1 *Conceptual Paper*

2 Upstream Social Marketing for Implementing Mobile
3 Government

4 **Valentina Burksiene ¹*, Jaroslav Dvorak ² and Mantas Duda ³**

5 1 Department of Public Administration and Political Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities,
6   Klaipeda University, H. Manto 84, 92294 Klaipeda, Lithuania; valentina.burksiene@ku.lt
7 ² Department of Public Administration and Political Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities,
8   Klaipeda University, H. Manto 84, 92294 Klaipeda, Lithuania; jaroslav.dvorak@ku.lt
9 ³ Department of Public Administration and Political Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities,
10   Klaipeda University, H. Manto 84, 92294 Klaipeda, Lithuania; dudamantas@yahoo.com
11 * Correspondence: valentina.burksiene@ku.lt

12 **Abstract:** The article analyses the main aspects of upstream social marketing for implementing of
13 mobile government (MGov). The methodology of current research is based on the systematic
14 literature review in the fields of MGov and social marketing. According to our findings, most
15 researchers investigated MGov from the side of citizens (consumers) and emphasised the benefits to
16 them while changing their attitudes and behaviours in employing mobile applications. However, as
17 there is a lack of the researches from the side of governmental bodies, in this paper, we were contrary
18 looking for new meanings, attitudes and values from their perspective. Limitations of employment
19 of MGov occur due knowledge gap among decision makers and public policy formers (upstream
20 audience). Therefore, we argue that upstream social marketing for the upstream audience would
21 bring the success in faster MGov implementation. Specific social marketing would be mostly valuable
22 on the municipal level that is the closest substance to the society. Thus, in our paper we emphasise
23 the benefit of the MGov for the local upstream audience and propose possible external marketers as
24 well as the motivating theses based on these 7P of marketing mix for the successful MGov on
25 municipal level.

26 **Keywords:** upstream social marketing; mobile government; marketing mix; public services; public
27 administration; behavior

28

29 1. Introduction

30   Evolution of mobile technologies influences all public areas in both developing and developed
31 countries. Rapid changes in market of mobile technologies have turned to creation of new abilities in
32 both e government and e participation. Connectivity of mobile phone and internet has developed the
33 phenomenon of m-government that fostered transformation of public services [1]. The authors [2], [1],
34 [3], [4] revealed many advantages of mobile government (later in this paper - MGov) such as better
35 and faster availability, more personalization and democracy, real in time dialog, cost effectiveness and
36 simplicity, corruption prevention, emergency response, efficiency, etc.

37   MGov influences improvement of e - government and requires some specific adaptation or
38 rebuilding to mobile applications such as website design, layout, content, etc. The mobile
39 communication is used as a complementary perspective to explain user acceptance of MGov services
40 [5].

41   MGov user base is comprised of all classes of people as it requires little technological knowledge
42 [6]. MGov creates and/ or extents ability for the remote citizens to accept public services and public
43 information as well as to solve their everyday life problems within their municipality or even
44 nationally. New mobile applications make public servants as well as citizens to permanently learn and
45 innovate in order to participate in a public life.

46　　　Local governors, while receiving on time announcements on important local issues (i. e., rubbish,
47　road accidents, etc.) from the citizens, may react faster or in other words, to increase the quality of
48　public services and thus achieve higher quality in the particular living environment. This active
49　collaboration may develop and strengthen local governance (*de facto)* which is meant as a prerequisite
50　for happier society. Therefore, we argue that MGov would play a significant role (especially on the
51　level of municipal governance) bringing the benefit to both citizens and local public authorities.

52　　　Agreeing to [7] (p. 104) who state that „services should be delivered in ways with which the public
53　is already familiar and/ or in which users are actively engaged" we argue that MGov is closely related
54　to learning (or gaining the new knowledge) that leads to the changes in individual, social and public
55　attitudes, understanding and behaviour. It means that the learning (or gaining the knowledge) about
56　MGov should occur in all levels of the municipal structure.

57　　　Most papers of MGov are grounded on the behaviour theory and analyse mostly the issues of
58　attitudes and behaviours of the general public, individuals and society (see in [5]; [6]; [4]. Therefore,
59　[8] emphasize the role of public authorities, stating that the primary responsibility of government is
60　both to deliver essential community services and to provide information access to citizens while using
61　technological tools.

