

## Is Regularity (Trend, Tendency) Regarding Permanent Enlargement (Growing) of Government Sector also Applicable for Lithuania?

**Dr. Algirdas Astrauskas**  
University of Mykolas Romeris  
Ateities g. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania

### Abstract

*This article contains research, which was aimed to examine if and how regularity (trend, tendency) regarding permanent enlargement (growing) of government sector discovered in scientists' V. Obrazcovas, E. S. Savas and E. E. Jančiauskas monograph was present in Lithuania between 1919 and 2013, measuring it by the number of public government sector units (or to be more specific – by the number of administrative-territorial units of a state).*

**Keywords:** Public sector, enlargement of public sector, public government

### Introduction

Lithuanian Law University (Mykolas Romeris University at present) published the monograph by Vladimiras Obrazcovas, Emanuel Steve Savasir Eduardas Enrikas Jančiauskas *State and local government property management and privatization: Theory and Practice* (Obzazcovas, Savas, Jančiauskas 2003). The above scientists, applying various scientific research methods, have revealed a number of regularities (trends, tendencies) regarding government sector's size and its changes. One of such revealed regularities (trends, tendencies) was regularity (trend, tendency) of *government sector's permanent enlargement (growing)* i.e. with years under the influence of certain factors (the scientists have named the main factors in the monograph), government sector has a tendency to permanently expand (grow). V. Obrazcovas, E. S. Savas and E. E. Jančiauskas have revealed such regularity (trend, tendency) by presenting important theoretical statements and by analysing factual (statistical) information about government sector's size and enlargement in the United States of America during the period of 1942-2007 by three measures: number of government sector's units, government sector's spending and number of government sector's employees.

The author of this article, when studying the theoretical statements by above mentioned scientists, has noticed, that the latter have not had a unambiguous definition of *government sector* when analysing this sector and regularities (trends, tendencies) relating its size and enlargement (growing). In their scientific work they have used not one, but several – *government sector, public sector and public government sector* - definitions still not making it clear if they are used as similar or different (if so, how) definitions. This, according to the author of this article, is described as significant factor which can determine completed results of scientific research (including revealed consistent patterns).

The author of this article assumes that the scientists have associated those definitions (just named them differently) with the definition of *public sector*, which covers not one, but two sub-sectors – *public government sub-sector* and *sub-sector, providing public services*. The author of this article agrees with scientists' Vladimiras Obrazcovas, Emanuel Steve Savas and Eduardas Enrikas Jančiauskas revealed regularity (trend, tendency) of *government sector's permanent enlargement (growing)*, however only to an extent in which government sector definition covers public government sub-sector and at the same time he tends to doubt about the 'whole' government sector's (i.e. public sector, also including public government as well as public services sub-sector's) permanent enlargement (growing) regularity (trend, tendency).

This is why the author of this publication has raised himself a question if and if so how the regularity (trend, tendency) *regarding government sector's (to be more specific – public government sector) enlargement (growing)* described by the scientists Vladimiras Obrazcovas, Emanuel Steve Savas and Eduardas Enrikas Jančiauskas is present in Lithuania?

In the aim to answer himself this question, the author of this article, similarly to the scientists mentioned above, has performed a research about ,confirmed‘ / ‘non-confirmed‘ public government sector’s enlargement (growing) regularity (trend, tendency), by analysing the first public government sector’s measure, which, according to the scientists above, best describes the number of public government sector’s units at all public government (national and sub-national) levels as well as its changes over a certain period of time. In the table 1.2.1 ,Number of Government units in USA‘ [5, 24] of the above mentioned monograph, there are facts presented that, in fact, during a period between 1942-2007 there was an increase in number of states (from 42 to 50), municipalities (from 16 220 to 19 371), and districts, which had special competences‘ institutions in operation (from 8299 to 34 683).

The author of this article, when conducting other scientific research, had noticed, that in Lithuania, as well as other countries‘ the nature of public government and its greatly influenced number of public government sector’s units (or to be more specific –administrative-territorial units of a state and equivalent institutions of territorial government) have noticeably changed during different periods of time. During the whole period of 1919-2013 Lithuania has remained an unitary state with 3-4 public government levels, however, the model of public government was different. As a result, in order to conduct a premeditated research and to check scientific hypothesis regarding regularity (trend, tendency) of *public government sector’s permanent enlargement (growing)* by evaluating the number of public government sector’s units, the following periods have been selected:

1. Period from 1919 to 1939 (when Lithuania has re-established its independence and has been functioning as an independent state),
2. Period from 1945 to 1990 (when Lithuania has become a Soviet Republic),
3. Period from 1990 to 2013 (when Lithuania has again re-gained its state independence and is functioning as a democratic state).

