

A New Approach Towards User-Generated Content in Anti-Brand Communities: Are All Online Anti-Brand Communities the Same?*

(Research Article)

*Marka Karşıtı Topluluklarda Kullanıcı Tarafından Oluşturulan İçeriklere Yeni Bir Yaklaşım:
Tüm Çevrimiçi Marka Karşıtı Topluluklar Aynı Mı?*
Doi: 10.29023/alanyaakademik.1641890

Kemal Cem SÖYLEMEZ¹, Mert ERSEN², Semra ERPOLAT TAŞABAT³

¹ Ph.D., Independent Scholar, Izmir, Turkey, kemalcemsoylemez@gmail.com, Orcid No: 0000-0003-1607-7208

² Ph.D., Independent Scholar, Izmir, Turkey, mert_9034@hotmail.com, Orcid No: 0000-0001-5643-4690

³ Prof., Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Department of Statistics, semra.erpolat@msgsu.edu.tr, Orcid No: 0000-0001-6845-8278

ABSTRACT

Keywords:
Online Brand
Communities, User-
Generated Content,
Anti-Brand
Communities

Received:
18.02.2025

Accepted:
21.07.2025

Online anti-brand communities are growing rapidly, yet little is known about what drives members to create different types of content. Similarly, research on structural differences between online anti-brand and brand communities is limited. Anti-consumption literature often ties consumers' relationships with brands to emotions, with brand hatred representing a particularly intense negative response. This goes beyond dislike, signifying deep negativity toward a brand. Prior studies frequently explore brand hatred through equity theory, examining the impact of symbolic dissonance and ideological conflict. However, many treat anti-brand communities formed from negative product experiences and those arising from ideological disagreements as identical. Building on Soylemez's (2021a) work, this study uses equity theory to explore how community orientation (brand vs. anti-brand) and the reasons for anti-brand community formation (performance issues vs. value conflicts) influence content creation. Experiments show that performance-based anti-brand community members favor community-oriented content, while value-based anti-brand members focus on brand-oriented content. Moreover, members of online brand communities produce more brand-oriented content than their anti-brand counterparts. These findings highlight significant differences in content production across community types. The study concludes by discussing managerial and theoretical implications, providing insights into the complex dynamics of online brand and anti-brand communities.

ÖZET

Anahtar Kelimeler:
Çevrimiçi Marka
Toplulukları,
Kullanıcı Tarafından
Oluşturulan İçerik,
Marka Karşıtı
Topluluklar

Çevrimiçi anti-marka toplulukları hızla büyürken, üyelerinin farklı türde içerik üretme motivasyonları hakkında çok az şey bilinmektedir. Benzer şekilde, çevrimiçi anti-marka toplulukları ile çevrimiçi marka toplulukları arasındaki yapısal farklar üzerine yapılan araştırmalar da sınırlıdır. Anti-tüketim literatürü, tüketicilerin markalarla ilişkilerini genellikle duygularla ilişkilendirir; marka nefreti ise hoşnutsuzluğun ötesine geçen ve bir markaya karşı derin bir olumsuzluk ifade eden yoğun bir duyguyu temsil etmektedir. Önceki çalışmalar, marka nefretini genellikle eşitlik teorisi bağlamında inceleyerek sembolik uyumsuzluk ve ideolojik çatışmanın etkilerini araştırmaktadır. Ancak, bu çalışmalar çoğunlukla olumsuz ürün deneyimlerinden kaynaklanan anti-marka toplulukları ile ideolojik anlaşmazlıklar nedeniyle oluşanları aynıymış gibi ele almaktadır. Bu araştırma, Soylemez'in (2021a) çalışmasına dayanarak, eşitlik teorisini kullanmakta ve topluluk yöneliminin (marka toplulukları vs. anti-marka toplulukları) yanı sıra anti-marka topluluklarının oluşum nedenlerinin (performans sorunları vs. değer çatışmaları) içerik üretimi üzerindeki etkilerini incelemektedir. Deneyler, performansa dayalı anti-marka topluluklarının üyelerinin daha çok topluluk odaklı içerik ürettiğini, değer temelli anti-marka topluluklarının ise ağırlıklı olarak marka odaklı içerik oluşturduğunu göstermektedir. Ayrıca, marka topluluklarının üyelerinin anti-marka topluluklarına kıyasla daha fazla marka odaklı içerik ürettiği tespit edilmiştir. Bu bulgular, yönetsel ve teorik çıkarımlar çerçevesinde ele alınarak çevrimiçi marka ve anti-marka topluluklarının dinamiklerine ilişkin değerli içgörüler sunmaktadır.

