Exploring the Effects of Brand Community Dissolution

RUNNING TITLE: Brand Community Dissolution

Miles Condon
St. Norbert College
Department of Business Administration
De Pere, WI, USA

Debra A. Laverie
Texas Tech University
Department of Marketing
Lubbock, TX, USA

Chu-Yen Pai
Minnesota State University, Mankato
Department of Marketing and International Business
Mankato, MI, USA

Adam Cann
Houston Texans
Director of Digital Media
Houston, TX, USA

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Miles Condon
Email: miles.condon@snc.edu

Abstract

This study uses the Integrated Brand Community (IBC) framework to examine how brand community dissolution influences consumer relationships and key brand outcomes, including trust, loyalty, advocacy, self-brand connection, and equity. Findings from a quasi-experimental design reveal that dissolution significantly weakens customer-brand, customer-company, and customer-customer relationships, while the customer-product relationship remains resilient. Additionally, brand equity remains stable across groups despite declines in other relational dimensions. Notably, former members exhibited similar levels of engagement as aspirational members who never joined the community, suggesting that dissolution may not be more detrimental than never establishing a community. These results advance our understanding of brand communities and highlight the critical role of organizational structures in maintaining consumer-brand relationships.

Keywords: brand community; integrated brand community; relationship marketing

Statements and Declarations

Conflict of Interest. The authors declare no competing interests.
Funding. No funding was required for this investigation.
Ethical approval. The study received IRB approval through Texas Tech University and participants provided informed consent.

Biography

Miles Condon is an Assistant Professor of Business Administration at St. Norbert College in De Pere, Wisconsin. His research broadly investigates consumer behavior, with an emphasis on perceptions of brands and the development and management of brand communities. He is also interested in marketing pedagogy, with a specific focus on student perceptions of marketing simulations and moderators of their success.

Debra A. Laverie is the Minnie Stevens Piper Professor which is awarded for unusual dedication to teaching. Her research has been published in the *Journal of Consumer Research*, *Journal of Retailing*, *Marketing Education Review*, *Journal of Marketing Education*, *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, *Journal of Macromarketing*, and *Journal of Consumer Behavior* as well as others. She has been awarded The Chancellor's Distinguished Teaching Award, the Academy of Marketing Science Outstanding Teacher Award, and the President's Excellence in Teaching Award, and has been recognized as Texas Tech Integrated Scholar.

Chu-Yen Pai is an Assistant Professor of Marketing, concentrating on consumer behavior studies. He is interested in how marketers and consumers respond to sustainable and prosocial issues. His research has been published in the *Journal of Macromarketing*. He has presented his research at several conferences, including the Winter and Summer Conferences of the American Marketing Association and the Association for Consumer Research Conference.

Adam Cann is the Director of Digital Media at the Houston Texans football team and Lone Star Sports & Entertainment. He was previously the Digital Director at the Philadelphia Union where he won Digital & Social Media Team of the Year. He received his Ph.D. in Marketing from Texas Tech University, where his research focused on mixed emotional responses in consumption settings.

Abstract

This study uses the Integrated Brand Community (IBC) framework to examine how brand community dissolution influences consumer relationships and key brand outcomes, including brand trust, loyalty, advocacy, equity, and self-brand connection. Findings from a quasi-experimental design reveal that dissolution significantly weakens customer-brand, customer-company, and customer-customer relationships, while the customer-product relationship remains resilient. Additionally, brand equity remains stable across groups despite declines in other relational dimensions. Notably, former members exhibited similar levels of engagement as aspirational members who never joined the community, suggesting that dissolution may not be more detrimental than never establishing a community. These results advance our understanding of brand communities and highlight the critical role of organizational structures in maintaining consumer-brand relationships.

Introduction

Brand communities have emerged as vital strategic assets for businesses to build connections with consumers that foster loyalty and trust. Companies can build strong relationships with consumers by incorporating brand communities into their business strategy (Kumar & Kumar 2020). By facilitating shared experiences and emotional bonds, brand communities become incorporated into consumers' identities, transforming them into brand advocates who willingly promote the brand, overlook service failures, and remain loyal even in competitive markets (McAlexander et al. 2002; Muñiz & O'Guinn 2001; Schau et al. 2009). Consequently, brand communities are related to positive outcomes such as brand identification, trust, loyalty, and community interactions (Coelho et al. 2018).