62　　　We argue that it is not enough only for the society members to be aware in mobile applications.
63　Contemporary IT knowledge and skills as well as the attitudes, understanding and behaviour of public
64　authorities seem to be much more important for the effective and high-quality government processes.
65　In other words, we argue that public leaders should be more concerned about developing MGov.

66　　　Shareef [6] (p.126) state that in many countries „public- service systems enjoy a monopoly and
67　suffer no competitive pressure to achieve efficiency and effectiveness ". But on the contrary,
68　democratic world with its directives makes changes of social environment trying to engage private
69　sector in public service systems for higher competitive pressure and therefore for higher service
70　quality. Thus, for instance, in EU (that is democratic in its origin) we probably deal with some other
71　issues in the MGov field. Pilot research of websites of Lithuanian municipalities revealed that only 33
72　of all 60 have been adopted to mobile applications. We perceive that the main issue of such situation
73　is a gap in specific knowledge and skills of local public leaders both in mobile applications and MGov.
74　It is worth to remind that Lithuania stands on the leading position in EU considering the IT network
75　and speed of the internet.

76　　　Therefore, we deal with the problem question: how to foster the knowledge about and improve
77　the skills of mobile applications among the public leaders for more effective MGov? That would lead
78　to more active m participation.

79　　　The authors of [5], [9] emphasize social marketing as a useful tool for correction or change of
80　society 's behaviours and attitudes towards innovations and solution of modern problems. They
81　propose to apply marketing communication to service acceptance.

82　　　Three levels of social marketing are defined (see in [10]) to be used for the different stakeholders.
83　*Downstream* social marketing is directed to the individuals, *mid - stream* social marketing - to the social
84　groups and *upstream* social marketing - to the decision makers, politics and administrators. While
85　agreeing to the above statements we argue that upstream social marketing would foster local public
86　authorities to gain the specific knowledge and skills and after to influence the employing of mobile
87　applications for MGov in municipalities, as these locally governed territories are mostly related to the
88　governance concept.

89　　　Thus, in our paper we revealed the benefit of the MGov for the local upstream audience and
90　proposed the theoretical model of upstream social marketing for the successful MGov on municipal
91　level. The model distinguishes to important aspects: i) possible external marketers (those from IT
92　business) and ii) marketing content (motivating theses) categorized by 7P marketing mix.

2. Materials and Methods

94　　　Our study contributes to the upstream social marketing by building on the new proposals for
95　mobile government. Systematic literature review in the fields of *mobile governance* and *social marketing*
96　was used in this paper. In the first subsection we firstly proposed categories of mobile governance and

after that defined its benefit linking to each category. In the second subsection we revealed important aspects of social marketing.

Mid - stream and upstream marketing levels have been neglected by social marketers in general [10] therefore, we supposed to have similar situation in MGov marketing field. We decided to shed light on the upstream social marketing for MGov on the municipal level as municipalities are the most important substances for the welfare of society. and predict the following:

Hypothesis 1 (H1). For success of MGov its benefits need to be aware not only for individuals or society members (down and mid- stream audiences), but also for policy formers and other decision makers (upstream audience).

Hypothesis 2 (H2). Upstream social marketing is important and should be used to foster MGov on municipal level by the upstream audience.

Hypothesis 3 (H3). Marketers of IT business may play role as upstream social marketers while fostering MGov with a specific theses categorized by 7P marketing mix.

We not only presented the theoretical model for the fostering MGov on the local level of public leaders (upstream audience) but also proposed both responsible actors and possible marketing content (theses) based on the theoretical arguments. The marketing content for promoting the innovation was constructed on the frame of 7P marketing mix that is very appropriate for all services including public ones. Characteristics of each of 7P dimensions as well as the marketing theses were constructed on the analysed theories and systemized in relation to the concept of benefits of MGov. The theses we have proposed emphasize the exceptional benefit of MGov for upstream audience.

3. Results

3.1. Mobile Government for More Effective E Government

The scientists analysing the contemporary trends of m-government development through the world have identified a number of advantages in this area. Most papers researched the phenomenon from citizens 'perspective emphasizing change of their behaviour and attitude towards MGov. However, what is less touched by researchers is the MGov perspective from the point of view of the government. What are the advantages of the MGov for a government as a whole? Why is it important for the government to start use the MGov tools? In this paper, we contrary are looking for new meanings, attitudes, values and emotions as engines for changes, sharing experience of the effective MGov for a government.