* This study is reviewed and approved by the ethical committee of Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University Science and Engineering Research and Publishing Ethics (18.11.2023-138769).

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, online brand communities (OBCs) have become integral to modern consumer culture, offering platforms for individuals to engage with brands, share opinions, and collaborate with like-minded individuals (Schau et al., 2009). While many OBCs function as positive spaces that promote brand advocacy and loyalty, a parallel phenomenon has emerged: the rise of online anti-brand communities (OABCs) (Melancon & Dalakas, 2018). Anti-brand communities have developed as spaces where dissatisfied consumers unite to express grievances against a specific brand (Dessart et al., 2020). This dissatisfaction may stem from negative shopping experiences or ideological differences (Choi & Sung, 2013). These communities, which form in opposition to specific brands or companies, represent a growing force in the digital marketplace (Krishnamurthy & Kucuk, 2009; Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2010).

It is essential to distinguish OABCs from online firestorms, which are characterized by sudden surges of negative word-of-mouth (Herhausen et al., 2019). The concept of anti-branding, which involves actively rejecting brand behaviors (Dessart et al., 2016), has emerged as a relatively recent phenomenon (Zarantonello et al., 2016; Almeida, 2018). The consequences of negative brand interactions often extend beyond these communities, resulting in more significant and lasting effects (Baumeister et al., 2001; Dessart et al., 2016).

Unlike OBCs, OABCs primarily serve as spaces for members to express dissatisfaction and criticism, generating diverse forms of user-generated content (UGC) that can significantly influence a brand's public perception (Kucuk, 2010). Beyond serving as an outlet for complaints, OABCs empower consumers by providing opportunities to propose competitive alternatives (Cova & White, 2010).

Despite the increasing prevalence of OABCs, there remains a notable gap in understanding the factors that drive their members to engage in different types of content creation. While OBCs are generally motivated by loyalty and positive brand experiences (Algesheimer et al., 2005; Brogi et al., 2013), OABCs are more complex, with motivations ranging from dissatisfaction with product performance to deep-seated ideological disagreements with a brand's values or practices (Lee et al., 2009). However, the literature often assumes that OABCs are merely the opposite of OBCs, with OBCs primarily composed of pro-brand users and OABCs predominantly consisting of anti-brand users (Bilro et al., 2019). Furthermore, existing studies fail to differentiate between OABCs that emerge due to negative product experiences and those arising from value conflicts between brands and customers. This oversimplification limits our understanding of the unique dynamics that influence the content generated by members of these communities.

In his study, Soylemez (2021a) utilized equity theory to categorize UGC based on its intended audience, distinguishing between brand-oriented and community-oriented content. Brand-oriented content, such as proposing new product ideas, delivers direct value to the brand by offering actionable insights for product or service improvement. On the other hand, community-oriented content, such as assisting other users with product usage tips, provides indirect value by alleviating customer service demands and fostering stronger interpersonal connections among community members. Building on the work of Soylemez (2021a), this study aims to bridge the gap by investigating how content generation differs between OBCs and OABCs through the application of equity theory. The study also examines the differences between performance-based OABCs and value-based OABCs.

Equity theory is particularly relevant in this context because it helps explain how perceived imbalances between the benefits received from a brand and the effort or costs incurred by consumers can lead to different forms of content generation in these communities (Oliver & Swan, 1989). From a managerial perspective, executives cannot afford to ignore the power of organized consumers with negative perceptions of a brand (Brandão & Popoli, 2020). Marketing teams continue to struggle with how best to engage with OABCs (Melancon & Dalakas, 2018). For both marketers and academics, understanding what drives participants in these communities to generate specific types of content is critical. Despite their negative implications, these communities can serve as a valuable barometer for gauging consumer sentiment (Kwok, 2016). Depending on how OABCs are perceived, both targeted and competing brands may adopt a range of strategic responses. Grounded in equity theory, this paper explores the following research questions.

RQ₁: What is the relationship between community-orientation (pro vs anti) and the relative contribution of brand-oriented content and community-oriented content?

RQ₂: What is the relationship between the type of online anti-brand communities (performance-based vs value-based) and the relative contribution of brand-oriented content and community-oriented content?

