
EBRANDS

EIGHT BASIC PRINCIPLES ABOUT TECHNOLOGICAL BRANDS

Herlander Elias

Universidade da Beira Interior

Índice

1	Introduction: The Brand Interface . . .	1
2	The Self And The Ambient	2
3	Synergies	2
4	The Age of Pitching	3
5	Mystery	4
6	Changes	5
7	Patterns	6
8	Archive	7
	Conclusion	8
	References	8

1 Introduction: The Brand Interface

THE so-called “eBrands” of our time are in sum technological brands. It means they work as a platform, a social media hub or a center for content to be distributed. In this 21st century, our data-driven lives are marked by the interface. Brands that perform well are either big players or startups and the big message these brands issue is “the interface”, meaning the way how people interact with brands and how brands perform as hubs for social interaction and content creation, which is of the utmost importance.

Today we interact with a huge amount of brands, and they are all becoming eBrands. We control our profile with an app, we check the website and we are ready to purchase something or to keep track of our orders online. These days, there is an app for everything. Ultimately, the eBrands are no longer performing as just an extension of a

real world service but rather as the primary driver. Having said this, what it means is that an eBrand today is basically everything that unfolds from the interface. A good interface makes life easier for the user, while a bad interface renders the transition from user to consumer into something harder to accomplish. When the brand interface is well crafted the user searches, finds and puts its order in place. This way, the system will learn more about the user and triggers suggestions that are useful for future orders (Muminova, 2013). Another thing that happens is that the interface can become a powerful narrative device, meaning the better the user experience is (UX), the more comfortable the user will be in using the digital front of the eBrand, be it an app or a website. eBrands may use the touchpoint, for instance, an app or a website to create a more enveloping experience for the user. The best eBrands are becoming platforms, virtual places where people hang out, chat, experience, purchase and share their thoughts.

In our time eBrands have massive distributed grids. People interact with portals of information about news and goods. And current interfaces are being designed to be used by young people. Times changed. Nowadays, every software is becoming more simple and minimal. The updates improve the interfaces. We behave as if we have never left the eBrand. The eBrand is always there for us online, examining us, learning from us. We become a brand extension. Apps are turning into super-apps (Gardner & Davis, 2013), places where we will always be, places to do everything. Things are becoming future-proof. Regardless of

our age, whether we are youngsters or elder people the brand interface adapts to us and we become collaborators of the eBrand.

2 The Self And The Ambient

Due to exponential growth in mobile media, we are more prone to something called “ambient computing” or “intimacy computing”. We do not turn off our digital devices. They are a part of us. We extend them and they, in return, extend us. Our Self presents itself online, we have a profile somewhere, and we also have a record and a history of browsing and purchasing. We like to share ideas, we tell the world who we are in this ambient. The digital devices remain in our intimate zone. We stand both in a private sphere and in a public one as well. What we are consolidating now is a second Self. We show up online, we pitch ideas, services and products. Moreover, we thrive through connections and we bond naturally. The role of the eBrands here is to be a platform where we blossom by crossing our stories with the story of the eBrand.

We are constantly updating our Self in this new digital world. We long for intimacy and eBrands explore this fragile existence of ours with their ambient. It happens in airports, websites, retail stores and apps. What is going on is that eBrands are helping us out to improve our connections. The better connected we stand, the more improved our relationship with the world will be. So, the eBrands actually play a very significant role in our lives, since they are the new organic central hubs that connect us all.

In the field of this ambient computing explored by eBrands it happens that everybody is worried about how they show their own Selves. The digital presentation became something really important because we present ourselves online with skills, experiences, social history and professional backgrounds. We panic every time something goes wrong with our information, and that is one of the main reasons why we update everything. And at the same time our intimacy is just a relationship with close devices or close people. There is no time for self-reflection or insights. We just show up online and we are fond of certain eBrands that help us filling the gap of loneliness. eBrands are social brands that help us to connect to others and enroll into community assignments. The promise that eBrands offer, is that somehow in the age of digital media we need to increase our humanness.