**Aim of the article** is to present a research, which is meant to ,check‘ if and how regularity (trend, tendency) of *government sector’s permanent enlargement (growing)*, measured by the number of public government sector’s units has appeared in Lithuania during a selected period of time.

### ***Number of Public Government Sector’S Units in Lithuania during the Period of 1919-1939***

Total number of public government sector’s units at all government levels in Lithuania did fluctuate (either increasing or decreasing) during the period between 1919-1939 (**Table 1**). The line number 5 in the Table 1 does not sort of reflect the regularity (trend, tendency) of consistent increase in number of public government sector units in Lithuania during the period of 1919-1939 (it reflects the opposite more). However, such a judgement (at the same time the regularity (trend, tendency) of *government sector’s permanent enlargement (growing)*, based on number of public government sector’s units dynamics) would be unjust. In order to ensure the, presence ‘of such regularity (trend, tendency), it is necessary to divide the 1919-1939 periods into two sub-periods:

1. The period up to 1927, when in 1918, after restoration of independence of Lithuania there was a democratic state being created for eight years with English type of local self-government system,
2. The period from 1928 onwards, when after state breakthrough in 1926, the authoritarian regime has been established with its adequate state division into administrative units and French type of local self government system.

No	Public government level	1919-1920	1923-1924	1927	1931-1934	1938-1939
1.	<b>National level of public government (legislative, executive and judicial authorities)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
2.	<b>Regions with autonomy (<i>kraštai</i>)</b>	-	<b>1***</b>	<b>1***</b>	<b>1***</b>	<b>1***</b>
3.	<b>Administrative- territorial units of higher level (without Klaipėda autonomy region)</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>Administrative- territorial units of higher level (with Klaipėda autonomy region)</b>	-	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>34</b>
3.1.	Counties (without Klaipėda autonomy region)	20*	20	20**	20**	20**
	Counties (with Klaipėda autonomy region)		(20+3***)	(20+3***)	(20+3***)	(20+3***)
3.2.	Cities with counties' rights (without Klaipėda autonomy region)	4*	4	5**	-	-
	Cities with counties' rights (with Klaipėda region)		(4+1***)	(5+1***)		
3.3.	Cities (without Klaipėda autonomy region)	-	-	-	10**	10
	Cities (with Klaipėda autonomy region)	-	-	-	(10**+1)	(10+1)
4.	<b>Administrative- territorial units of lower level without Klaipėda autonomy region)</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>283</b>
4.1.	Rural districts ( <i>valsčiai</i> ) and towns (without autonomy Klaipėda region)	299* (277+22)	304 (282+22)	270**/299 (270**+29)	-	-
4.2.	Rural districts ( <i>valsčiai</i> ) and secondary towns (without autonomy Klaipėda region)	-	-	-	270** (251+19)**	283 (244+39)
5.	<b>TOTAL (without Klaipėda autonomy region)</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>315</b>
	<b>TOTAL (with Klaipėda autonomy region)</b>	-	<b>334</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>319</b>

\*Number of counties and rural districts (*valsčiai*) according to the Law on administrative-territorial units (1919 the 26th of July (including Suvalkai, Seinai and Trakaiditrics, part of which was taken by Poland in 1920)

\*\*According to the research of R. Stačiokas

\*\*\*Klaipėda autonomy region, which was joined to Lithuania in 1924, had 3 counties, (which are not usually shown on maps)

**Table 1: State Government and State Administrative Units in Lithuania During 1919-1939**

**Source:** Gliožaitis, A. A. 2008. *Lithuanian administrative division on maps*. Gairės.: Lithuanian Statistical yearbooks of 1923-1938; Stačiokas. R., 1991. *Lithuanian municipal development*. Research and Training centre of Vilnius University.

Each of the period's ,shows 'public government sector units 'growing (or at least non decreasing) tendency at all public government levels:

1. During the period of 1919 -1927, number of public units with autonomy has grown (from 0 to 1), number of counties has remained the same (20), number of cities with counties' rights has grown (from 4 to 5), and also the number of rural districts (*valsčiai*) and towns has not decreased.
2. During the period of 1928-1939 while number of public units with autonomy, counties and cities has remained the same, the number of rural districts (*valsčiai*) and secondary towns has grown (from 270 to 283).