The benefits of active brand communities are well documented in the literature, but what happens when the brand dissolves its community? There are a small number of studies that have examined brand community dissolution, when the organizational structure the brand provides is also dissolved (Muñiz & Schau 2005; Parmentier & Fischer 2015; Scaraboto et al. 2013). The current study furthers understanding of the effects of brand community dissolution on key consumer outcomes. This understanding is crucial, as it will clarify potential vulnerabilities when the organizational structures supporting key relationships are altered or lost, which will help develop more resilient strategies for managing brand relationships over time.

We first provide an overview of relationship marketing, emphasizing its foundational role in brand communities. We then explore the nature of the relationships necessary to maintain brand communities. To assess whether the organizational structure provided by the brand is essential for sustaining these relationships, we use a quasi-experimental method to examine the impact of dissolving this structure on key branding variables such as brand loyalty, advocacy, trust, equity, and self-brand connection.

Literature Review

Brands are central to shaping consumer identity, influencing decision-making, and fostering community. To strengthen the relationships between brands and consumers, firms have moved beyond traditional advertising to embrace strategies prioritizing long-term, sustainable connections (Vargo & Lusch 2008). These relationships are the foundation of brand communities, providing enduring benefits to the brand and its members, including sustained competitive advantage (McAlexander et al. 2002). These advantages become amplified when companies adopt a value-in-use perspective, focusing on the consumer experience and the perceived value of products in everyday lives. This approach broadens the understanding that consumers interact with the brand but also with one another, co-creating value by sharing their experiences, and reinforcing the collective identity tied to the brand (Payne & Frow 2017; Vargo et al. 2020).

Brands support sustainable communities by providing the organizational structure that creates environments where consumers develop strong emotional and social connections through shared experiences (Bagozzi & Dholakia 2006; Cova & Cova 2002). Brand communities are tied to consumption as well as the consumer's identity, relationships, and shared rituals (Scaraboto et al. 2013). These communities are strategic assets that foster competitive advantage (Fournier & Lee 2009). The dynamics that drive the success of brand communities are deeply rooted in relationship marketing principles, which emphasize the importance of long-term customer relationships over transactional interactions.

Relationship Marketing

Relationship marketing emphasizes building long-term customer relationships rather than focusing on one-time transactions (Morgan & Hunt 1994). Strong bonds develop in the communities, leading to lasting relationships (Kozinets 1999). Brand communities foster these deep connections that can serve as a source of competitive advantage. These communities act as self-sustaining ecosystems where customers co-create value and strengthen the brand's presence (McAlexander et al. 2002; Vargo et al. 2020). The emotional ties and social bonds formed within brand communities make it difficult for competitors to disrupt, as members are more engaged and committed. To fully understand the role of brand communities in driving sustained competitive advantage, it is essential to explore their structure, key components, and the benefits of strong consumer-brand relationships.

Brand Community

A brand community is a specialized social structure built on a network of relationships among brand users (Muñiz & O'Guinn 2001). Brand communities represent a distinct social organization rooted in shared affiliations with a brand and characterized by member interactions. These communities reflect how brands can become focal points for social bonding. Members are united by a shared consciousness, traditions and rituals, and a sense of moral responsibility, developing enduring connections with the brand and fellow community members (Muñiz & O'Guinn 2001). The boundaries of brand communities go beyond product usage, involving active participation in brand events, co-creation of meaning, and emotional investments that deepen member identity and loyalty (McAlexander et al. 2002). Brand communities thrive when members see themselves as consumers and co-creators of the brand's narrative, contributing to its social value and collective identity (Fournier & Lee 2009).

The conceptualization of brand communities has evolved through significant theoretical advancements, starting with the traditional dyadic relationship between customer and brand, which focused on direct interactions (Fournier 1998). Muñiz and O'Guinn (2001) extended this to a triadic model, where the brand is the focal point in consumer relationships, emphasizing the role of inter-customer bonds. McAlexander et al. (2002) expanded this further, presenting a customer-centric model where the brand community encompasses not only customer-to-brand and customer-to-customer relationships but also interactions with products and representatives of the brand. This integrated brand community (IBC) model underscores the complexity and richness of brand communities, which provide benefits through shared experiences and multi-faceted relationships.

Integrated Brand Community

The IBC model is a holistic, customer-centric concept describing how customers are connected to the brand, market offerings, the company, and one another (McAlexander et al. 2002). By focusing on the interconnected nature of customer-brand, customer-product, customer-company, and customer-customer relationships, brands can create deeper, more immersive experiences that deepen consumer connections and provide sustained competitive advantage (Fournier & Lee 2009).

The relationships that constitute IBC are not static but evolve through shared experiences, communication, and emotional bonds. Marketers play a crucial role in facilitating these relationships, and their understanding of this complex web of interactions is critical to maximizing the benefits of brand community dynamics. The following sections delve into the four core relationships that form the foundation of an IBC: customer-brand, customer-product, customer-company, and customer-customer relationships.

