multicultural Europe. Culture nevertheless is increasingly seen by governments as a tool that can be utilized for a variety of developmental practices – from urban regeneration (Evans, 2001), to social inclusion (Long and Bramham, 2006), to health care and treatment (Madden and Bloom, 2004), or even for what seems like personal or state glorification (Collard, 1998; Gray, 2010, p. 1). Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their

embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, be considered as products of action, and as conditioning elements of further action” (Slapkauskas, 2010, p. 1).

The globalization of the world shows integration of previously national economies in a global economy mainly due to free trade and free movement of capital, as well as mild or uncontrolled migration. Thus, in terms of internationalization, one of the most important concepts is mobility (Alperytė, 2010, p. 303). Melnikas (2007) identifies international cooperation as another very important concept in the context of internationalization and regional cultural policy. Various ethnic, confessional or social conflicts existed in the history and still are present in some secret ways; and there are many cases in modern Europe when various historically developed conflicts and their relics interfere in the development of the integral cultural space (Melnikas, 2007). However, modernization of management should not direct regional cultural policy towards economics of culture only in order to obtain respective benefits from this sector because the culture code itself provides the grounds for understanding of general national culture by revealing values, vital and mental attributes of art, language, creation and expression which may not and do not have to be the result of economic calculations (Bucinskas, Raipa and Pauliukeviciute, 2010).

Lithuanian culture governance is growing, but still there are a lot of problems in the context of regional cultural policy development. Treaty of accession to the European Union validates Lithuania as an integral (undivided into parts) region. This creates a problem of preparing development strategies of economic and social growth for some regions of Lithuania following different levels of development of certain geographical areas, differentiation of investments and social help, historically set differences of economic and cultural efficiency. Following EU agreements, directives and regulations characterizing regional management (Boldrin, 2001) it appears that regional policy in Lithuania in regions where GDP per resident is less than 75% should be developed on the basis of region division into micro-regions. Average micro-region in Lithuania excluded on the national level is approximately 6.5 thousand square kilometers i.e. much less than average EU micro-region. Due to the fact that micro-regions in Lithuania are so small and their material and technical base is very weak it is irrational to solve any cardinal economic or social-cultural problems on the level of micro-region. This is done on the scale of the whole economy (Dubinas, 2007, p. 5-6).

Main cultural policy issues and priorities in Lithuania according to the governments’ programme for

the year 2008-2012 (adopted in 2008) accentuates the following cultural policy goals: to enhance the role of the Ministry of Culture in development of national cultural programmes; to improve national and humanistic nurture programmes; and to integrate cultural and educational policy aims. The programme concentrates on cultural policy issues such as professional and amateur art, protection of cultural heritage, culture industries, state support for art and artists, regional cultural development, investment in the cultural sector and financing policy, etc. In June 2010, the Seimas passed the Resolution on the Guidelines of Alteration of Lithuanian Culture Policy. The main objective of this document is to renew the Lithuanian Cultural Policy model and to realize the guidelines in different sectors and directions: to enhance culture and cultural policy as strategic guidelines for the state; to reform culture management; to improve financing of culture; to implement protection of copyright and related rights; to form an integral system of heritage protection; to increase access to culture in the whole country; and to strengthen dissemination of Lithuanian culture abroad (Current Issues in Cultural Policy Development and Debate, 2011).

Lithuania’s regional cultural policy depends on the national regional policy strategic orientations. National regional policy – the state institutions and other entities, which have a differential impact on public areas of social and economic development try to reduce regional differences in socio-economic development disparities within regions, by promoting sustainable development throughout the national territory. Lithuanian regional policy long term objective is to ensure a high quality of life for all residents of the country. Lithuanian regional policy priority by the year 2013 direction is equivalent to Lithuanian territorial economic development, purposeful and coordinated long-term economic development and the promotion of competitiveness in different sectors, trying to increase the low standard of living areas surrounded by the regional centers, which have great economic potential and infrastructure to carry out the functions of the regional growth centers and their development, can achieve a better territorial cohesion in the region. National regional policy in Lithuania carried out in two main directions: promote economic development and improve the quality of life (level of municipalities) (short-term direction of development).