Analysis of scientific literature allowed us to admit that most authors do not differentiate the m-government advantages into categories. However, our analysis proposed the possibility of categorizing them into *function-driven advantages of m-government for the government*. Here we highlight and further describe interrelated major function-driven advantages: i) mobility of government, ii) carrots, sticks and sermons, iii) encouraging coproduction, iv) digital administration, v) non-constrained infrastructure.

Mobility of government. Since the beginning of the New Public Management, it has been argued that government should delivery public services by using flexible, transparent, customer-oriented, access free, managerial approaches (contracting-out; public services one-stop-shops). Indeed, mobile technologies allow the government to provide the services 24/7, battery-power permitting, internet-enabled device [11]; [12]; [13]. MGov creates conditions to move the service together with the customer, contrary in the past the service points moved to reach the clients (remote workplaces; services centres in rural areas, etc.).

Carrots, Sticks and Sermons. According to the [14] a government has capacity to choose among three public policy instruments in the implementation of the policy: economic means (carrots); regulations (sticks) and information (sermons). Indeed, the mobile government may enjoy the possibility to use all three-policy instruments too. Carrots in case of m-government can be understood as *economic means in kind* that according to [14] is perceived as provision of goods and service. The capacity to provide services through the smart phone applications, GPS service has been explained by many researchers in the field [15]; [16]; [17]; [12]. The regulatory power of m-government is interlinked

with information provision to the residents. Different government programmes may be equipped with opportunity to spread information about the programme existence and meanings through the smart phones. That allows the government to save time while passing information [1]. From one hand, m-government can effectively communicate with residents through their smart phones in case of urgent messages, crisis management, educating and informing about benefits [18], [19]. From the other hand, the residents always have the smartphones close to them therefore Mgov can "keep in touch" residents by providing on time information regarding different regulations, describing required actions or appropriate behaviours of individuals. In other words, the government is now able to correct or influence the behaviour and attitude of the society very fast. Even the trust in technology is growing [20].

Encouraging co-production. Government has financial resources, power and influence for encouraging co-production of the public services. According to [21], co-production is a process in which input (staff, infrastructure, resources) is used for the production / provision of goods and services. This process involves individuals who are not public employees. Ostrom [21] notes that all public goods and services are potentially provided through regular service providers and customers. Ingrams [13] argues that m-government „*can boost coproduction and citizens participation"*, that according to [15], [2], [22], [1] allows to become cost-effective by saving resources on data gathering, sending stamped letters, decrease data entry errors, faster and less erroneous processing of data. Citizens' engagement in the delivery of the public services through the MGov makes public servants' everyday work more effective.

Digital administration. Authors depict MGov as the core of the *new digital administration* of m-government. Szabo [12]provided an example that there is no need for the new digital administration to sit daily in the office. According to the author: „*even a committee meeting can be held either on a train with mobile devices*" [12] (p. 73). The authors of [17], [22], [23], [13] argue, that coordination of data and branches, communication between different layers of government and internal processes become better due to MGov potential. Direct access to databases, protocols, registers [15] (that was challenging even in the time of the diffusion of one-stop-shops centres development) become available in the case of better delivering of the public services.

Non-constrained infrastructure. One of the issues most often raised by researchers is the infrastructure constraints for the countries with poor wired infrastructure [2]; [17]. The investment into the MGov serves for better connectivity (i.e., wireless) that creates more equal conditions to provide public services and allows to reach remoted territories [2]. Delivery of e-public services through mobile devices eliminate access restrictions and ensure services that are demand-driven.

Definitions above may be systemized to the possible benefit of MGov (see Table 1). The government in general and the municipal government (that is in the closest engagement with society) in particular somehow need to be informed about that benefit.