This brings out the following important conclusions (assumptions, to be precise), which had been examined during research and analysing other periods (to confirm they are correct):

- 1) The regularity (trend, tendency) regarding the enlargement (growing) of number of public government sector's units in essence is also present in Lithuania.
- 2) The number of public government sector units usually has a tendency to consistently increase during a certain period of time, when there is created and successfully functioning the same model of public government system (in present case – the system of administrative-territorial units of a state). For one reason or the other qualitative changes to public government sector units' system may mean that existing tendency of public government sector units' enlargement may come to an 'end'. However, later on, with the quality changes in public government system, the new tendency of public government sector units 'enlargement begins'.

### ***Number of Public Government Sector'S Units in Lithuania During 1945 To 1990***

During the period of 1945-1990 (**Table 2**) when Lithuania was part of Soviet Union, the number of public government sector units (in the given case – the number of administrative-territorial units of a state) has been determined by the centralised totalitarian government system and planned economy.

During 44-45 year period there have been 4-5 major changes in the territorial- administrative unit's system within Soviet Union republics, including socialist Lithuania: types of units and/or their number. This is why it useful to evaluate the regularity (trend, tendency) regarding public government sector's enlargement based on number of public government sector units by dividing this period into sub-periods:

1. *Period between 1945 to 1951* when pre-war Lithuanian administrative-territorial units system's elements like rural districts (*valsčiai*) and secondary towns still played an important role (even though the 'new' system's seeds were being planted – cities of republican subordination (5), districts (*rajonai*) (as many as 2884) and the like). In this period, there is an obvious tendency of increase in number of higher level administrative- territorial units' (from 31 to 57), (like counties, cities of republic subordination), which, with the number of rural districts (*valsčiai*) and secondary towns remaining the same (320), has determined the tendency of overall growth of number of public government sector units at all levels of public government (increased from 352 to 379).
2. *period between 1951 to 1959* when experiments took place among Soviet Union republics', including Lithuanian system of administrative-territorial units, in the search of the best system of administrative-territorial units, which would best work in centralised government system and planned economy. In 1951, there has been a major change put in place - ex-counties (*apskritis*) and rural districts (*valsčiai*) as well as secondary towns have been dissolved and a new, four level public government system, has been created with new three level system of administrative - territorial units (4 regions (*sritis*) (there has never been any equivalent in Lithuania before this), 87 districts (*rajonai*) (instead of 49 counties (*apskritis*)), 2774 *apylinkės* (rural territories), 65 towns of district subordination and 7 urban-type settlements (which replaced rural districts (*valsčiai*) and secondary towns). Such a transition is a clear evidence of how one public government sector units' system (in the present case – the system of administrative-territorial units of a state) has been replaced by a different system with far greater number of administrative-territorial units which are also different by nature. However the results of the first experiment were not that successful and due to this the obvious excesses were being corrected as early as in 1954: the 4 regions (*sritis*) were dissolved, districts (*rajonai*) were enlarged and at the same time the number of cities of republic subordination was increased, number of *apylinkės* (rural territories) was reduced (by half), at the same time the number of towns of district subordination was significantly increased (from 65 to 81) as well as number of urban-type settlements was increased (from 7 to 17).

No.	Public government level	1945	1949	1951	1954	1963	1979	1989
1.	<b>Highest level of state government (legislative, executive and judicial authorities)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
2.	<b>Higher level of administrative-territorial units</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>
2.1.	Regions ( <i>sritys</i> )	-	-	4	-	-	-	-
2.2.	Counties ( <i>apskritis</i> )	26	49	-	-	-	-	-
2.3.	Cities of Republic subordination	5	5	5	7	8	11	11
2.4.	Districts ( <i>rajonai</i> )	-	-	87	83	41***	44	44
3.	<b>Lower level of administrative-territorial units</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>2851</b>	<b>1310</b>	<b>1265</b>	<b>642</b>	<b>533</b>
3.1.	Rural districts ( <i>valsčiai</i> ) and secondary towns	320	320	-	-	-	-	-
3.2.	Districts of Cities of Republic subordination	-	5	5	5	5	7	7
3.3.	Towns of district subordination	-	-	65	81	83	81	81
3.4.	Urban-type settlements	7*	7*	7	17	21	22	22
3.5.	<i>Apylinkės</i> (rural territories)	2866*	2772*	2774	1207**	1156 653***	532	423
4.	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>2948</b>	<b>1401</b>	<b>1315</b>	<b>698</b>	<b>589</b>

\**Apylinkės* (rural territories) have been created since 1940, however did not play any significant role til 1951. In 1951, after dissolving the rural districts (*valsčiai*), *apylinkės* (rural territories) have become more important. In 1946, first urban-type settlements have been created, however they were more like a type of residential places. As of 1951, urban-type settlements have become an administrative unit.