Lithuania’s regional cultural policy changes in the context of New Public Governance are not so easily identified, because in Lithuania many sector development practice has not even reached the level of fruitful implementation of New Public Management theory. Speaking about the New Public Governance approach, it is important to state, that in Lithuanian regional cultural policy field there are some as-

pects that could be named as the New Public Governance expressions and experience. Effective public administration in the age of result-oriented management requires public agencies to develop a capacity for strategic management and in Lithuanian regional cultural policy we could name examples of such kind of practice. For example, Lithuania is trying to build new modern and actual capacities for cultural policy formation and implementation in different regions: to enhance capacity-building for cultural policy and cultural management in Lithuania and to promote the establishment of a network of UNESCO Chairs in the Baltic countries, through regional training. Different theoreticians in Lithuania try to research information and documentation activities focusing mainly on cultural policies and development, cultural statistics, economics, legislation concerning culture, and administration in arts and culture (UNESCO Chair in Cultural Policy and Cultural Management, 2011). The culture has been influenced by historical events in Lithuania, geography and artistic movements. Various regional cultural policy changes occurred throughout Lithuania's transformation from a former country of the Soviet Union to an independent Baltic state. A free culture market, which includes activities of the communities of different hobbies and acts in a democratic context in order to debureaucratize solutions for implementation of policy, is being formed in Lithuania. But still remembering bad effects of economic-financial crisis on Lithuanian regional cultural policy, it is relevant and necessary, that all cultural institutions in Lithuania could act as a platform to foster dialogue between all the relevant actors concerned with the development and execution of cultural policy, to identify policy implications in different fields of competence and sensitize public opinion, experts and decision-makers to the most appropriate methods of formulating, planning, implementing and evaluating regional cultural policies by programmes and projects. The knowledge system that facilitates feedback, planning, and information distribution as well as knowledge sharing, collection, and archiving for future operations (performance measurement) in the context of New Public Governance becomes more important.

Theoreticians present a number of problematic issues of bureaucratic implementation of regional cultural policy in Lithuania that are also related to public servants training in the context of culture governance. One of the most important problems of implementation of regional cultural policy is unfair financing of political trends, programs and attention of politicians to selection of priorities. Therefore, this problem may be defined as injustice. Another disadvantage of policy implementation is related to the development of programme implementation from the function-

nal, structural and location point of view. In this case, implementation equally depends on central and especially on local government which compose the whole mosaic of bureaucratic process of regional policy implementation with rules and procedures. Therefore, the second problem of bureaucratic process of cultural policy implementation may be called fragmentation or segmentation of implementation. The third disadvantage is related to the problem of functionalism, because policy implementation is based on trust between developers and implementers of programs. This includes central government, representatives of local government, local agencies (Kettl and Fesler, 2009, p. 382-383).

Equal access to culture and participation in cultural life are emphasized in the Lithuanian's government's Programme for the year 2008 - 2012. Social cohesion was defined as one of the aims of the state's policy – "to reduce social disparity" and it gives priority to investment in the political, economic, social, science and cultural sectors. The chapter "Culture for All" promotes access to art and cultural values for all Lithuanian social layers, ensures the drafting of regional programmes in order to minimize disparities in provinces and aims to ensure a close link between the development of local culture and regional social policy. However, the research study "Survey of Conditions of Regional Culture" (2009) revealed that the majority of respondents consider Lithuania's regional cultural policy insufficient. The possibilities to supply cultural demands for residents of regions are less than in big municipalities. While the state is the main supporter of above mentioned social cohesion programmes and action plans, there are more and more initiatives originating from NGO's and the private sector (Social Cohesion and Cultural Policies, 2011).