Table 1. Benefit of MGov for the government

Category	Benefit
Mobility of government	Ability to be flexible, transparent, customer – oriented for access- free governance; ability to improve managerial approaches
Carrots, Sticks and Sermons	Satisfaction of ability to variate between policy instruments: economic means in kind, regulatory power and information provision effectiveness (saving time)
Encouraging coproduction and citizen engagement	Cost effectiveness by saving resources; faster and less erroneous everyday work
Smart administration	Ability to coordinate data and branch network horizontally and vertically

Non-constrained infrastructure	Ability to eliminate access restrictions and ensure services that are demand-driven

184   *3.2. The Main Aspects of Social Marketing for MGov*

185   Kotler P. is famous as an originator of marketing theory who later also developed a phenomenon
186   of social marketing. According to the marketing theory the main goal of business marketing is to
187   increase business market or to sell more goods and services in order to fulfil interests of shareholders
188   and consumers. Therefore [24] point out that business use the marketing technics to benefit a company
189   and its stakeholders.

190   Social marketing in opposition to business marketing develops fundamental concepts to solve the
191   social problems [24]. This kind of marketing is directed to the welfare of society while changing or
192   improving social environment.

193   The discourse of social marketing has been analysed in various papers (see in [25]; [10]). The
194   authors revealed that social marketing has a profound positive impact on various social issues: i.e.,
195   public health, injury prevention, environment, community involvement, financial well- being [26],
196   public infrastructure, physical activity, water quality, substance misuse, use of non- custodial
197   sentences [27], etc.

198   The authors argue that to do social marketing is more difficult than commercial one. For instance,
199   provided (marketed) goods look cool and tasty for consumers satisfying their needs. While efforts
200   (social marketing) to make changes in the consumption habits or change the attitude towards the
201   harmful, addictive behaviour usually is a big challenge. There is rare one who is eager consciously and
202   voluntary to give up an addictive behaviour, change a comfortable life style, establish new habits, learn
203   a new skill, etc.

204   Systemized definitions of social marketing (see definitions in [26] revealed the *phenomenon being*
205   *the sustained over time process, activity, planned approach or a way to use commercial marketing strategies,*
206   *marketing principles and techniques for social innovations or modern solutions that may overgo the barriers and*
207   *improve social well-being*. It is used by governments and non-profit organizations in order to engage and
208   empower the individuals, target audiences for the positive changes.

209   Despite the originating roots of social marketing in early 1970s, [26] (p.2) ensure that the term is
210   still "a mystery to most", thus we decided to make emphasis on some important aspects of this
211   phenomenon as well.

212   Examples of goals of social marketing in various papers allow to divide them into two main
213   groups related to the behaviour (voluntary or involuntary) change: i) goals to fostering the new type
214   of positive behaviour for saving the lives, preventing health, etc.; ii) goals to stopping harmful
215   behaviour that leads to negative outcomes for the individuals or even society (see Table 2). In many
216   cases social marketing stands against and tries to withstand the business marketing in order to either
217   to release or re - influence the behaviour and attitude both of individuals and society, that has been
218   formed under the influence of business marketing.

219   **Table 2.** Goals of social marketing (samples)

Fostering a new positive behaviour (attitude)	Stopping harmful behaviour in order to prevent negative outcome
Wearing a bike helmet	Reduce tobacco use
Increase recycling	Prevent infant mortality
Job training for homeless	Stop spreading of HIV/AIDS
To license the pets	Prevent malaria
To be eco- friendly pet owner	Prevent injury
Transportation demand management	Prevent public health
Smoke free venues	Eradicate polio
Sexual responsibility	Decrease littering

Pollution ethics	Stop bullying
To enhance sustainable consumption	Stop drunk driving
To improve sustainable lifestyles	Reducing fatty acids in the food
Changing to socio structural environment	Drug/ alcohol abuse
Consumers ethical decisions	Reducing consumption

220

221   The authors of [10], [27], [24], [26] differentiate target audiences for practicing the social marketing
222   into three levels: i) downstream marketing audience; ii) mid- stream marketing audience and iii)
223   upstream marketing audience. The authors point out different influence goals associated to these
224   audiences. The selection of a target audience is based on different criteria including prevalence of the
225   social problem, ability to reach the audience, readiness for change and other factors (see Table 3).
226   **Table 3.** Definitions of social marketing levels, audiences and goals