The Self faces this new brand ambience as a

starting point, a place to thrive, share and connect. We build our character based on our education, our favorite books, our values and also around our resources. Brands know this so they want to be around us. They are guiding us as some sort of mentors. Our story crosses paths with the eBrands’ stories. It is a new world where everybody’s Self is intertwined with the ambient of certain brands. In addition to this, brands want to be the centerfold of resources (Magill, 2003), for they know we extract from them. We are hoarders of information, culture (Schroeder & Salzer-Mörling, 2006) and data. Brands see an opportunity to connect better with consumers through resources that are enabled and the opposite takes place too: we look at brands as resource pools. We check, we login, we download, we tag, we upload (Lunenfeld, 2011), we connect, et al.

3 Synergies

eBrands these days perform synergies. They extend the eBrands discourse into trendy styles, celebrities and influences. A brand today is a platform, an organic entity that has not just one face but many faces. People adopt the brand’s vision according to the trends, the values and its mission. Brands have become synergistic and dynamic. They are a state of flow for people who flow, swipe and take snapshots. Everything is now image-based and brands are no exception. And today’s consumers are firstly consumers of images, news, ideas and concepts. The synergies come from shared ideals, paradigms and trends alike. When it comes to people, nobody stands in one place doing just one thing. We are all multitaskers out of tune with the laws of physics that say one thing is only in one place at one time. We are as time travellers because simultaneously we chat, we play, we Google and we “like”.

Synergies are of the utmost importance because there is a technical architecture that basically allows us to connect, share, join and publish contents. The nature of the online medium architecture is metamorphic. There is a cloud of services and we access it through mobile media terminals, aka, the smartphone. Synergies are also about being smart. The online medium and our digital devices are smart too, so the eBrands are getting smarter also. The quest begins as such: one person shares an idea, it triggers either a trend or a community, and then it spins out of control until an eBrand grabs it and streamlines it for the general use. One concept evolves, then it demands for

an interaction, soon people expect more of it and finally it gets viral. But this is the kind of viral fact or concept a brand can control. The shape is harder to grasp but the ideas flow continuously until they are rendered into a product, a commodity or a service, and soon become an architecture of synergies with people and partnerships and communities. For the eBrand the primary driver is to control the formula that spins off the ideas and the trends. The process is called absorption. The whole brand unfolds like a sheet of paper of meaning that has many sub-meanings much as there are folds possible to be made with paper. But as using paper the same procedure is always the same, so is the original formula. That is what the eBrand “tackles” – it is the gold.

There are many variants of brands but they all perform with a bias: sell a vision, cast a visual identity, introduce a new business model, and then pitch the concept to consumers and business partners. Brands need populations that evolve and grow old with them. Brands want to be part of our lives. They tend to become corporations for some reason, because they regulate the permutations and they contribute to a surveillance capitalism of sorts. They cross territories if they are capable to do it as long as their reach is increased. Then they breed new products that turn into cults with no constraints whatsoever. Brands evolve and defy conventions. They grow so we can do anything using their products, wear their logos (Lury, 2004), stay inside their ecosystem (McCann, 2012). The power dynamics of brands are an issue (Wessling, 2011). They want to be all-mighty but at the same time they do not want us to feel intimidated by them or their discourse. Brands will to be “friends” with us, as they want to be close but not too close. After all, in the end, it is all about money so we cannot get too excited about brands, even if they belong to social media.

Interactions are what define an eBrand today. Brands have the need to powerplay the consumers and they use strategies, semiotics and iconics to deal with us. They have their tactics and their motos and they are not on detours to reach us. They also look for optimal lines of communication media, and “the flow” is the concept behind their success, at the same time, they are our connection and addiction to them. Our inner desires are manipulated by them. The effects of these manipulations are the increasing synergies that allow brands to better communicate what they do best with us. Since we are social to core, an eBrand of our time is a sort of entity, an artificial construction, a construct that is

meant to become social with us and for us. The architecture of synergies that an eBrand unfolds bears the purpose of keeping us locked inside its ecosystem. The brand is a cloud, an app, but also a compound. Brands want to learn from our subjectivity, yet what they are digesting is the objective data that we leave behind online like a trail of crumbs.