There are some indirect actions, which are taken to ensure regional development in Lithuania. They include special development programmes funded from the budget, which results in constructing of new roads, building of infrastructure institutions, establishing of national enterprises, etc. Undoubtedly, foreign investments are very important in regional cultural development, too. Foreign companies and their branches employ labor force, create markets and improve standards of life (Simanaviciene and Kilijonienė, 2005, p. 39). The main strategies of regional cultural development could be as follows: establishing institutions, changing infrastructure and promoting the realization of regional cultural policy which should guarantee permanent and balanced course of developments. Development should not simply mean the growth in population, but also satisfy people's well being, social, political, cultural and material stability.

ty (Macys, 2000, p. 252). Public culture sector institutions in Lithuania must also rethink resource management strategy they are using and explore different approaches in this field. The resource based view has been one of the most relevant theoretical approaches in Strategic Management. However, its use has not been widespread in public management practice (Melian-Gonzalez, Batista-Canino and Sanchez-Medina, 2010, p. 97). Culture governance at the present stage in Lithuania requires the deeper study of internationalization processes, which transform some ways of regional policy implementation. The relationship between political, economic and media powers well as the qualities of the constitutional and political system need to be studied also. Public managers directing transformational change in government should qualitatively analyze environmental factors, shaping concrete decisions formed and implemented in the context of New Public Governance:

- the loss of trust in Government and demands for reform;
- policy shifts and performance management directives;
- declining resources and aging technology;
- retirements and the hollowing out of government;
- changes in organizational culture and organizational structure;
- cooperation, collaboration and new delivery networks (Mcnabb, 2008, p. 35).

Speaking about the effects of EU regional policy on the development of Lithuania regional cultural policy, it is important to note that the financing of EU regional policy has grown markedly since 1975. If in 1975 regional policy accounted for only five per cent of the total of the EU budget, we can say that at present the EU regional policy makes up about a third of the total EU budget and is in the second place after the EU Common Agricultural policy, according to budget allocations for EU public policy. Its budget makes up 213 billion EUR for the period 2000–2006 (Nakrošis, 2003). Successful and responsible management of financial recourses in the context of cultural policy priorities implementation is also seen as the part of modern way for governing the cultural development in regions. Main documents making up the legal basis for implementing Lithuanian regional policy include the Republic of Lithuania's Law on Regional Development, documents of strategic importance to the state's regional policy (the Long-term Development Strategy of the State, the Long-term Economic Development Strategy of Lithuania, the Ordinary Territorial Plan of the Republic of Lithuania, the Cohesive Development Strategy, the Strategy of Lithuanian regional policy up until 2013) as well as various ru-

lings of the Lithuanian Government and acts approved by the Home Office that authorize methods for the preparation of regional development plans, identify the criteria of problem territories, and so on (Raugauskiene, 2005, p. 108). Bovaird and Loffler (2009) state that increased insistence by key stakeholders (and particularly the media) that new levels of public accountability are necessary, with associated transparency of decision making and openness of information systems is also an external factor driving public policy reform (Bovaird and Loffler, 2009, p. 16). If Lithuania wants to continue regional cultural policy transforming processes (from national regional policy to creative regional cultural policy in the field of culture sector development), it has to form new systems for citizens participation, effective and efficient performance management in culture sector and increase the level of public private partnerships in cultural service delivery. Engaging with citizens is "a core element of good governance". Many theoreticians claim that the benefits include: improving the quality of policy-making by allowing the government to tap wider sources of information, perspectives and potential solutions; facilitating greater and faster interaction between citizens and governments; increasing accountability and transparency, which in turn increase representativeness and public confidence (Martin, 2009, p. 280).

Promotion of creativity, openness of national culture aims should be to stimulate international cultural cooperation, representation of national culture abroad and culture of other nations in Lithuania that is why participation in cultural life should be also oriented towards accessibility and creation of conditions for society and communities to take part in various forms of cultural activities.

Culture for Lithuania represents an important strategic dimension of conducting international relations through diplomacy. Lithuanian's international cultural policy is based on the view that the EU is not only about political, economic and social integration leading to the creation of the common European market, but that the European project is also about building common values and a community of culture and civilization. It values its national culture, but argues that national culture expresses itself only in interaction with other cultures. Regional cultural policy in the context of New Public Governance is getting more and more dependent on different networking forms. Social networks as systems (or subsystems) can be temporal, structural makings which perform the functions of expert temporary commissions, institutions, committees, which act realizing both general and specific aims of interests groups. Social networks performing in such conditions and carrying certain ge-

neral or special tasks or functions develop and improve themselves as social systems and subsystems – saying in other words the functions they execute enable and compel the structures to improve institutionally and increase the effectiveness of their activity (Lin, 2003, p. 39).