Marketing level	Audience	Influence goals
Downstream marketing	Individuals (*those who are influenced*)	To adopt recommended behaviours, to change individual's behaviour
Midstream marketing	Family, friends, neighbours, health care providers, teachers, organizations, community leaders (*those who are influenced and who may influence individuals*)	To engage influential and relevant community members in the process of identifying problems, mobilizing resources, planning and implementing strategies, and tracking and evaluating progress toward objectives and goals. To build target community
Upstream marketing	Decision makers and opinion formers, policy makers, public administrators, political leaders, politicians, lawmakers, educators, managers (*influencers*)	To change behaviours and attitudes of the decision makers, policy formers, legislators. Factors affecting positive social change: laws, public policy, rules and other social norms, built environments, school curricula, community organizations, business practices, celebrities, media

227

228   According to [26], [27] in most cases, social marketing principles and techniques are used by those
229   who are responsible for influencing public policy, rules, behaviours or to improve public health,
230   prevent injuries, etc. In other words, it is mostly used (or intended to be used) by the government,
231   administrators or other decision makers (*upstream audience)*, who apply social marketing directly to the
232   individuals (*downstream audience*) or social groups (mid -stream marketing). But the authors also state
233   that these upstream persons are not social marketers by their profession or they even may not have
234   appropriate knowledge on the specific marketing topic. For instance, [8] remind that the primary
235   responsibility of government is both to deliver essential community services and to provide
236   information access to citizens while using technological tools. But these authorities or some of them
237   may not be aware of the principles, adaptation or profit of particular technological tools (MGov in our
238   case). Therefore, we recognize a lack of guidance for successful upstream social marketing, and more
239   systemic approach that could alter the structural environment in which pro social change is sought
240   [27]; [10].
241   Due these arguments we agree with [24], that social marketing should focus much more on
242   upstream audience in an attempt to influence policy makers, public administrators, political leaders
243   and other public decision makers. And argue that in case of MGov, upstream marketing, principles
244   and techniques firstly should be focused on changing understanding, attitudes and behaviours of
245   those in front lines.

246   We agree that this indeed should be challenging, as according to [27] (p. 1529) upstream social
247 marketing not only involves different techniques but researchers also "may be reluctant to enter the
248 socio-political arena". If to follow social marketing relations to other scientific fields [26], [27], we
249 would point out that for the effective outcome of upstream social marketing for MGov, the subject
250 might be also associated with public sector marketing (that is most often counted on to support
251 utilization of governmental agency products and services and increase compliance with policies) and
252 with education (because social marketers may use education as a tactic focusing on increasing
253 awareness and understanding) as well as utilising theories and models from other disciplines. But
254 further research should be done to practically prove these associations.

3.3. Upstream Social Marketers for Municipal MGov

256   Al Thunibat [7] reminded that services should be delivered in ways with which the public or
257 society is already familiar (in other words the audience of all three levels should have appropriate
258 specific knowledge). It means that individuals, social groups and public decision makers somehow
259 need to learn about MGov or to gain the new knowledge. We mean that someone who already has the
260 knowledge about MGov should appear on the "government's stage" and in some way share that
261 knowledge, that finally could serve as a stimulant or influencer for MGov innovation in a particular
262 territory.
263   Hung [5] proposed the marketing communication to be applied to service acceptance. Several
264 studies based on behavioural theories for MGov revealed that change of behaviour is influenced by: i)
265 self-efficacy (individual attitude, personal needs, etc.) and/ or ii) facilitating conditions (external
266 influencers, marketing communication, etc.)
267   Kotler [9] emphasized social marketing to be very useful for correction or change of society's
268 behaviour and attitude towards innovations and solution of modern problems. MGov as the
269 contemporary innovation (or in other words higher level of e government) requires change of the
270 attitude of all individuals, societal groups and policy formers in order to improve co-production and
271 corporate social responsibility [24] that leads to the public well-being. Therefore, we argue that social
272 marketing is a very useful technique (the way or tool) for promotion and facilitation of MGov among
273 society in a particular territory for more active m - participation.
274   Agreeing to [27], [10] that social marketing is more focused on individuals we argue that
275 individuals have already enough knowledge and skills to use mobile applications and would employ
276 them for MGov if only such ability existed. Therefore, the main concentration for the benefit of MGov
277 should be both on the upstream audience who are responsible for this innovative ability to come to
278 the reality and the upstream social marketing that would foster the MGov learning, knowledge and
279 skills.
280   The authors of [28], [29], [30],[31], [32] emphasized the importance of local authorities in the public
281 welfare. That allows us to state that governance is most effectively and efficiently applied on the
282 municipal level. Upstream social marketing for MGov could change the attitudes and behaviours of
283 policy formers, public decision makers towards both MGov and therefore more effective local
284 governance.
285   The authors of [26] pointed out *public sector agencies* (i.e., WHO[1], ministries, state sectoral agencies,
286 departments, non - profit organizations) who usually manage social marketing and act as external
287 professionals in a public area, but do it in not always consciously coordinated way. The authors also
288 distinguished the role of professionals working in for profit organizations in the positions of corporate
289 philanthropy or corporate social responsibility as useful partners for social marketing.
290   Gordon [27] reminded the argument of both social cognitive and social learning theories which
291 state, that the change of attitude and behaviour is governed by the immediate environment and the
292 wider social context. In the case of MGov the external influencers (i.e., marketers) acting on the
293 particular territory may do impact on the upstream audience of this territory accordingly, if only both
294 sides are in good relationship or co-operation (i.e., the model of public private partnership). Especially