In order to survive today, an eBrand needs to perform synergies with people and business partners, yet at the same time it needs these people to bring a disruption. It needs to define and defy categories. An eBrand has a social mind, and it is an organism that seeks engagement, colors, music, expression, paradigms and future manufacturers, service providers and marketplaces. Now a brand knows we need attention, but it powerplays otherwise as if we are the ones needing for attention. No doubt, that we are influenced by eBrands to act socially as we must bring more people to “the fold”, a kind of “Welcome to the community!”. It is more a catchy way to engage new people than just being only a brand, demanding that the model to follow is to share experiences, to follow the resonance. Every idea and file and trend must bounce back. Brands believe in this, so they are seeking windows of opportunity to better connect with us, and it is remarkable how it works. We are being stimulated constantly by videos and commercials, and print advertising (Alstiel & Grow, 2010; Jhally, 1995) and deluxe photography, and even by interactive media, to get a certain behavior as an effect. On the other hand, there is this belief that people are increasingly facing isolation. Brands took the role as “connectors” that provide a solution by bonding with us, across synergies. The consequence is that we need diversity and brands are starting to resemble each other, and that is a bad thing.

4 The Age of Pitching

Consumers feel the need to be listened to. But much as brands, consumers too pitch their ideas to other people. Everybody is pitching something to somebody. If everybody is selling, there has to be people who are buying. It is an architecture of pitching that we face now. And what exactly do we need? We need great things, not necessarily more stuff. We already got everything. So what we need is the new “new”. If that is even possible. People need communication to change the world, they need brands to help them feel empowered, but brands that are reliable until the end. People cho-

ose brands based on sexyness and convenience, values and vision. Jargon is a barrier. We like brands that pitch complex ideas in simple words, graphics or photos. We, much as brands, are looking for ideas turned accessible. We just need the bullet points. We don't have time to read. In contrast, we enjoy researching. We are true detectives, searchers (Anderson & Wolff, 2010), seekers and stalkers. In order to survive, brands need to establish communication in a sense that they speak simple but not simpler. We like smart things. Yet, we just have time to pitch or be pitched with key sentences: we need visuals that causes us to find deeper senses of understanding, we need relevance to be shared, we want to feel as important as we think we are and, last but not least, we need understanding.

The trick with brands is that they start small and grow large. In addition, they tend to forget how they started and it freaks consumers out a lot. Brands grow with consumers, and when a generation is gone they must look for another generation to choose as the new target and amuse it. The problem with the brands, in general, is that they are outperformed by startups when these become giants, but they overpower everybody due to their scale. A brand of the old days was for generations to come. It had traditional roots in the past and a long-lasting vision for the future. Nowadays, brands have a present and a future – everything is new – and now a generation of people, in terms of sociological or anthropological settings, no longer has the possibility to survive during thirty years or more. Currently, a generation lasts just for a few years, ten years maximum. It follows the pace of mobile media trends. We establish more empathy with genre-defying brands, the disruptors. These are the one brands we find interesting. They open up connections, they pitch up new things to us. There are always new paths and possibilities with the new brands, the eBrands. Also, the future is all about brands that teach us how to extract more from the world, to extract more from life and to improve our lives. Basically the new dynamics are all about to empower the consumer and pitch new experiences to him. In the long run we follow the brands and they follow us.

We want to be amused by brands, too. We want brands to turn complex concepts into more simple ones. We want excitement and good vibes. We want to surf the edge, but safe and sound. So in the age of pitching what are eBrands exactly? We can say they are commitment devices, which means that they are not the logos on the products

or services or the guys behind the robocalls and spammy callcenters – eBrands are connecting us with life. Brands as connectors is what we need, so that is what they are becoming. They are devices that establish commitments, relationships with us. Brands are social things now. They cause temptation. So between what they pitch to us and what we expect, we find ourselves between our future “Selves” and our present “Selves”. We are amidst a battle. Brands want us to lose control and spend money, to subscribe services and afford new things. They want us to engage and connect with life. Brands want to be with us, they want to be us. One way brands have found to powerplay us is to show us the outcomes in the future (should we stay onboard with them) and it works just as nice. It works out as an investment. We bet on them and see how it pans out. We are being fooled by commercials. Our emotions are triggered, our reason meets displacement. We need to understand the purpose of the message of brands. We long for understanding and good feelings. So, we join the brands and it seems that it is an escape. In the end there are rewards expecting us. We find the storytelling funny, we seek for exploration and find the challenges amusing. We feel empowered. Socialisation takes place and that is good for us. We are too digitally connected, though (Kawamoto, 2003).