Regional cultural policy transformation in the context of New Public Governance in Lithuania is seen as continues process, during which the role of different regional organizations is increasing, the changing circumstances of decision making and implementation provide new challenges for human resource management in culture sector. Regional cultural policy transformation can bring both good and not so expected changes in regional culture service delivery that is why it is relevant to identify regional cultural policy influence factors on developing a creative economy in Lithuania.

### **Regional cultural policy influence on developing a creative economy in Lithuania**

When multi-level governance (New Public Governance) is linked with regional regulation, then this new approach makes much more sense. Regional cultural policy in the context of New Public Governance can influence the processes of developing a creative economy. The emergence of European law has changed the way national governments operate in Europe, as they face a common regulatory framework for the delivery of many services (including cultural services). This “Europeanization” of the nation-state involves also the monitoring of state compliance by means of supranational mechanisms (Lane, 2009, p. 114).

Analyzing and trying to identify ways of developing a creative economy in Lithuania, it is important to say, that enhanced interregional Baltic and European cooperation provides a clear focus of Lithuania’s international cultural policy and its impact on creative economy in the country. Its interregional cooperation within the Council of Baltic Sea States is firmly established, as it participates in *Ars Baltica*. Furthermore Lithuania participates in the Nordic Baltic Eight, the Nordic Council of Ministers, and e-Pine (“Enhanced partnership in Northern Europe,” 8+1). Lithuanian regional cultural policy can help the country to develop a creative economy in a more efficient way.

Up to July 2010, units of county administrations functioned at regional level. The role of counties in cultural policy issues and the decision making process was rather weak. Inter-ministerial co-operation usually functions when ad-hoc governmental commissions, committees, working groups, etc. are established. The Ministry of Culture naturally coo-

perates with other ministries (horizontal ties) in matters relating to copyright, heritage and terrains protection, local self-government, tourism, international cultural co-operation and representation of Lithuanian culture abroad, as well as in the fields of economy, social affairs, education in the arts, media, etc. (Liutkus, 2010, p. 8). Some changes made in regional cultural policy formation and implementation (including refusal of county administrations system) offer new and modern directions for the development of the creative economy. Current theories in public governance are based on the idea that cultures are creative and changing, full of internal contestation, and dependent on social positioning. Cultures are therefore inescapably hybrid and permeable. That is why creative economy can not be seen and identified without the cultural influence on it. The level of developing a creative economy in Lithuania is not very high, but new forms of cultural and creative industries can increase it. ENCATC (the leading European network on Cultural Management and Cultural Policy education), essential Arts Research Sources: National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and Alliance for Arts, also Cultural Policy and the Arts National Data Archive (CPANDA) (includes analysis and research findings from major reports) provide a lot of useful information about developing a creative economy on the influence of regional cultural policy. Cultural Policy Journals: *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*; *International Journal of Arts Management*; *Journal of Cultural Economics*; *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (formerly the *European Journal of Cultural Policy*); *Cultural Trends* – are those sources, where countries can find the latest data about creative economy also.

Creative industries (the part of creative economy) have an important social significance and in that way they influence cultural changes in local production and consumption. What needs to be highlighted, however, is that it is precisely by looking at the creative industries that we can most easily see the processes of cultural transition at work (Primorac, 2006). In the second half of the twentieth century, the growth of the cultural industries accelerated. A number of factors were involved: rising prosperity in the global North, increasing leisure time, rising levels of literacy, links between the new medium of television and new discourses of consumerism, the increasing importance of “cultural hardware” (hi-fi, TV sets, and later VCRs and personal computers) for the consumer. The term “creative industries” was adopted primarily in order to promote the development of industries based on the exploitation of intellectual property, and traces the genealogy of such thinking in a number of strands of analysis. Whilst the cultural and creati-



ve industries have achieved much recognition in policy circles, however, it could be argued that very little actual policy has been developed even at the local level (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt, 2005). Regional cultural policy influence on developing a creative economy in Lithuania occurs within specific regional projects and programs, based mostly on cultural and creative industries. Main directions how regional cultural policy influences the developing of creative economy in Lithuania are: urban development, the delivery of technology services, cultural and creative industries, citizens' participation in different programs and projects, public private partnership, strengthening the competitiveness. The role of technology delivery in a more efficient way in every sector of organizations should be increased. A number of important limiting factors must be considered when designing and integrating new technology into public agency operations. Among these are:

- the high initial cost of technology and its implementation;
- the penalties associated with selecting the wrong technology system;
- longer than anticipated time needed to implement a technology change;
- the high cost of training or hiring new staff to operate the system (Mcnabb, 2008, p. 108).