Customer-Brand Relationship. The customer-brand relationship refers to the emotional bond and loyalty consumers form with the brand. As a symbol of identity and differentiation, brands can be integrated into consumer identities through repeated positive interactions (Keller 2013). Consumers will also develop relationships with brands similar to interpersonal relationships, leading to deep emotional ties (Fournier 1998).

Customer-Product Relationship. The customer-product relationship focuses on the consumer's interactions with and perceptions of the branded product. This relationship is personal, often creating emotional bonds between consumers and products. Products serve as personal symbols and tools for identity enactment, reinforcing how consumers perceive themselves regarding the brand (Laverie et al. 2002). As products play central roles in consumers' lives post-acquisition, marketers must ensure that their offerings deliver functional value and foster an emotional connection (McAlexander et al. 2002).

Customer-Company Relationship. The customer-company relationship focuses on interactions between consumers and their direct encounters with a firm's representatives (e.g., salespeople, brand ambassadors). These interactions are critical in shaping consumers' relationships with a brand as they are transactional and relational, with each interaction contributing to a deeper understanding of the brand (Berry 1995). For example, in the Jeep brand community, participation in company-organized events such as Jeep Jamborees that involve guided trail rides and opportunities to earn Badges of Honor for a fee enhances positive feelings toward the brand by fostering personalized engagement with company representatives (McAlexander et al. 2002).

Customer-Customer Relationship. The customer-customer relationship highlights the social connections between consumers who share an affinity for the brand. These relationships are critical for building a sense of community, as they often extend beyond mere brand interactions to encompass broader shared interests (Hung 2014). When consumers feel connected to others in the brand community, their participation in brand-related activities increases (Hook et al. 2018), reinforcing their emotional investment in the brand.

Brand Communities as Strategic Assets

Brand communities have evolved from mere marketing tools into essential components of business strategy, enabling firms to build deeper relationships with their customers and sustain long-term loyalty (Fournier & Lee 2009). These communities guide key consumer behaviors, such as reduced switching tendencies, increased brand trust, stronger brand attachment, increased forgiveness of product failures, and heightened advocacy (Habibi et al. 2014; Hur et al. 2011; Millán & Díaz 2014). The strategic benefits of these behavioral shifts are significant, as members of brand communities tend to exhibit greater loyalty, identification, trust, and advocacy, reinforcing their long-term engagement with the brand, increasing brand equity (Brodie et al. 2013; Escalas & Bettman 2003; Kumar & Kumar 2020; Stokburger-Sauer 2010). Devoted members of brand communities can be a strategic asset to the brand and a source of value (Parmentier & Fischer 2015). Further, brands can involve consumers in brand co-creation to increase their engagement (Jaakkola & Alexander 2014).

Brand Community Dissolution

Dissolving a brand community may have negative consequences. Scaraboto et al. (2013) investigated the closure of adverworlds and offered insights into how communities react. The communities are formed based on ties to the brand and to fellow community members. When the community is shut down, consumers feel a sense of betrayal, anger, and mourning and consider terminating their relationship with the brand (Scaraboto et al. 2013). These reactions can be especially intense among highly engaged members, who may accelerate the collapse of the community and even destabilize the brand's identity (Parmentier & Fischer 2015). Traditionally, brand communities are viewed as spaces where consumers co-create value with the brand through shared engagement (Jaakkola & Alexander 2014). However, when a firm dissolves a brand community, those same co-creation dynamics can shift toward value destruction (Parmentier & Fischer 2015). For instance, consumers who experience brand community dissolution may detach themselves from the brand through emotional distancing, cognitive reevaluation, and behavioral changes, leading to decreased brand advocacy, identification, trust, loyalty, and equity (Laroche et al. 2012; Odekerken-Schröder et al. 2010; Perrin-Martinenq 2004; Weitzl et al. 2024). When these processes unfold in the context of community dissolution, the loss of brand support may further amplify negative consumer responses and threaten the stability of brand-related relationships.

In contrast, other research suggested that brand community relationships may survive even after the brand ceases to support the community. In the case of a marginalized brand, Muñiz and Schau (2005) found that the community continued to thrive after the product's discontinuation, with bonds so strong that members described a sense of religiosity. Similarly, Russell and Schau (2014) showed that collective memory practices and shared storytelling enable consumers to sustain communal identity despite narrative closure. In a related context, Weijo et al. (2019) demonstrated how mnemonic communities preserve shared narratives and collective identity long after structural or relational breakdowns, as evidenced by years of commemorative practices that keep the community active despite organizational withdrawal. Complementing these findings, research on post-termination brand relationships shows that emotional and identity-based ties often persist even when the formal relationship ends; for example, Odekerken-Schröder et al. (2010) reported that many consumers continue to display positive attachment, identification, and even ongoing contact with the brand long after dissolving the relationship. Together, these studies indicate that some brand communities can persist independently of ongoing firm support, drawing on shared meaning and emotional connections to maintain relationships.