5 Mystery

Mystery is an erotic thing. It is not the art of showing, but rather the art of hiding. It is a how, not a what. Brands need to play with it, and keep showing us new things, but not at once. Instead, they should do it step by step. A successful brand takes people to magical places. It knows how to tell a story. The mystery represents potential, possibilities, the sexyness of newness. We find brands interesting if they can pull something of the imagination. We want to find freedom as well we want a trip with the brand. It is as if we are been given a blank page by the brand. We want to fill it up with whatever we need. It is like answering a question. We want to wonder what comes next, unveil the next big thing. What happens is that we expect from brands to understand diversity, complexity. Brands are supposed to mimic life despite being constructs that do not exist in nature. On the other hand, just as nature is mysterious, we expect mystery and answers from brands. We can delay brands but we cannot kill them. They change, adapt and evolve. The thing is that now we evolve

with them. This is a partnership. Moreover, in this partnership, we, as consumers, are part of a culture of branding. In it, ideas flow and they flow fast (Bauman, 2011).

As for now we are playing the infinite game and the trick when it comes to brands is to keep playing. We establish contact and we manage. There are a lot of differences, choices, options and potential but the role of the eBrand of today is to become the driving force of everything. Brands need to thrive or they will perish. As long as the mystery keeps popping up we keep interested in them, as for example the phenomenon of “expansion”. This is a fact and it tends to become scarier. From a certain point of view, we are consumers (Bauman, 2011), but from another one we are nothing but users feeling as if we are working for the brands. As if we have an assignment that we should embrace.

Another tipping point is about how we always end up getting related to more stuff. We want brands to un-complicate reality for ourselves. The mother of all sharing platforms is to experience something, because after all we share experiences and contents. We enjoy to unveil reality. What exactly are the new vectors and the new backgrounds? We want to be free and have more options. That is it. We like to search and find. We are still hunters and gatherers. Only the trophies changed. That is where brands come in. They believe they have the answer for us, about most things in our lives. This is a bit presumptuous but it happens. Brands want to be it all.

It just so occurs that we like openings. We like to feel more connected even when we are not. Brands come into play since the brand is a voice and the product is a souvenir. We feel like we are a member of a club and we display that we are fond of certain aesthetics and visions. The brand vows to wow us. And most of the time it works just fine. But what we are in fact buying is actually more mysterious. We are buying information, not the product. The product is a consequence. For the brand the purpose is to reach a point in which it can anticipate us, our next move. Brands want to be so irresistible that they become contagious, platforms of invitations that refine and define us. And it all starts with a conversation.

6 Changes

Brands thrive if they promote trust. We need to believe in them and our contribution to them is highly relevant (Pérez, 2014). Brands do not need stran-

gers but an audience in which they can rely on. As for the eBrands the situation is that they use the power of digital media and the online medium to get closer to us, empowering them they are in fact empowering us too. These kind of brands target early adopters of new trends and technologies, the savvy ones. People tend to rely on brands if they are visionary and efficient. The whole game is based on changes as long as they are good. So, what must happen is that our reputation must be considered as a key point much as it happens with brand’s reputation altogether. Other people follow us according to our reputation trail and it becomes a currency for brands. They are assembled by people whose reputation also matters. These people are responsible for driving the changes in the direction, the right direction of the brands. This is what fascinates us.