That is why leadership in the context of regional cultural policy, democratic decision-making, and modernization of measurement and control systems trying to develop the creative economy in Lithuania should be sufficiently analyzed and implemented. Some theoreticians argue that all industries are cultural industries, because all industries are involved in the production of goods and services (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt, 2005, p. 8). In this case, the most important thing is national strategic orientations and priorities in the context of regional cultural policy, because only how country wants to manage its creative economy can explain its concrete policies in the context of cultural and creative industries. Governance obliges governments to cooperate in new ways with non-governmental actors and to create networks and structures for successful decision-making in regional cultural policies. The delicate balance of government engagement without government domination is one of the major challenges of governance processes (Andrew and Gattinger, 2005, p. 2).

Despite some definitional, statistical, and conceptual problems, creative economy in Lithuania could be developed more efficiently by using regional cultural policy procedures. A great attraction of cultural industries policy in Lithuania, at the urban,

regional and national levels, for many politicians and advisors, could be seen to be even more economically relevant, but summarizing the research it is important to state, that regional cultural policy changes in the context of New Public Governance require first of all knowledge sharing, best practice analysis, secondly, new skills for programs and projects implementation in the ever changing environment.

## Conclusions

1. Main aspects and factors of New Public Governance are quite similar to the well known New Public Management paradigm, but most important difference between the New Public Governance and New Public Management is that New Public Governance comes closer to ethical governance. Theoretical/methodological framework of New Public Governance consists of main theoretical approaches, such as the governance theory, or the network governance model. In order to understand better new coming changes in regional cultural policy formation and implementation arena, it is important to know main factors of New Public Governance, develop its definition seeking to increase the level of good modern governance theory and practice.

2. Regional cultural policy transformation in the context of New Public Governance in Lithuania is seen as a continuous process, during which the role of different regional organizations is increasing, the changing circumstances of decision making and implementation provide new challenges for human resource management in culture sector. Most regions in the context of New Public Governance in Lithuania are modernized and developed according to their specificity and formulated goals for the strengthening of regions identity and economy. Taking into consideration the fact, that Lithuanian culture governance is growing, but still there are a lot of problems in the context of regional cultural policy development, a country should rethink its regional cultural policy goals and plans for implementation according to the national regional policy strategic orientations and try to establish performance management as well as leadership issues in the context of regional cultural development both at the national and regional levels.

3. Regional cultural policy influence on developing a creative economy in Lithuania occurs within specific regional projects and programs, based mostly on cultural and creative industries. But still the level of creative economy in Lithuania is not high. Regional cultural policy instruments could help make some changes in creative economy development in the context of New Public Governance.