Taken together, the above literature shows two competing perspectives on the consequences of brand community dissolution. On one hand, the organizational structure provided by the brand may be essential for maintaining customer-brand relationships, suggesting that dissolution poses risks to key branding outcomes. On the other hand, some brand communities may persist despite the withdrawal of organizational support, as members sustain relationships through emotional bonds, shared meanings, and communal coping processes.

Although there is extensive research on the formation and benefits of brand communities, the consequences of brand community dissolution on IBC relationships and key brand outcomes remain underexplored (i.e., customer-brand, customer-product, customer-company, and customer-customer relationships), nor how these changes translate to brand trust, loyalty, advocacy, equity, and self-brand connection. It remains unclear whether dissolution is more harmful than never establishing a brand community in the first place. Understanding these implications of community dissolution is essential, given its potential to disrupt established relationships and adversely affect brand equity. This study investigates the consequences of dissolving the organizational structure that supports a brand community, exploring whether the relationships formed within the community can persist once the structure facilitating those connections is removed.

These gaps motivate the present study and form the following research questions.

RQ1: How does brand community dissolution affect the four dimensions of Integrated Brand Community (customer-brand, customer-product, customer-company, and customer-customer relationships)?

RQ2: How does brand community dissolution influence key brand outcomes, including brand trust, loyalty, advocacy, equity, and self-brand connection?

RQ3: Does the dissolution of a brand community impose more adverse organizational consequences than never having established such a community?

Based on the above theoretical background and research questions, we summarize the purpose and empirical context of our investigation below. To address our research questions, we investigate consumers with different histories and engagement levels with a brewery brand community that experienced a period of dissolution. This real-world context provides a natural opportunity to assess how the absence of brand support influences IBC relationships and downstream brand outcomes.

Method

Overview

To determine the effects of the dissolution of a brand community, a quasi-experiment compared perceptions of IBC relationships and key brand outcomes for current members, former members of the dissolved community, and aspirational members (those who desired to join but were not members) of a brewery brand community. Participants were not randomly assigned to groups; instead, the three groups were determined based on their real-world membership status, which allowed for the investigation of brand community dissolution in a practical setting.

The participating brewery initially launched a membership club in 2012, which was dissolved in 2015 by the organization for strategic purposes. In 2017, the company reinstated the club with the same terms in response to favorable market conditions. In both iterations, club members had access to product storage, discounted merchandise, and two member-only products ($40 value) in exchange for a yearly fee ($300). Additionally, members were able to attend monthly releases where they were able to purchase exclusive products while interacting with other members, employees, and owners of the brewery. These interactions provided the foundation for the relationships underlying IBC, and thus, the club's dissolution offered an opportunity to investigate how the loss of a community structure impacts consumer perceptions of IBC relationships and key brand outcomes.

Pretest

To confirm that membership status created a sense of integrated brand community in members, we conducted a pretest with current members (M; $N = 93$) and aspiring members (AM*;* $N = 130$) of a brewery membership club in the same region as our main study. Only participants scoring 4 or above on a 5-point desire-to-join scale were included as aspiring members to control for selection bias.

Analysis of the IBC scale ($\alpha = 0.934$) revealed that current members reported significantly higher overall IBC ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.49$) compared to aspiring members ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 0.80$; $t(215.90) = 8.43$, $p < 0.001$, $d = 1.06$). This pattern held across all IBC dimensions: customer-product relationship (4.18 vs. 3.45, $p < 0.001$), customer-brand relationship (4.52 vs. 3.86, $p < 0.001$), customer-company relationship (4.40 vs. 3.66, $p < 0.001$), and customer-customer relationship (4.01 vs. 3.19, $p < 0.001$). These results show that members felt a higher degree of IBC than aspiring members, suggesting that the value these membership clubs can facilitate is more than transaction-based relationships and can provide a foundation for brand community. Consequently, these results show that membership clubs can serve as the foundation to investigate the effects of the dissolution of IBC.

Participants and Procedure

To minimize selection bias, only respondents who reported a desire to be in the membership club (scoring 4 or above on a 5-point scale) were allowed to complete the survey. Filtering out participants with little interest in the club ensured participants were aspiring community members engaged with the brand and its membership offerings, minimizing selection bias.