We as consumers choose brands of services and goods according to the self-similarity principle. We need brands that mirror us. We want them to be like us and vice-versa. It is a spiral, a vortex of good changes we decide to embrace as long as we are confident in the brand’s vision and influencers. We enjoy brands with nice and interesting ideas and optimal design. What we get from the brands of today is that everybody is learning from everybody. Sometimes we follow no one. But when interesting ideas are pitched we jump right into them. We watch for patterns and invest in these eBrands because they sound smart and reliable, as well as future-proof. That is good for us. At the same time we find parallel narratives. From people and from the brand, and they get intertwined in a durable mutation. We feel the need to stay in power and so does the brand, too.

Currently, a brand must keep changing because people also change, both their audience and their designers and workers. It is a spinning world. When we look at brands we want them to be a sandbox for new ideas. We want them to have the mystery of surprises. We want to constantly feel like it is always Christmas morning and there are presents to unravel. We need the spark. A brand that constantly keeps us making us feel this way is in the right direction. The only thing a brand needs to do is to steer in the direction of the right changes. We also regard brands as play-projects in which they link our data and they come up with new formats for goods and services that improve our lives. The right direction for brands is to keep up with our pace and go beyond it without losing sync with the new kids. The brand now works for them too, since they are its future audience. To

connect to younger audiences is obligatory. Considering this, it makes sense that eBrands pursue new ideas and growth with cutting edge. So brands become like hubs for interaction and instructions of how we could live better, and not just faster or more smarter (Solis, 2010).

We need to comprehend that eBrands of our time perform as a soundtrack for our lives. They overlap our visual spectrum but we keep seeing reality. But the tune we are listening to is a branded one. Beyond that there is also this need that brands have to achieve one major idea that connects one world and one market. Brands will become corporations and as wealthy as nation-state. Brands are part of our culture and they drive the changes. They are the core from where the new idea creators emerge and dictate trends. What causes brands to grow as they connect with us is the belief engine. They establish commitment devices to connect better with us and they assure that we believe in them, so we keep adopting their visions and pitched lifestyles.

7 Patterns

In order to improve brands how communicate with us by patterns of images, sounds and words, these follow a formula, and we follow it as well. There is this patternicity that we find curious and so we keep adopting it. Progressively, we become familiar with it. So aside from facts, brands which have become content producers and news publishers wrap us in their belief engine. We assume their vision of the world as our own. In this case, we do not follow patterns of facts but rather a pattern of guidelines that are incorporated in. It is all a vision that we adopt. We are entitled to the brand's vision because we subscribe the brand motto. And the brand uses its pattern of communication to make us believe in its story. On the other hand just because brands should not take us for granted, they keep getting better with their media and communication skills. They evolve to make us evolve with them. It's a partnership, not a business meant to buy things.

There is also the case that brands work out for us as a big placebo. We feel better whenever we get in touch with them. There is a negative space, with no patterns, and when brands reach out to us there are new patterns. We are bombarded with stimuli. The purpose is to rediscover the wonder we lost in the social. Correspondingly, brands become platforms for stories and experiences, they are fond of a social (Boyd, 2003) elan that entices

us with curiosity regarding their latest endeavours. The positive space is when we want to believe in the best that the brand makes for us, in that it is designed to suit us best. If we follow the patterns we will achieve something along with the brand. We all get to evolve, because we are partners in evolution.

The generations that now go online to the Web meet a new kind of brands. These eBrands are supposed to be impressive and alluring, they are platforms (Breakenridge, 2001) for tools, advices, trends, instructions and visions of what the future may be. A brand now is always online, like we are (Cocoran, 2007). And the brand can always reach us. Due to this massive revolution, brands are evolving with patterns of seduction like a living organism. And they want us to be aware of them, and also aware of life. Now we are supposed to follow the patterns and embrace a brave new world. We remain in a transit zone because changes keep happening around us. And everybody or brand endorses something. There is just no discourse in which there is no bias or angle. It is all technopolitical.