The research objectives were explored through two hypotheses focusing on how community orientation influences the generation of different types of UGC. The experiments aimed to demonstrate that these factors significantly impact the relative contribution of various UGC types, thereby enhancing the broader understanding of this

phenomenon. Based on the findings, the paper offers a comprehensive discussion of both theoretical and managerial implications, along with suggestions for future research directions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

2.1. User-Generated Content Classification

User-generated content encompasses various forms of brand-related materials—such as photos, comments, and videos—produced by consumers rather than the brand itself (Itani et al., 2020). Within OBCs, members interact with two key stakeholders: the brand and the community. Depending on their objectives, members can direct their contributions toward either stakeholder (Haikel-Elsabeh et al., 2019). For example, community members often share information to support others, enhance their own reputation, or display altruism (Robertset al., 2006). Participation in these communities also helps members meet psychological needs, such as belonging, recognition, and social enhancement (Simon & Tossan, 2018).

A practical illustration of this dynamic can be observed in smartphone communities, where members frequently offer advice or tips to improve device functionality. In these cases, the community itself serves as the primary audience. This type of engagement strengthens the community and indirectly benefits the brand by reducing customer service burdens and fostering brand loyalty through enhanced communal bonds (Soylemez, 2021). Therefore, if a brand aims to establish its OBC as a dynamic hub for fan interaction or an informal source of information, it should implement strategies that promote the creation of community-oriented content.

Community members add direct value to brands when they share suggestions, voice complaints, or discuss brand-related topics (Soylemez, 2021b). Firms value these inputs as they provide actionable insights to improve the customer experience (Itani et al., 2020). For instance, in online smartphone communities, members might complain about the poor durability of charging cables. While these discussions occur within the community, the ultimate target audience is the brand itself. Community members understand that their peers cannot redesign cables or change suppliers, so they aim to communicate their concerns to the brand through collective discussions. This type of feedback underscores the brand's responsibility to act on the insights generated within the community. To leverage the community as a resource for more intricate tasks—such as generating innovative product ideas or collaborating on product designs—the brand must actively foster an environment that supports the creation of brand-focused content (Soylemez, 2021b).

In his research, Soylemez (2021a, 2021b, 2023a, 2023b) observed that the relative generation of brand-oriented and community-oriented content by OBC members is influenced by a range of factors. These include personal attributes such as motivations and personality traits, brand-related characteristics such as product visibility, and broader cultural dimensions like individualism versus collectivism. However, these studies did not examine whether community factors, such as community orientation, influence the relative generation of different types of UGC.

2.2. Online Brand Communities vs. Online Anti-Brand Communities

Consumers often anthropomorphize brands, holding them accountable for their actions (Almeida, 2018). When customers feel wronged by a company, they may retaliate against the brand in response to perceived harm (Grégoire & Fisher, 2008; Choi & Sung, 2013; Almeida, 2018). Such retaliation can arise from the brand's failure to uphold its role as a relational partner (Dessart et al., 2016; Pinto & Brandão, 2021) or from deeper ideological conflicts, such as concerns over human resource practices, environmental impact, or trade policies with small businesses, both locally and globally (Romani et al., 2015; Almeida, 2018; Brandão & Popoli, 2020).

Online brand communities (OBCs), which transcend geographical boundaries, are typically centered around a dominant brand or company and built on structured social relationships (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006). In contrast, members of online anti-brand communities (OABCs) reject the brand, along with its associated meanings, practices, and ideologies (Dessart et al., 2016). OABCs empower consumers by facilitating the free exchange and creation of information, thereby shifting control away from the brand and toward the customer (Kwok, 2016). Unlike complaint forums or product review sites, OABCs aim to construct a negative identity for the brand rather than merely addressing transactional issues between the brand and its customers (Lee, 2010; Tomás, 2018).

Research on OABCs suggests that OBCs and OABCs should be viewed as similar phenomena rather than opposites (Dessart et al., 2012; Popp et al., 2016). It is commonly assumed that positive and negative brand engagement are simply opposite facets of the same phenomenon (Bilro, Loureiro, & Marques, 2019). Similar to OBC members, OABC members experience a sense of belonging and identification with both the community and its participants (Almeida, 2018). Both types of communities influence trends by shaping and reshaping consumer behavior (Kwok, 2016). Just as OBC members develop a sense of belonging, so too do OABC members, particularly when they unite to express strong negative feelings toward brands (Osuna-Ramírez, Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2019; Dessart, Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2020). Both OBCs and OABCs revolve around the brand, heavily relying

on social connections, engaging in co-creation, and fostering a sense of brand ownership, often forming around strong brands (Dessart, Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2012). In both settings, members look to the community for identity formation, recognition, and support (Cova & Pace, 2006; Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2010).