A total of 290 participants completed a survey regarding the membership club of a midsize brewery in the Rocky Mountains region of the United States. Of these, 199 were aspirational members

(AM), 28 were current members (M), and 63 were former members (FM) of the original membership club. Participants were recruited via the company's email list, a Facebook group for the membership club, and relevant online forums. They were provided with a link to a Qualtrics survey containing the measures. The survey took approximately 15 minutes to complete, and respondents were thanked and debriefed afterward. One respondent was randomly selected to receive a $50 Amazon gift card to encourage participation.

Measures

The investigation measured IBC (McAlexander et al. 2002), which encompasses the four types of relationships a consumer has: (a) with the brand's products, (b) with the brand itself, (c) with people in the company, and (d) with other customers. In addition to IBC, the study measured brand advocacy (Badrinarayanan & Laverie 2013), self-brand connection (Escalas & Bettman 2003), brand trust (Chaudhuri & Holbrook 2001), brand loyalty, and brand equity (Yoo & Donthu 2001).

Results

Integrated Brand Community

Reliability analyses for the study's measures showed strong internal consistency across most constructs (see Table 1 for results). No outliers in the data affected the results, so all data were included. However, there were violations of the assumption of normality. Given adequate power in the sample and the fact that ANOVA is reasonably robust to deviations from normality (Maxwell et al. 2017), the data were not transformed. We also conducted Levene's test for equality of variances to determine if the data violated the assumption of homogeneity of variance, and we conducted Welch's tests and Games-Howell post hoc tests when this assumption was violated.

A one-way between-subjects ANOVA showed a significant effect of membership status on IBC ($F(2, 287) = 5.17$, $p = 0.006$, $\eta 2 = 0.04$). Post hoc tests revealed a significant difference between M ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.61$) and AM ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.78$, $p = 0.002$) and FM ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 0.77$, $p = 0.004$). There was no significant difference between AM and FM ($p = 0.98$), and this pattern of results held for most of the subcomponents of IBC (i.e., customer-brand, customer-company, and customer-customer relationships), except for the customer-product relationship, where there was no significant effect of membership status on the customer-product relationship (see Table 2 for results).

Key Brand Outcomes

Other brand measures were assessed in addition to brand community measures. A one-way between-subjects ANOVA also showed a nonsignificant effect of membership status on brand equity ($F(2, 287) = 1.84$, $p = 0.16$, $\eta 2 = 0.013$), suggesting that the brand's perceived value was unaffected by the membership status. All other brand measures (i.e., brand advocacy, self-brand connection, brand trust, and brand loyalty) showed a similar pattern with no significant difference between former and aspiring members (see Table 2 for results).

Discussion

This study advances research on brand communities by examining the effects of dissolving the organizational structure that supports them, an issue that has received far less attention than community formation and benefits. Using the IBC framework, the findings show that dissolution weakens customer-brand, customer-company, and customer-customer relationships, whereas customer-product relationships remain comparatively stable. Former members also resembled aspirational members on trust, loyalty, advocacy, and equity, indicating that dissolution primarily removes the added relational benefits of membership rather than producing uniformly negative outcomes. Together, these results suggest that the consequences of community dissolution are more differentiated, and less universally harmful, than previously assumed.

Theoretical Implications

Although prior research has documented emotional, experiential, and symbolic responses to community dissolution (Scaraboto et al. 2013; Parmentier & Fischer 2015; Russell & Schau 2014; Weijo et al. 2019), these studies did not clarify how dissolution affects each of the four IBC relationship types originally identified by McAlexander et al. (2002). Nor did existing work distinguish which relationships depend most on firm-supported structures and which may persist independently. Our findings address this gap by showing that customer-brand, customer-company, and customer-customer relationships deteriorate after dissolution, whereas customer-product relationships remain comparatively stable, offering the first empirical evidence mapping dissolution effects across all IBC dimensions.

The results further underscore the critical role of the organizational structure in maintaining brand-related relationships. When the formal community is dissolved, the relational bonds that sustain many IBC components weaken, challenging the assumption that brand communities naturally persist beyond the firm's involvement. This finding aligns with research showing that consumer co-creation is crucial for maintaining strong brand communities (Lee et al. 2022; Oh et al. 2020) and supports work demonstrating that dissolution can trigger detachment and negative emotions (Scaraboto et al. 2013). Together, these findings highlight that several core IBC relationships depend significantly on ongoing organizational support.