\*\*In 1954 the number of *apylinkės* (rural territories) has been significantly decreased by a Lithuanian SSR presidium decree, in order to strengthen the role of *apylinkės* (rural territories) councils'.

\*\*\*Number of *apylinkės* (rural territories) has been greatly decreased for the second time in 1963 as a result of the fact that in seeking for the same goals, the number of districts (*rajonai*) had been reduced.

**Table 2: State Government And State Administrative Units in Lithuania During 1940-1989**

Source: Gliozaitis, A. A., 2008. *Lithuanian administrative division in maps*. Gairės.

3. *Period between 1963 to 1980-90s* during which, when socialist Lithuanian government has got more rights to rationalise the public government sector units' system in its territory (to be more specific – the system of administrative-territorial units of state), for the second time the excess public government sector's units were dissolved: in 1963 the districts (*rajonai*) have been enlarged (their number has decreased from 83 to 41) and again the number of *apylinkės* (rural territories) has been halved (from 1156 to 635). Number of *apylinkės* (rural territories) was gradually decreasing later as well up to 1989, until more or less optimal number had been reached (about 423).

Even though during the period between 1963 till 1989 the overall number of public government sector units has been decreasing, this was only caused by reducing excess number of *apylinkės* (rural territories) (they were forming the majority of units). The number of all other major administrative-territorial units (cities of republic subordination, towns of district subordination, urban-type settlements) was only growing. This clearly means, that the regularity (trend, tendency) regarding public government sector enlargement based on number of public government sector units is confirmed, however with the same as mentioned above and newly ,noticed' peculiarities.

*Therefore two more important scientific conclusions are drawn:*

1. *Due to important reasons, when changing not only the total public government sector units' system, but also single sub-systems/divisions by another quality sub-system/division, the regularity (trend, tendency) regarding public government sector units enlargement based on total number of public government sector units' if taken into account the number before and after the transition, may not be evident.*
2. *The public government sector enlargement tendency, based on majority of public government sector's internal elements (like certain important (significant) sub-systems or types of units (if the number of these sub-systems or types of units as well as the number of individual units in these sub-systems overall is not very big) of public government sector) may be overshadowed by one individual element of such system (for example – a decreasing tendency of one of public government sector's sub-systems or single units' type (usually even less important or not so significant) (especially if number of units in such a type of units is big on the whole)). Due to this the regularity (trend, tendency) regarding permanent enlargement of public government sector units' can be ,present' (be evident) only in separate public government sector sub-systems (or unit types). At the same time, public government sector indicators (for example, overall number of public government sector units), characterizing the whole of public government dynamics, caused by one of elements, that experienced a cardinal reduction (for example due to reduction of number of one type of units), can also be negative.*

### ***Number of Public Government Sector 'S Units in Lithuania during a Period from 1990 till Present***

During the period between 1990 through to 2010 (**Table 3**) the growth of total number of public government sector units in all of the public government levels from 566 units at the start of period to 618 units at the end of the period clearly confirms that there is a regularity (trend, tendency) in public government sector units' dynamics.

No	Public government level	1990	1995	2000	2013
1.	<b>National level of public government (legislative, executive and judicial authorities)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
2.	<b>Administrative- territorial units of higher level</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1.	Cities of national importance	11	-	-	-
2.2.	Districts ( <i>rajonai</i> )	44	-	-	-
2.3.	Counties ( <i>apskritis</i> )	-	10	10	10
3.	<b>Lower level state administrative territorial units</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>
3.1.	Towns of regional importance	71	-	-	-
3.2.	Urban-type settlements	14	-	-	-
3.3.	<i>Apylinkės</i> (rural territories)	413	-	-	-
3.4.	Joint units	12	-	-	-
3.5.	Urban municipalities	-	12	7	7
3.6.	Rural municipalities	-	44	43	43
3.7.	Municipalities	-	-	10	10
4.	<b>Additional administrative territorial units</b>	-	<b>524</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>546</b>
4.1.	Wards	-	524	-	-
4.2.	Territories administrated by wards	-	-	537	546
5.	<b>TOTAL: (without additional units)</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>71</b>
6.	<b>TOTAL: (with additional units)</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>618</b>