What primarily differentiates OBCs and OABCs—beyond their emotional stance toward the brand and their respective goals—are the triggers that foster a sense of belonging. While OBCs often focus on positive product experiences, OABC members are motivated by the desire to transform consumer culture and pursue collective goals (Dessart, Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2012). These communities act as support networks where members help one another achieve shared objectives (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006). Many OABC members believe that democratizing brand-customer relationships will force companies to address the grievances they have caused (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2010).

Table 1. Comparison of Online Brand Communities vs. Anti-Brand Communities

	Online Brand Community	Online Anti-Brand Community
Establishment	Brand owners or members	Members
Purposes	Sharing of brand/product advantages	Discussion of brand/product disadvantages
Atmosphere	Harmonious, Supportive	Controversial, Emotional, Impulsive, Sarcastic
Motive of Participation	To support the brand	To complain about the brand
Member Commitment	Relatively long-term for relationship building with members and brand	Relatively short term for the expression of repressive tolerance
Nature of Benefits Sought	Functional and social benefits	Social benefits
Topics of Interest	Mainstream consumer issues	Non-mainstream consumer issues (e.g., boycotting, anti-consumption, simplicity)
Mode of Identification	Created through identification with brand	Creation of identity through disidentification with brand

Source: Kwok, (2016)

One emerging area of interest is the concept of brand betrayal, which often catalyzes participation in OABCs. When consumers feel betrayed by a brand they once trusted, they may experience intense negative emotions that fuel engagement in anti-brand activities. This sense of betrayal typically arises when a brand violates consumers' expectations or ethical standards, leading to feelings of disillusionment. Members of OABCs seek to voice their dissatisfaction and warn others, employing negative word of mouth to harm the brand's reputation (Wetzer et al., 2007).

The existing literature reveals two major gaps. First, most studies on brand hate focus on traditional websites rather than OABCs (Almeida, 2018). It remains unclear whether individuals exhibit distinct emotions and behaviors when acting independently versus engaging as members of a community (Dessart et al., 2020). Although anti-branding is often perceived as an individualistic pursuit, it is deeply connected to communal consumption (Dalli et al., 2006; Dalli & Corciolani, 2008; Dessart et al., 2016). In OABCs, individuals unite to confront corporate misconduct, which they attribute to companies prioritizing profit over consumer welfare (Kozinets & Handelman, 2004; Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2010). Customers opposing brands due to specific practices actively shape their identities through these interactions (Awasthi et al., 2012; Brandão & Popoli, 2020). Anti-brand communities empower participants to create their own meanings, roles, practices, and consumer identities (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2010). These communities also function as information hubs that expose corporate wrongdoing, organize opposition, share knowledge, and build alliances (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006). Movements lacking a strong collective identity tend to dissipate quickly (Gamson, 1992). For anti-brand communities to thrive, a well-defined self-image and shared brand meaning are essential (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2010). The second gap in the literature is that user-generated content (UGC) is often treated monolithically, emphasizing quantity over the types of content created. There is limited understanding of why certain types of content are more prevalent than others.

Equity theory (Adams, 1965) argues that individuals engage in social exchanges based on a perceived balance between their inputs (e.g., time, effort, and expertise) and the outcomes they receive (e.g., recognition, rewards, or improved status). In OBCs, both the brand and the community itself become critical stakeholders. Members generate either brand-oriented or community-oriented content, depending on their relationships with these stakeholders (Soylemez, 2021a; Soylemez, 2021b). Applying this theory can shed light on why UGC differs between OBCs and OABCs, as perceptions of fairness in exchanges with brands or peers influence the prioritization of content contributions.

In OBCs, members perceive a direct relationship with the brand, which fosters the creation of brand-oriented content. Such contributions—ranging from feedback and suggestions to complaints and ideas—stem from the belief that the brand values and acts upon their inputs. Equity theory explains this behavior: members invest time and effort into brand-oriented content expecting reciprocal outcomes, such as acknowledgment, product improvements, or enhanced customer experiences (Haikel-Elsabeh et al., 2019). For instance, members of a smartphone OBC might share insights on product flaws or suggest new features, anticipating the brand will incorporate their feedback into future updates. When the brand demonstrates responsiveness, it reinforces members' perceptions of fairness in the exchange, encouraging continued brand-oriented participation.

In contrast, members of OABCs prioritize community-oriented content because the brand is often perceived as unresponsive or unwilling to address grievances. According to Equity Theory, contributors in OABCs focus on peer interactions to achieve a sense of fairness. Community-oriented content in OABCs typically includes sharing negative experiences, organizing boycotts, or exchanging strategies to resist perceived exploitation by the brand (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006). For example, in an anti-brand forum targeting a fast-food chain, members might share stories about poor service or harmful health practices, seeking validation and solidarity from the group. These peer-to-peer interactions fulfill psychological needs like recognition, belonging, and shared purpose (Dessart et al., 2016). Perceived equity in OABCs emerges from the mutual reinforcement of shared grievances and collective actions, rather than direct engagement with the brand. As a result, brand-oriented content, such as complaints or suggestions, is less frequent because members do not expect equitable outcomes from the brand, which is viewed as indifferent or incapable of addressing their concerns.