---

[1] World Health Organization

295 this model would be beneficial for the public sector where there is no tradition to employ social
296 marketing in the structure.
297   Remigijus Simasius, a mayor of Lithuanian capital Vilnius, has expressed his thought about the
298 partnership in the field of smart city, telling that experimenting in local government is a little
299 dangerous thing, but to allow business to experiment in the city is very important for the contemporary
300 city development (see in [33][2]). This allows us to treat business, that is engaged in technological
301 development of the city, as the possible external influencer or a marketer for upstream MGov that may
302 both manage business marketing techniques and do social upstream marketing motivating upstream
303 audience.

304 *3.4. Content of Upstream Social Marketing for Municipal MGov*

305   We suppose that to find the right content to be marketed would be some challenge for the external
306 managers as there is no practical experience.
307   In the first part of this paper we systemized the theoretical aspects and defined the benefit of
308 MGov (see Table 1). Therefore, we suggest that these beneficial aspects may be transformed into
309 motivating theses for upstream marketing (as a content) and used by external influencers (i.e,
310 marketers) for the change of behaviour of upstream audience towards MGov. According to [27], [34]
311 traditional marketing mix (4P: Product, Price, Place, Promotion) may not work on an upstream level:
312 marketing principles may be applied not in a comprehensive manner. The authors insist on that
313 alternative marketing and wider use of tools (i.e., media advocacy, relationship building, stakeholder
314 engagement, creation of motivational exchanges, promotion, public relations, etc.) is required.
315 Agreeing to the authors, we decided to construct the marketing theses on 7Ps marketing mix that was
316 accepted by Kotler P. and Keller K.L. (see in [34]) and that is very appropriate in the field of services
317 (see Table 4).

318 **Table 4.** Marketing of MGov for upstream audience in the context of marketing mix

Dimension	Characteristics	Marketing theses
Product	Intangible MGov (as a result of behaviour change); tangible (mobile application and IT platform)	Flexible, transparent, customer oriented, demand - driven
Price	Costs of the product and its enforcement as well as of changing legislations	Access free, economic means in kind, cost effectiveness by saving resources
Place/ physical evidence	Location associated to the particular MGov; look and feel of the structural service environment	Ability to eliminate access restrictions and ensure services that are demand-driven
Promotion/ information	The tools that can be employed in upstream social marketing (active dissemination of research articles and reports, media advocacy, stakeholder and political engagement, public relations, lobbying, etc.)	information provision effectiveness (saving time)
Participants/ people	Stakeholders, educators, media advocacy, policy forums, service providers	Ability to coordinate data and branch network horizontally and vertically, variation between policy instruments,

---

[2] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mZ7QUj7kgSs

Processes	Selection, training and supervision of the service providers, supported by data management based on information technologies	Faster and less erroneous everyday work
Political power	Political directives of higher boards as starting point, legislation	improvement of managerial approaches, governance, regulatory power

4. Discussion and Conclusions

Authors should discuss the results and how they can be interpreted in perspective of previous studies and of the working hypotheses. The findings and their implications should be discussed in the broadest context possible. Future research directions may also be highlighted.