## References

1. Alperyte, I. (2010). Business Culture in Lithuania: Trying to Fill Institutional Voids. In *Business Management. 6th International Scientific Conference selected papers*, (303-310). Vilnius: Gediminas Technical University.
2. Andrew, C., Gattinger, M. (2005). Accounting for Culture: Thinking Through Cultural Citizenship. In Andrew C., Gattinger, M., Jeannotte, M. S. and Straw, W. (Eds.), *Accounting for Culture: Thinking through Cultural Citizenship*, (1-9). Ottawa: The University of Ottawa Press.
3. Bouckaert, G., Dooren, W. V. (2009). Performance Measurement and Management in Public Sector Organizations. In Bovaird, T. & Loeffler, E. (Eds.), *Public Management and Governance*, (151-165). London: Routledge.
4. Bovaird, T., Loeffler, E. (2009). The Changing Context of Public Policy. In Bovaird, T. & Loeffler, E. (Eds.), *Public Management and Governance* (15-27). London: Routledge.
5. Bucinkas, A., Raipa, A., Pauliukeviciute, A. (2010). Modern Aspects of Implementation of Cultural Policy. In *Bridges*. Klaipėda: Klaipėda University. Vol. 4, 1-14.
6. Collard, S. (1998). Architectural Gestures and Political Patronage: the Case of the Grands Travaux. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. Victoria: Routledge: Vol. 5 (1), 33-47.
7. Current Issues in Cultural Policy Development and Debate. (2011). *Compendium. Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe*. Prieiga per internetą: <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/lithuania.php?aid=41>
8. Dubinas, V. (2007). The Challenges in Regional Management in Lithuania. In *Vadyba/Management*. Klaipėda: West Lithuania Business College: Nr. 2 (17), 5-8.
9. Evans, G. (2001). *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance?* London: Routledge.
10. Graužinis A. (2001). Lietuvos regioninė struktūra Europos Sąjungos kontekste. *Regionų plėtra – 2001. Tarptautinės mokslinės konferencijos pranešimų medžiaga*, (1-143). Kaunas: Technologija.
11. Hesmondhalgh, D., Pratt, A. C. (2005). Cultural Industries and Cultural Policy. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, (1-14), London: Routledge, 11 (1).
12. Kettl, D., Fesler, J. W. (2009). *The Politics of the Administrative Process*. 4th Edition. Washington D.C. CO Press.
13. Lane, J. E. (2009). *State Management*. London: Routledge.
14. Lin, N. (2003). *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Cambridge University Press.
15. Liutkus, V. (2010). Compendium Cultural Trends in Europe – Country Profile Lithuania. *Council of Europe/ERICarts: "Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe"*, 12th edition 2011.
16. Long, J. J., Bramham, P. (2006). Joining Up Policy Discourses and Fragmented Practices: the Precarious Contribution of Cultural Projects to Social Inclusion. In *Policy and Politics*. Bristol: The Policy Press. Vol. 34 (1), 133-51.
17. Mačys, G. (2000). Regionų ekonominė plėtra: analizės metodika ir finansiniai šaltiniai. In Mačys, G. & Stempkauskas, V. (Eds.), *Ekonomika ir vadyba – 2000, aktualijos ir metodologija. Tarptautinės konferencijos pranešimų medžiaga*, (252-254). Kaunas: Technologija.
18. Madden, Ch., Bloom, T. (2004). Creativity, Health and Arts Advocacy. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Victoria: Routledge: Vol. 10 (2), 133-56.
19. Martin, S. (2009). Engaging with Citizens and Stakeholders. In Bovaird, T. & Loeffler, E. (Eds.), *Public Management and Governance* (279-297). London: Routledge.
20. McNabb O. E. (2008). *The New Face of Government*. New York. CRC Press. Preface XV.
21. Melian-Gonzalez, A., Batista-Canino, R. M., Sanchez-Medina, A. (2011). Identifying and Assessing Valuable Resources and Core Capabilities in Public Organizations. In *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. SAGE Publications. Vol 76 (1), 97-114.
22. Melnikas, B. (2007). Integral Cultural Space in Europe: Equal Rights and Transition Processes in the Eastern and Central European Countries. In *Public Policy and Administration*. Kaunas: Technology. Nr. 21, 7-18.
23. Nakrošis, V. (2003). *Europos Sąjungos regioninė politika ir struktūrinio fondo valdymas*. Vilnius: Eugrimas.
24. Potuček, M. (2004). *The Capacities to Govern in Central and Eastern Europe*. High Level Meeting. Bratislava, NISPAcee.
25. Primorac, J. (2006). *The Position of Cultural Workers in Creative Industries. The South-Eastern European Perspective*. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation.
26. Raipa, A. (2011). Naujojo viešojo valdymo indikatorių diagnostavimo galimybės. In *Viešoji politika ir administravimas*. 10 (2). 167-182.
27. Ragauskienė, E. (2005). The Implementation of Regional Policy in Lithuania. In *Ekonomika/Economics*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas. Nr. 72.
28. Schedler, K. (2009). Process Management in Public Sector Organizations. In Bovaird, T. & Loeffler, E. (Eds.), *Public Management and Governance* (181-199). London: Routledge.
29. Simanavičienė, Ž., Kilijonienė, A. (2005). The Evaluation of Implementation of Regional Policy. In *Engineering Economics*, Kaunas: Technologija: No 4 (44), 37-42.
30. Slapkauskas, V. (2010). The Inner Tensions of Legal Culture in Consumer Society. In *Jurisprudence*. Vilnius: Mykolas Romeris University: Vol. 4 (122), 371-385.
31. Social Cohesion and Cultural Policies. (2011). *Compendium. Specific policy issues and recent debates*. Access on internet: <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/lithuania.php?aid=428>.
32. *UNESCO Chair in Cultural Policy and Cultural Management*. (2011). Access on Internet: <http://www.unesco.org/en/unitwin/access-by-region/europe-and-north-america/lithuania/unesco-chair-in-cultural-policy-and-cultural-management-412/>.