At the same time, the stability of consumer-product relationships and brand equity suggests that not all aspects of brand meaning are equally vulnerable. This finding aligns with previous research indicating that products often function as personal symbols and tools for identity enactment (Laverie et al. 2002) and that brand equity can remain resilient even after adverse events (Keller 2013). Similarly, Muñiz

& Schau (2005) found that strong product-consumer relationships survived the brand's deletion and the dissolution of the brand community. These findings extend brand community theory by clarifying which IBC components rely most on structural reinforcement and which can endure independently, offering a more differentiated understanding of how brand community dissolution shapes consumer-brand connections.

Managerial Implications

These findings offer critical insights for organizations for building and sustaining brand communities. Prior literature showed that brand communities strengthen trust, loyalty, advocacy, and identification (Fournier & Lee 2009; Habibi et al. 2014; Kumar & Kumar 2020). Our results extend this understanding by demonstrating that these benefits depend on the continued organizational support that enables Integrated Brand Community (IBC) relationships. When this support is withdrawn like dissolving brand community, customer-brand, customer-company, and customer-customer ties weaken, consistent with research showing that dissolution can trigger emotional distancing, detachment, and negative reactions (Scaraboto et al. 2013; Parmentier & Fischer 2015). Thus, firms seeking the advantages of brand communities should invest in maintaining the structural elements, such as communication channels, events, and representative contact, that sustain relational bonds.

At the same time, the results reveal that dissolution is not as damaging as prior work might predict. Former members did not differ from aspirational members on brand trust, loyalty, advocacy, or brand equity, suggesting that dissolution primarily removes the incremental relational gains associated with community membership rather than creating new negative outcomes. This pattern aligns with research indicating that some aspects of brand meaning, such as product-based relationships and brand equity, can remain stable even when relational structures deteriorate (Laverie et al. 2002; Keller 2013). Taken together, these insights extend existing theory by showing that the relational components of IBC are more dependent on brand-supported structure than the product and equity components, offering a more differentiated view of how community dissolution affects distinct dimensions of the consumer-brand relationship.

Practically, if dissolution becomes necessary, firms can preserve goodwill by communicating transparently, offering transitional engagement opportunities, and reinforcing product-based value to maintain a positive baseline relationship. Furthermore, firms should remain attentive to highly identified members, who may experience stronger emotional reactions and require targeted communication, reassurance, or "closure" strategies to mitigate negative word-of-mouth, consistent with research on consumer identification and post-termination responses (Weitzl et al. 2024).

Finally, because dissolution was no more harmful than never establishing a community, companies may consider temporary or time-bound brand communities when permanent support is not feasible. Event-based or seasonal communities (e.g., a curated brand community during the Coachella music festival) can generate engagement benefits without long-term relational obligations.

Limitations and Future Research

While this study provides important insights into the effects of brand community dissolution, it was the first step in determining the full impact the dissolution of a brand community may have on its members. As such, several limitations and opportunities for future research should be addressed. First, the reliability of the consumer-customer relationship measure was questionable, which may have limited the strength of the conclusions.

Additionally, using a single brand community in the brewery industry may limit the generalizability of the findings. Future studies should explore the nature of the dissolution, such as how quickly the organization executed the process. The quick dissolution of the community used in this investigation could have caused increased perceptions of brand failure or a brand betrayal, potentially leading to more negative outcomes (Baghi & Gabrielli 2021; Eckardt & Spies 2024). Future studies should also explore the effects of brand community dissolution across different sectors and geographical contexts to better understand the broader applicability of the findings.

Finally, the timing of data collection is another limitation, given that the brand community had dissolved before data collection. Although the findings show a lasting impact of the dissolution of the brand community, it is possible that former community members would have responded differently if data collection had occurred shortly after the dissolution.

Conclusion

The current investigation provides valuable insights into the effects of brand community dissolution on perceptions of integrated brand community relationships and key branding variables. The findings suggest that while the dissolution of a community weakens critical relational ties, not all aspects of the consumer-brand relationship are equally affected. These insights contribute to a more nuanced understanding of how brands can manage the risks and potential impacts of dissolving brand communities.

References

Badrinarayanan, V., & Laverie, D. A. (2013). The role of manufacturers' salespeople in inducing brand advocacy by retail sales associates. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *21*(1), 57–70.

Baghi, I., & Gabrielli, V. (2021). The role of betrayal in the response to value and performance brand crisis. *Marketing Letters*, *32*(1), 91–102.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Dholakia, U. M. (2006). Antecedents and purchase consequences of customer participation in small group brand communities. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *23*(1), 45–61.

Berry, L. L. (1995). Relationship marketing of services: Growing interest, emerging perspectives. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *23*(4), 236–245.

Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. (2013). Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(1), 105–114.

Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, *65*(2), 81–93.

Coelho, P. S., Rita, P., & Santos, Z. R. (2018). On the relationship between consumer-brand identification, brand community, and brand loyalty. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *43*, 101–110.

Cova, B., & Cova, V. (2002). Tribal marketing: The tribalisation of society and its impact on the conduct of marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, *36*(5/6), 595–620.

Eckardt, F., & Spies, H. (2024). The breaking of bonds: a systematized review of detachment in interpersonal and customer relationships. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, *23*(3), 147–188.

Escalas, J. E., & Bettman, J. R. (2003). You are what they eat: The influence of reference groups on consumers' connections to brands. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *13*(3), 339–348.

Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *24*(4), 343–373.

Fournier, S., & Lee, L. (2009). Getting brand communities right. *Harvard Business Review, 87*(4), 105–111.

Habibi, M. R., Laroche, M., & Richard, M. O. (2014). The roles of brand community and community engagement in building brand trust on social media. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *37*, 152–161.

Hook, M., Baxter, S., & Kulczynski, A. (2018). Antecedents and consequences of participation in brand communities: A literature review. *Journal of Brand Management*, *25*, 277–292.

Hung, H. Y. (2014). Attachment, identification, and loyalty: Examining mediating mechanisms across brand and brand community contexts. *Journal of Brand Management*, *21*(7), 594–614.

Hur, W. M., Ahn, K. H., & Kim, M. (2011). Building brand loyalty through managing brand community commitment. *Management Decision*, *49*(7), 1194–1213.

Jaakkola, E., & Alexander, M. (2014). The role of customer engagement behavior in value co-creation: a service system perspective. *Journal of Service Research*, *17*(3), 247–261.

Keller, K.L. (2013). *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*. UK: Pearson Education Limited.

Kozinets, R. V. (1999). E-tribalized marketing?: The strategic implications of virtual communities of consumption. *European Management Journal*, *17*(3), 252–264.

Kumar, J., & Kumar, V. (2020). Drivers of brand community engagement. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *54*, 101949.

Laroche, M., Habibi, M. R., Richard, M. O., & Sankaranarayanan, R. (2012). The effects of social media based brand communities on brand community markers, value creation practices, brand trust, and brand loyalty. *Computers in Human Behavior, 28*(5), 1755–1767.

Laverie, D. A., Kleine III, R. E., & Kleine, S. S. (2002). Reexamination and extension of Kleine, Kleine, and Kernan's social identity model of mundane consumption: The mediating role of the appraisal process. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *28*(4), 659–669.

Lee, K., Uslay, C., & Yeniyurt, S. (2022). An empirical examination of consumer co-creation process. *Marketing Letters*, *33*(3), 423–439.

Maxwell, S. E., Delaney, H. D., & Kelley, K. (2017). *Designing Experiments and Analyzing Data: A Model Comparison Perspective* (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315642956

McAlexander, J. H., Schouten, J. W., & Koenig, H. F. (2002). Building brand community. *Journal of Marketing, 66*(1), 38–54.

Millán, Á., & Díaz, E. (2014). Analysis of consumers' response to brand community integration and brand identification. *Journal of Brand Management*, *21*(3), 254–272.

Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing, 58*(3), 20–38.

Muñiz Jr, A. M., & Schau, H. J. (2005). Religiosity in the abandoned Apple Newton brand community. *Journal of Consumer Research, 31*(4), 737–747.

Muñiz, A. M., & O'Guinn, T. C. (2001). Brand community. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *27*(4), 412–432.

Odekerken-Schröder, G., Hennig-Thurau, T., & Knaevelsrud, A. B. (2010). Exploring the post-termination stage of consumer–brand relationships: An empirical investigation of the premium car market. *Journal of Retailing*, *86*(4), 372–385.

Oh, T. T., Keller, K. L., Neslin, S. A., Reibstein, D. J., & Lehmann, D. R. (2020). The past, present, and future of brand research. *Marketing Letters*, *31*(2), 151–174.

Parmentier, M. & Fischer, E. (2015). Things fall apart: The Dynamics of brand audience dissipation. *Journal of Consumer Research, 41*(5), 1228–1251.

Payne, A., & Frow, P. (2017). Relationship marketing: Looking backwards towards the future. *Journal of Services Marketing, 31*(1), 11–15.

Perrin-Martinenq, D. (2004). The role of brand detachment on the dissolution of the relationship between the consumer and the brand. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *20*(9-10), 1001–1023.

Russell, C. A., & Schau, H. J. (2014). When narrative brands end: The impact of narrative closure and consumption sociality on loss accommodation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *40*(6), 1039-1062.