Mobile government has evolved due technological innovations, and social marketing may be a very useful technique (the tool) for promotion and facilitation of that innovation among different audiences of the society in a particular territory for more active m - participation. The main concentration for the benefit of MGov should be done both on the upstream audience, who are responsible to create this innovative ability, and the upstream social marketing.

The cities and municipalities play important role in the context of governance, therefore the success of MGov is more aware on this level. However, policy formers and decision makers are not marketers by profession and there is usually no tradition to employ marketers in the public systems. Hitech business marketers then may act as external influencers or social marketers for MGov if only both sides are in good relationship or co-operation. The model of Public Private Partnership (known as PPP) may work in this case. But this model has restrictions to be applied in many countries, even democratic (e.g, Lithuania).

The social marketers also should be ready for some challenges that may occur while implementing MGov marketing strategy to political leaders and motivating them to accomplish a large social change, if to agree to [10].

It has been proven in number of researches that MGov provides many benefits for the citizens. Authors argue that MGov should become also the goal for each modern government. However, for the government in general the use of the MGov as the continuous process is usually ignored at the scientific discussions. According to our findings there are five function-driven advantages of MGov that make government flexible, transparent, customer-oriented, cost-effective, coordinating, demand-driven and powerful. Indeed, the list of benefits is not exhaustive, thus further literature analysis may reveal more of them.

Social marketing in most cases stands against the business marketing and serves for the society wellbeing. The techniques of this marketing are used for change of attitudes and behaviours of different audiences in a public life. In the context of marketing these audiences are categorized into downstream, mid- stream and upstream audiences. Different audiences mean differentiation in social marketing content and its' strategical application. Upstream social marketing is least analysed by researchers because, as they say, it is challenging to research the socio – political field and policy formers from outside the field. Nevertheless, upstream audience plays a very important role in a modern public life. Therefore, open discussions of scientists alone or together with the political partners on how to tackle these challenges would be very useful for further development of the topic. Systemic approach of upstream social marketing would be then developed for the structural innovative changes of the social environment.

Motivation of upstream audience to foster the MGov on the territory they govern should be based on the marketing mix strategy based on the 7Ps. Indeed, further research is necessary to practically test the ratio of each "P" both *per se* and in any unique territory (municipality) before developing the specific upstream social marketing mix strategy for MGov.

Author Contributions: V.B. suggested the initial research idea, performed the literature review, designing and data systemizing on social marketing, deigned the structure of the study, supervised writing and will be the primary party to handle review process. J.D. and M.D. performed the literature review, data systemizing and

368 **References**

369 1. E. Goyal and Seema Purohit, "2012 Emergence of m-Government The Way Forward.pdf," *SIES Journal*
370   *of Management*, vol. 8, no. 1. pp. 56–66, 2012.

371 2. S. Trimi and H. Sheng, "Emerging Trends in M-Government," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 53–58.

372 3. I. Almarashdeh and M. K. Alsmadi, "How to make them use it? Citizens acceptance of M-
373   government," *Appl. Comput. Informatics*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 194–199, 2017.

374 4. M. Mpinganjira, "Antecedents of Citizens' Attitude Towards M-Government: an Empirical
375   Investigation," in *Changing Business Environment: Gamechangers, Opportunities and Risks*, C. Delener, N.
376   and Schweikert, Ed. 2017, pp. 563–570.

377 5. S. Y. Hung, C. M. Chang, and S. R. Kuo, "User acceptance of mobile e-government services: An
378   empirical study," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 33–44, 2013.

379 6. [M. A. Shareef, Y. K. Dwivedi, T. Stamati, and M. D. Williams, "SQ mGov: A Comprehensive Service-
380   Quality Paradigm for Mobile Government," *Inf. Syst. Manag.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 126–142, 2014.

381 7. A. Al Thunibat, N. A. M. Zin, and N. Sahari, "Mobile Government User Requirements Model," *J. E-
382   Gov.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 104–111, 2011.

383 8. H. S. Al-Hubaishi, S. Z. Ahmad, and M. Hussain, "Exploring mobile government from the service
384   quality perspective," *J. Enterp. Inf. Manag.*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 4–16, 2017.

385 9. P. Kotler, H. Kartajaya, and I. Setiawan, *Marketing 3.0: From Products to Customers to the Human Spirit*.
386   2011.