In the meantime we are buying stories, following celebrities, influencers and accepting patterns of media images. We assume that we are pursuing uniqueness. We believe the brands we are fond of are a whole force, enabling us to rediscover something wonderful about the world. In this sense the brand is built by contributors and influencers. The brand becomes a primary driver for need of change and it is its cycles of generating sexyness in newness. We accept the brand's speech and the ideas that their keynote speakers pitch to us. They show us they want to make a difference in the world, and we share that similar perspective. We, too, want to change the world. To change the patterns. First we want to get familiar with brands but we also do not want the world to be so much predictable. This is why every now or then brands change their patterns and amaze us along the way.

Because archetypes change, nowadays many people follow brands that are a management of expectations, brands that also must deliver something "fresh" and challenging. A brand should never become a routine, not to mention because of its competition. In this trend, archetypes are renewed. New models show up and diversity makes us to see that the brand is a hub for innovation rather than a center of old school concepts.

There are brands with more complex structures than others. However, brands need to work with

common groups and find balance in both negative and positive bias. Every thing matters.

8 Archive

Brands are platforms that archive our data. The more we are online with their apps (Molloy, 2013) and websites open, the more connected we are and the more data they will harvest to understand our patterns. The problem that brands have now is that the archive is overwhelming. For instance, brands promote too many images. There is just too much media to examine and to use to connect with us. The overload of information is becoming a problem. We need to get tribal again, more simple, close to the ground. Diversely, brands use their archive on us, so we feel too close, too intimate with the brand. We have the need to communicate but maybe there is just too much of communication in the sense of noise, confusion. We need instructions rather than just projections. Sometimes we need to do a media detox, we need a blackout. There are too many brands and media. Real information is important but it seems a pastiche. And brand's ideas seem too similar. There is something missing. All that we are is not mirrored in the archive. We are bigger than that.

In a context in which everybody is pitching we feel compelled to keep buying something. However, brands need to promote integrity and pass to us the groove of new experiences and passion for life, because we are more than just consumers, we are living beings. We follow brands because of expertise and leadership, we seek guidance and commitment. People are based on relationships, they need connection based on real life. Consequently, a problem we have with the archive is that we need someone to tell us what are the new drivers. We cannot grasp the shape of the archive. We need brands to make us unleash creativity and not blockage.

All the memory data that brands keep about ourselves is supposed to improve us along the journey. This is a voyage in life where brands help us all the way. The traffic of data is huge and it crosses the Web. People use interfaces and become a sort of perception machines connected to a larger machine that actually is a corporate brand. We are all followers of something much as the archive follows us. It works on its own, on TVs, smartphones and computers. A brand that performs well is a brand that uses its archive on us to trigger a revolution. We need in fact new possibilities, even if all the media and the archive becomes a glo-

bal computer. Brands compute our data to deliver new things to us. But the question is when does the work stops and the play begins? There is something bigger and beyond us, and that is the archive that brands build up about us and the worst thing is that brands share it between themselves in the model of business to business operations.

More than never, we need our lives to be enriched, not by money but by joy of living and sharing. We need brands to stop calculating and make us start creating. We are not machines, we want to be happy (Roberts, 2004). If we reclaim the archive we reclaim the future. We are not inert, we are mobile. We seek the new. It is as if we are all contestants and there is a prize for the winner. The play is the brand driver. In this new game every thing is about dialogue, conversation, because it is not a prison. We do some collateral thinking for own good, we deal with floods of work and we admit complexity. Brands must help us show to find knowledge and fight ignorance. Promoting expression is what the brands should be doing, guiding us and our future movements, but we, human beings, are impatient creatures and we feel we cannot afford to wait for positive changes. It is a speedy world. We just happen to need everything right here, right now. No time left to spare. Life is just too short.

Since time is a commodity, brands need to make life easier for us. We need a good quality of life. But we also need to get into the new standards since things change. The bigger the data a brand has on us, the more choices a brand will provide even if it means cannibalising one of its branches. A good brand evolves and so does its archive. Brands of present time are smarter. They are smarter as time goes by. Inside these brands we have our new Id. We log into the eBrands and expect a high-quality service. We search for the wonderful in them. There must be something good for us, tailored for us with an optimal design. The eBrands at stake are something we worship, it is almost as if they are to be cults or religions (Cooke, 2012), for they connect us with something "sacred" in a consumer society: consumerism itself, the backbone of a capitalist society. eBrands as such are something powerful. They introduce us to pockets of innovation, they are all about evolution, a creation of new consumer goods. As for now eBrands become hubs of newness (Frampton, 2012). We long for them.