Schau, H. J., Muñiz, A. M., & Arnould, E. J. (2009). How brand community practices create value. *Journal of Marketing*, *73*(5), 30–51.

Scaraboto, D., Carter-Schneider, L., & Kedzior, R. (2013). At world's end: Exploring consumer-marketer tensions in the closure of adverworlds. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *29*(13-14), 1518–1541.

Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2010). Brand community: Drivers and outcomes. *Psychology & Marketing*, *27*(4), 347–368.

Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2008). Service-dominant logic: Continuing the evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *36*(1), 1–10.

Vargo, S. L., Koskela-Huotari, K., & Vink, J. (2020). Service-dominant logic: foundations and applications. In *The Routledge handbook of service research insights and ideas* (pp. 3-23). Routledge.

Weijo, H., Bean, J., & Rintamäki, J. (2019). Brand community coping. *Journal of Business Research*, *94*, 128-136.

Weitzl, W. J., Hutzinger, C., & Wagner, U. (2024). I am ashamed of my brand-self! Consumer-brand identification as a moderator of emotional reactions following symbol-laden brand failures. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *33*(1), 1–13.

Yoo, B., & Donthu, N. (2001). Developing and validating a multidimensional consumer-based brand equity scale. *Journal of Business Research*, *52*(1), 1–14

Appendix

Table 1. Reliability Analysis

Constructs	Cronbach's alpha
Integrated brand community	0.926
Consumer-brand relationship	0.813
Consumer-company relationship	0.889
Consumer-customer relationship	0.676
Consumer-product relationship	0.826
Brand equity	0.815
Brand advocacy	0.864
Brand loyalty	0.852
Self-brand connection	0.825
Brand trust	0.797

Table 2. Statistical results

Measures	Members (M) vs. Aspiring Members (AM) vs. Former Members (FM)							
	M	AM	FM	ANOVA or Welch's test	Results	Games-Howell post hoc test		
						M vs. AM	M vs. FM	AM vs. FM
Integrated brand community	$M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.61$	$M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.78$	$M = 3.23$, $SD = 0.77$	$F(2, 287) = 5.17$, $p = 0.006$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$	Significant	$p = 0.002$	$p = 0.004$	$p = 0.980$
Customer-brand relationship	$M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.47$	$M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.80$	$M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.93$	$F(2, 76.97) = 13.11$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$	Significant	$p < 0.001$	$p < 0.001$	$p = 0.25$
Customer-company relationship	$M = 3.84$, $SD = 0.59$	$M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.84$	$M = 3.04$ $SD = 0.97$	$F(2, 287) = 8.79$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.06$	Significant	$p < 0.001$	$p < 0.001$	$p = 0.12$
Customer-customer relationship	$M = 3.45$, $SD = 0.68$	$M = 3.02$, $SD = 0.90$	$M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.90$	$F(2, 287) = 5.69$, $p = 0.004$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$	Significant	$p = 0.008$	$p = 0.04$	$p = 0.67$
Customer-product relationship	$M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.93$	$M = 3.13$, $SD = 1.04$	$M = 3.13$, $SD = 0.98$	$F(2, 287) = 2.62$, $p = 0.07$, $\eta^2 = 0.02$	Nonsignificant	N/A	N/A	N/A
Brand equity	$M = 3.91$, $SD = 0.6$	$M = 3.69$, $SD = 0.66$	$M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.6$	$F(2, 287) = 1.83$, $p = 0.16$, $\eta^2 = 0.01$	Nonsignificant	N/A	N/A	N/A
Brand advocacy	$M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.73$	$M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.02$	$M = 3.21$, $SD = 1.08$	$F(2, 287) = 7.21$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.05$	Significant	$p < 0.001$	$p < 0.001$	$p = 0.27$
Brand loyalty	$M = 3.8$, $SD = 0.52$	$M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.84$	$M = 3.06$, $SD = 0.87$	$F(2, 77.94) = 14.05$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.05$	Significant	$p < 0.001$	$p < 0.001$	$p = 0.06$
Self-brand connection	$M = 3.16$, $SD = 0.65$	$M = 2.76$, $SD = 0.83$	$M = 2.58$, $SD = 0.75$	$F(2, 287) = 3.26$, $p = 0.006$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$	Significant	$p = 0.033$	$p = 0.004$	$p = 0.287$
Brand trust	$M = 3.9$, $SD = 0.71$	$M = 3.45$, $SD = 0.87$	$M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.86$	$F(2, 287) = 4.67$, $p = 0.002$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$	Significant	$p = 0.026$	$p = 0.001$	$p = 0.118$