**Table 3: State Government and State Administrative Units in Lithuania during 1990-2013**

**Source:** Author's scientific publications [1; 2].

Still, there are two periods to be separated here:

- 1) Period up to 1995, when after regaining its independence, Lithuania was running a search for the best (optimum) model of public government system that would be suitable for democratic society and market economy. However it still had not fully liberated from elements that are typical in centralised government system (from such centralised government system claws). During this period a rather large number of public government sector units has still remained, in size, it hardly differed from the last Soviet period numbers.
- 2) Period after 1995, when number of lower level administrative-territorial units has been reduced by five times (in 1995 this number had been decreased from 510 to 56) and 10 new units – counties (*apskritis*) have been introduced. They were meant to implement regional policy, to exercise state supervision functions and to administer EU structural funds. After fundamentally having changed the system of administrative-territorial units in Lithuania (i.e. after qualitative change of such units'system has taken place), a 'new' enlargement tendency of public government sector units' (to be specific –administrative-territorial units of a state) has begun. Number of lower level units has increased from 56 to 60, also, the numbers of additional administrative units (i.e. up to the year 2000 wards and from 2000 – territories administrated by wards) have grown as well.

### Conclusions

After having analysed and evaluating the collected data and having done some calculations based on that, it is possible to state, that:

- 1) The regularity (trend, tendency) regarding permanent enlargement (growing) of public government sector that has been depicted by the scientists Vladimiras Obrazcovas, Emanuel Steve Savas and Eduardas Enrikas Jančiauskas is present in Lithuania. This is measured by the first measure – the number of public government sector units.
- 2) The regularity (trend, tendency) regarding permanent enlargement of public government sector units' does not mean that the indicators, characterizing public government sector, are gradually increasing all the time (indicator value during present year has to always be greater than the one from a year before and/or the value of such indicator at any given period of time has to be greater at the end of such period than it was at the start of it). Public government sector's 'growth' has the following features:

2.1) number of public government sector units *has a tendency to gradually grow for a certain defined period of time, during which, the same quality public government sector units' system is in operation.* When for one reason or the other there is a change in quality of public government sector units' system, such a tendency for public government sector units to gradually grow may 'come to an end'. However, later, after the quality transition of public government sector units' system is complete, the 'new' tendency of public government sector units' system enlargement 'begins'.

2.2) The public government sector's enlargement tendency, based on majority of public government sector's internal elements (like certain important (significant) sub-systems or types of units (if the number of these sub-systems and unit types overall is not very big) of public government sector) may be overshadowed by one individual element of such system (for example – a decreasing tendency of one of public government sector's sub-systems or single units' type (usually even less important or not so significant) (especially if number of units in such a sub-system or a type of units is big on the whole)). Due to this the *regularity regarding permanent enlargement of public government sector units' can be ,present' (be evident) only in separate public government sector sub-systems (or single units' types).* At the same time, *public government sector indicators* (for example, overall number of government (public administration) sector units), *characterizing the whole of public government dynamics*, caused by one of elements, that experienced a cardinal reduction (for example due to reduction of number of one type of units , *can also be negative.*

### **References**

- Astrauskas, A. 2006. „Territorial administration in Lithuania: current situation and problems to be solved”. *Lithuanian economic transformation in 1990-2005.* Economic and social studies. Collection of scientific articles (II) – Vilnius pedagogical institute publishing office. Vilnius: 93–112.
- Astrauskas, A. „Development of local self-government in Lithuania in 1990–2010”. *Public politics and administration.* ISSN 1648-2603. 2011, Vol 10, No. 2: 283–298
- Gliožaitis, A. A. 2008. *Lithuanian administrative division in maps.* Vilnius: Gairės. Lithuanian Statistical yearbooks 1923-1938.
- Obrazcovas, V., Savas, E. S., Jančiauskas E. E. 2003. *State and municipalities property management and privatization: theory and practice.* Monograph. Lithuanian Law University
- Stačiokas, R. 1991. *Development of Lithuanian municipalities.* Vilnius university research and teaching centre.