Conclusion

These eight principles are what in our perspective shapes up a good eBrand. These constructs of our society are the outcome of the merge between brands and media technology. Without the Web and mobile media there would be no eBrands. But, then again, without the computer it would be impossible. The computer design prepared the ground for both the online medium and the blending between computer society and consumer society, between information and capitalism. Technology has set the stage for perfect brand-to-consumer relationships, thriving data pools and commitment devices. Once technology disappears in the background all that is left is a simple connection between brand and user-consumer. Following this we see more and more collaborations occur between people and corporate brands. These brands become superspreaders of trends for mavericks, start-ups and trendsetters. Now we do not own things. We rent and lease, we subscribe. Ownership ended. Everything just works out fine on a collective level. The rise of cooperative infrastructure has changed all business models. Most things are by-product of new digital media trends. Visionary CEOs influence their target audiences. No one takes ideas for granted, we all work together with brands as we look for moving innovation. Brands make good use of tacit information and set up new products and services for global deployment. In the aftermath, we don't need more brand arguments but better arguments.

Long gone are the brands that just show hyperbolic commodities. Now brands must reconceptualize their discourse. It is about convenience and more: breakthroughs. We are more sympathetic to brands that surpass themselves and their rivals with new bold product design. These constructs that merge technology and brands must inspire youth. However, it just so happens that in the end we all fall upon the tyranny of the rating. Each and everyone's opinion is able to promote or dethrone a brand.

In order to survive, an eBrand must have an architecture of articulation. It collects our information and it seeks originality in randomness. A *rendez-vous* with eBrands is needed. We connect with people and faces. We urge for commitments. The brands that do better remediation will rule the entire game in an intensive manner. As a result of this, we accept the memberships, the partnerships, and the whole flexibility in the brand's vision. We are driven by curiosity, newness and features, de-

sign and well-being. We will stay connected to brands that promote interconnection and show us what is beyond our reach. The imperative of "the new" makes us wonder, to enjoy the flow and the swipe. Creative statements help us to find peace with our inner "Selves". The brands that want us to be creative are the best ones. We are looking for brands with empathy, and not corporated psychopathy. We want them to elucidate us into the new territories.

References

- Alstiel, T. & Grow, J. (2010). *Advertising creative – advertising, copy + design*. Thousand Oaks, California, US: Sage.
- Anderson, C. & Wolff, M. (2010, August). The web is dead. Long live the Internet. In *Wired Magazine online*, US version, San Francisco, US: Condé Nast. Retrieved from www.wired.com/2010/08/ff_webrip/all/ (Access in May 18, 2014).
- Bauman, Z. (2011). *Consuming life [2007]*. Malden, Massachusetts, US: Polity Press.
- Best Global Brands 2012. (2012). US: Interbrand. Retrieved from www.interbrand.com (Access in August 10, 2013).
- Boyd, S. (2013, March 15). Social is the new production line, not the water cooler. In *GigaomPro.Com*. US. Retrieved from <http://research.gigaom.com/2013/03/social-is-the-new-production-line-not-the-new-water-cooler/> (Access in July 2014).
- Breakenridge, D. (2001). *CyberBranding. Brand building in the digital economy*. London, UK, / New York, NY, US: Financial Times – Prentice Hall (Person Education).
- Cocoran, I. (2007). The art of digital branding. New York, NY, US: Allworth Press. Retrieved from www.amazon.com/Art-Digital-Branding-Ian-Cocoran/dp/1581154887 (Access in October 2014).
- Cooke, P. (2012). *UNIQUE – telling your story in the age of brands and social media*. Ventura, California, US: Regal.
- Foley, M. J. (2013, July 11). Ballmer to staff: 'one microsoft all the time'. In *CNET.com*. US. Retrieved from www.news.cnet.com/8301-10805_3-57593246-75/ballmer-to-staff-one-m