## Regioninės kultūros politikos pokyčiai naujojo viešojo valdymo kontekste: kūrybinės ekonomikos vystymas Lietuvoje

### Santrauka

Naujojo viešojo valdymo kontekste atsiskleidžia keletas labai aktualių regionų kultūros politikos veiksnių ir galimi regionų kultūros politikos įgyvendinimo besivystančiose šalyse metodai. Atsižvelgiant į tai, kad šiuolaikinio viešojo (naujojo) valdymo metodika nėra objektyviai ištirta ir nėra tinkamai atskirti sprendimai, susiję su regionų kultūros politikos problemomis (pavyzdžiui, trūksta efektyvaus išteklių naudojimo, nėra daug kokybiško vadovavimo pavyzdžių ir kt.), svarbu pateikti regionų kultūros politikos transformacijos analizę šiuolaikiniame valdymo etape, pabrėžiant visų lygių organizacijų veiklos valdymo vaidmenų svarbą, tarpsektorinio bendradarbiavimo reikšmę. Regioninio identiteto formavimosi ir išsaugojimo klausimai, kultūros paveldo puoselėjimas, regiono patrauklumo didinimas – visa tai šiuolaikinės regioninės kultūros politikos formavimo ir įgyvendinimo kontekste įgauna ypatingą prasmę. Regioninės kultūros politikos kryptys reikalauja unikalaus tyrimo, tačiau pripažįstant tarptautinio konteksto svarbą šiuolaikinėje viešojo valdymo praktikoje, šiame straipsnyje visų pirma nagrinėjamas teorinis-metodologinis naujojo viešojo valdymo pamatas, taip pat pristatoma ir analizuojama regionų kultūros politikos transformacija Lietuvoje, atsižvelgiant į naujojo viešojo valdymo kontekstą, identifikuojama regioninės kultūros politikos įtaka kūrybinės ekonomikos vystymui Lietuvoje.

Svarbiausia straipsnyje analizuojama problema išreikšta klausimu: kokie pagrindiniai regioninės kultūros politikos naujojo viešojo valdymo kontekste pokyčiai? Lietuvos regioninės kultūros politikos atvejo tyrimas suteikia galimybę analizuoti strateginius regioninės kultūros plėtros prioritetus, padeda išsiaiškinti kūrybinės ekonomikos sistemos šalyje vystymosi priežastis ir aprašyti, kokį poveikį regionų kultūros politikai atneša valstybės kultūros sektoriaus valdymas. Šio straipsnio **tikslas** – išanalizuoti regionų kultūros politikos pokyčius Lietuvoje naujojo viešojo valdymo kontekste. Straipsnio **objektas** – Lietuvos regionų kultūros politika besivystančios kūrybinės ekonomikos kontekste. Pagrindiniai **uždaviniai**: išnagrinėti teorinį-metodologinį naujojo viešojo valdymo pagrindą; išanalizuoti regionų kultūros politikos transformacijas naujojo viešojo valdymo laikotarpiu Lietuvoje; nustatyti regioninės kultūros politikos įtaką kuriant kūrybišką ekonomiką Lietuvoje.