387 10. S. Dibb and M. Carrigan, "Social marketing transformed: Kotler, Polonsky and Hastings reflect on
388   social marketing in a period of social change," *Eur. J. Mark.*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 1376–1398, 2013.

389 11. J. Carroll, "'What's in It for Me ?': Taking M-Government to the People," *19th Bled eConference eValues*,
390   pp. 1–13, 2006.

391 12. B. Szabó, "Good examples of m-government in hungary 1," 2016.

392 13. Ingrams Alex, "M-Government.," in *E-Government and Information Technology Management: Concepts and*
393   *Best Practices*, J. Holzer, Marc, Manoharan, Aroon and Melitski, Ed. Irvine, California: Melvin and Leigh
394   Publishers, 2019, pp. 155–182.

395 14. J. McCormick and E. Vedung, "Policy Instruments: Typologies and Theories," in *Carrots, Sticks &*
396   *Sermons*, 2019.

397 15. I. Snellen and M. Thaens, "Ricerca Giannini-Formez II fase Administrative innovation , International
398   context and growth From e-government to m-government : towards a new paradigm in public
399   administration ?," 2008.

400 16. S. Trimi and H. Sheng, "M-GOVERNMENT," vol. 51, no. 5.

401 17. C. K. Georgiadis and E. Stiakakis, "Extending an e-government service measurement framework to m-
402   governement services," *ICMB GMR 2010 - 2010 9th Int. Conf. Mob. Business/2010 9th Glob. Mobil.*
403   *Roundtable*, pp. 432–439, 2010.

404 18. J. Hellström, "Mobile phones for good governance – challenges and way forward," pp. 1–13, 2008.

405 19. R. Rannu, S. Saksing, T. Mahlakõiv, and M. S. Ltd, "Mobile Government: 2010 and Beyond," *White Pap.*,

406   no. January, 2010.

407   20. HSBC, "Trust inTechnology," 2017.

408   21. E. Ostrom, "Crossing the great divide: Coproduction, synergy, and development," *World Dev.*, 1996.

409   22. OECD/ITU, *Mobile technologies for responsive governments and connected societies*. 2010.

410   23. D. D. Refiloe and M. Noluntu, "A Review of m-Government Maturity Models," vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 389–
411   397, 2018.

412   24. E. Khajeh, R. Dabestani, and S. Fathi, "The role of upstream and downstream social marketing in
413   electricity consumption management," *Int. J. Bus. Innov. Res.*, 2015.

414   25. J. Thaler and B. Helmig, "Theoretical Framework of Social Marketing Effectiveness: Drawing the Big
415   Picture on its Functioning," *J. Nonprofit Public Sect. Mark.*, 2013.

416   26. Lee Nency and Kotler Philip, *Social Marketing: Changing Behaviors for Good*. SAGE Publications, Inc.,
417   2016.

418   27. R. Gordon, "Unlocking the potential of upstream social marketing," *Eur. J. Mark.*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp.
419   1525–1547, 2013.

420   28. D. K. hong Chan, "City diplomacy and 'glocal' governance: Revitalizing cosmopolitan democracy,"
421   *Innovation*, 2016.

422   29. M. Yamin and A. T. Utami, "Towards Sister City Cooperation between Cilacap and Mueang Chonburi
423   District," 2016.

424   30. F. Terruso, "Complementing Traditional Diplomacy: Regional and Local Authorities Going
425   International," *Eur. View*, 2016.

426   31. C. J. Schultze, "Cities and EU governance: Policy-takers or policy-makers?," *Reg. Fed. Stud.*, 2003.

427   32. H. Baldersheim, J. Bucek, and P. Swianiewicz, "Mayors learning across borders: The international
428   networks of municipalities in East-Central Europe," *Reg. Fed. Stud.*, 2002.

429   33. "Pan -Baltic Infrastructure Summit," *Pan - Baltic Infrastructure Summit. 2017.* [Online]. Available:
430   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mZ7QUj7kgSs. [Accessed: 28-May-2019].

431   34. G. Jackson and V. Ahuja, "Dawn of the digital age and the evolution of the marketing mix," *J. Direct,*
432   *Data Digit. Mark. Pract.*, 2016.

433