- icrosoft-all-the-time/?subj=cnet&tag=title (Access in July 2013).
- Frampton, J. (2012). Branding in the post-digital world. creating and managing brand value. In Interbrand. US: Interbrand. Retrieved from www.interbrand.com (Access in July 2013).
- Gardner, H. & Davis, K. (2013). The app generation. How today's youth navigate identity, intimacy, and imagination in a digital world. New Haven & London, UK: Yale University Press. Retrieved from www.amazon.com/App-Generation-Navigate-Identity-Imagination/dp/0300209347/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1464102157&sr=1-1&keywords=The+app+generation (Access in November 2014).
- Gardner, J. (2013, October 28). The new definition of brand value – entering the participation age of branding. *BrandingMagazine.com, Business Column*. Retrieved from www.brandingmagazine.com_2013_10_29_entering-participation-age-branding (Access in October 2013).
- Jhally, S. (1995). *Os códigos da publicidade – o fetichismo e a economia política do significado na sociedade de consumo [the codes of advertising – fetishism and the political economy of meaning in the consumer society, 1987]*. Porto, Portugal: Edições Asa.
- Kawamoto, K. (2003). *Media and society in the digital age*. Boston, Massachusetts, US: Allyn And Bacon.
- Lunenfeld, P. (2011). *The secret war between downloading & uploading. tales of the computer as culture machine*. Cambridge, London, UK: MIT Press.
- Lury, C. (2004). *Brands – the logos of the global economy*. London, UK / New York, NY, US: Routledge, International Library of Sociology.
- Magill, P. (2003, September 24). The crisis of Branding and the theory needed to solve it. *Symposium on The Coevolution of Technology-Business Innovations*. US: IBM. Retrieved from www.almaden.ibm.com/coevolution/pdf/magill_paper.pdf (Access in January 2014).
- McCann, J. (2012, July 7). It's the ecosystem, stupid. Retrieved from http://subprint.com/blog/it's-the-ecosystem,-stupid (Access in October 2014).
- Molloy, S. (ed.) (2013). Appvertising. how apps are changing the world. US: Saatchi & Saatchi. Retrieved from www.amazon.com/Appvertising-How-Apps-Changing-World-ebook/dp/B00C7VHSCS?ie=UTF8&keywords=appvertising&qid=1464102403&ref=sr_1_1&s=books&sr=1-1 (Access May, 2016).
- Muminova, O. (2014, January 23). How to stay ahead in the digital age?. *Advertising column. TheGuardian*. Available in www.theguardian.com/advertising/digital-media-trends-staying-ahead (Accesso in May 18, 2014).
- Muminova, O. (2013, December 20). The top 10 trends for 2014. *The Guardian, Advertising column and Digital Media Trends Blog*. Retrieved from www.citi.columbia.edu/elinoam/articles/brands_digital_economy.htm (Access in May 18, 2014).
- Pérez, B. (2014, November 6). Relevance is the differentiator in digital brand strategy: the branding game has changed [provided by the author herself also]. In Ervin & Smith.com. US. Retrieved from http://ervinandsmith.com/blog/branding/relevance-is-the-differentiator-indigital-brand-strategy/ (Access in May 18, 2014).
- Roberts, K. (2005). *Lovemarks – the future beyond brands*. New York, NY, US: Powerhouse Books.
- Schroeder, J. E. & Salzer-Mörling, M. [ed.] (2006). *Brand culture*. New York, NY, US, Routledge.
- Solis, B. (2010, February 11). Why brands are becoming media. US. Mashable. Retrieved from www.mashable.com (Access in July, 2013).
- Wessling, H. (2011). Steve job's agenda. Intelligent cutting-edge products. US: Acepting. Retrieved from https://itunes.apple.com/pt/book/steve-jobs-agenda/id479327046?mt=11 (Access in May, 2016)
- Wheeler, A. (2013). *Designing brand identity – an essential guide for the whole branding team*, 4th edition. New Jersey, NY, US / Hoboken, Canada: John Wiley & Sons.