Straipsnyje naudojami šie tyrimo **metodai**: mokslinės literatūros analizė, aprašomasis metodas, metaanalizė, sisteminio vertinimo, teorinio modeliavimo metodai. Lietuvos kultūros valdymo veiksmingumas galėtų būti skatinamas įgyvendinant skirtingas regioninės politikos kryptis. Svarbu pabrėžti, kad nėra pusiausvyros tarp įvairių politikos įgyvendinimo sprendimų, taip pat stengiantis pereiti iš naujosios viešosios vadybos paradigmos prie naujojo viešojo valdymo praktikos.

Regionų kultūros politikos transformacija reikalauja gilių metodologinių studijų ir ilgalaikių mokslinių tyrimų rezultatų analizės. Tačiau naujojo viešojo valdymo praktikos srityje panašių tyrimų nėra atlikta daug. Naujojo viešojo valdymo pagrindiniai aspektai ir veiksniai yra gana panašūs į gerai žinomą naujosios viešosios vadybos paradigmą. Tačiau svarbiausias skirtumas tarp naujojo viešojo valdymo ir naujosios viešosios vadybos yra tas, kad naujasis viešasis valdymas labiau akcentuoja etišką valdymą. Naujojo viešojo valdymo teorinį-metodologinį pagrindą sudaro pagrindiniai teoriniai požūriai: valdymo teorija, valdymo tinklo modelis ir pan. Siekiant geriau suprasti pokyčius regionų kultūros politikos formavimo ir įgyvendinimo arenoje, svarbu žinoti pagrindinius naujojo viešojo valdymo veiksnius, ryškėjančius konkrečiame kontekste. Regioninės kultūros politikos transformacijos Lietuvoje naujojo viešojo valdymo laikotarpiu suprantamos kaip ilgalaikis procesas, kurio metu įvairių regioninių organizacijų vaidmuo didėja, sprendimų priėmimo ir įgyvendinimo aplinkybės nuolat keičiasi (reikalinga gebėti adaptuotis prie kintančios aplinkos), formuojasi nauji iššūčiai žmoniškųjų išteklių valdymui kultūros sektoriuje. Atsižvelgiant, kad Lietuvos kultūros valdymas modernėja, bet vis dar yra daug problemų regionų kultūros politikos vystymo kontekste, šalis turėtų permąstyti savo regionų kultūros politikos tikslus ir įgyvendinimo planus pagal nacionalinės regioninės politikos strateginės gaires ir pabandyti nustatyti veiklos valdymo bei vadovavimo klausimus regionų kultūros plėtroje tiek nacionaliniu, tiek regioniniu lygmeniu. Regionų kultūros politikos įtaka kuriant kūrybingą ekonomiką Lietuvoje pasireiškia per konkrečius regioninius projektus ir programas, daugiausia inicijuotus kultūros ir kūrybinės pramonės šakų kontekste. Kūrybinės ekonomikos lygis Lietuvoje nėra pakankamai aukštas, todėl regioninės kultūros politikos priemonės galėtų padėti atlikti kai kuriuos pakeitimus kūrybinės ekonomikos plėtroje naujojo viešojo valdymo teorinių postulatų įgyvendinimo laikotarpiu. Lietuvos regioninės politikos prioritetą iki 2013 m. yra lygiavertė Lietuvos teritorinė ekonominė plėtra, kryptingas ir koordinuotas ilgalaikis ekonominės plėtros ir skirtingų sektorių konkurencingumo skatinimas. Nacionalinę regioninę politiką Lietuvoje apibrėžia dvi kryptys: ekonominės plėtros skatinimas ir gyvenimo kokybės gerinimas (savi-valdybių lygiu).

Regioninės kultūros politikos pokyčiai naujojo viešojo valdymo laikotarpiu keičia ne tik politikos prioritetus, bet ir įgyvendinimo metodus, požiūrį į pačios politikos reikšmingumą, todėl naujus ir modernius metodus konkrečioje aplinkoje reikia įgyvendinti atsakingai, prieš tai atlikus tyrimus ir situacijos analizę.

**Pagrindiniai žodžiai:** regioninė kultūros politika, naujasis viešasis valdymas, kūrybinės ir kultūros industrijos, kūrybinė ekonomika.