Positive feedback and recognition for contributions can foster affection toward individuals or organizations (Simon & Tossan, 2018). Unlike traditional social movements that emphasize visual similarities, participants in anti-brand movements are primarily evaluated based on their contributions (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006). Developing a collective identity is crucial to the success of anti-brand movements, as it significantly influences participants' commitment and loyalty (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2010). Relationships in online anti-brand communities revolve around sharing advice, ideas, and support (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006).

In OABCs, consumers expressing grievances seek validation from fellow members (Hollenbeck & Chen, 2014; Dessart et al., 2020). Discussion forums, chat rooms, and blogs cater to the social needs of these community members (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006). Former employees often join OABCs to discuss workplace issues and receive informal support (Ashrafi, 2014). Participation in these communities is shaped by factors such as community identification, engagement, social approval, and oppositional loyalty (Dessart et al., 2016; Dessart et al., 2020). The primary goal of these communities is to uphold shared moral obligations (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006). Members collectively make ethical decisions regarding commercial actions and push companies to address societal needs (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006). Targeted brands are often portrayed as exploitative, unethical, and harmful (Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006). Consumers reject brands that contradict their values (Arnould & Thompson, 2005; Dessart et al., 2016). Participation in OABCs also requires a strong level of internalization (Wong et al., 2018). As members work toward a common cause, their sense of community deepens, fostering greater honesty and openness (Tomás, 2018). Based on this literature review, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H₁: OBC members generate more brand-oriented content than they generate community-oriented content, whereas OABC members generate more community-oriented content than they generate brand-oriented content.

2.2. Online Brand Communities vs. Online Anti-Brand Communities

OABCs can emerge either from negative experiences with a brand or from ideological objections to the brand's practices in areas such as environmental impact, human resources, trade, or ethical considerations (Choi & Sung, 2013). Although existing literature tends to group performance-based and value-based OABCs together, these two types likely exhibit distinct dynamics.

Performance-based OABCs arise when consumers are dissatisfied with specific product or service attributes, such as durability, functionality, or quality. In these communities, members perceive the brand as the key stakeholder capable of addressing their grievances. Guided by equity theory, members invest in brand-oriented content (e.g., complaints, suggestions, or feature requests) because they expect their contributions to elicit actionable responses from the brand, such as product improvements or compensation. For example, in an anti-brand smartphone community, users might highlight defective charging cables and provide direct feedback to pressure the brand into addressing the issue. The perceived fairness of this exchange is closely tied to the brand's responsiveness. When brands demonstrate a willingness to act on community feedback—such as issuing updates or publicly acknowledging concerns—members feel their inputs are met with equitable outcomes, motivating further brand-oriented content creation. This dynamic reflects the transactional nature of performance-based OABCs, where members primarily aim to engage the brand in dialogue to resolve their issues. Consequently, brand-oriented content dominates, as it aligns with members' expectations of achieving fairness through direct influence on the brand.

In contrast, value-based OABCs stem from ideological opposition to a brand, often rooted in perceived ethical violations, environmental harm, or corporate misconduct. Members of these communities are motivated by shared values and a collective desire to resist the brand's practices, rather than by an expectation of direct engagement with the brand. Equity theory explains that in value-based OABCs, members derive a sense of fairness not from the brand's responsiveness, but from peer recognition and group solidarity. This dynamic shifts the focus toward community-oriented content, such as organizing boycotts, sharing strategies to counteract the brand's practices, or exchanging tips on alternatives. For instance, in a value-based OABC targeting a fast-fashion brand accused of unethical labor practices, members might collaborate on awareness campaigns or share recommendations for sustainable alternatives. These peer-to-peer interactions fulfill psychological needs such as recognition, belonging, and shared purpose. Since members do not anticipate equitable outcomes from the brand—viewing it as unresponsive or resistant to change—community-oriented content becomes the primary form of engagement. This content fosters cohesion within the community and advances the group's ideological goals. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed.

H₂: Members of performance-based online anti-brand communities generate more brand-oriented content than they generate community-oriented content, whereas members of value-based online anti-brand communities generate more community-oriented content than they generate brand-oriented content.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Procedure

The research employed a 2 (OBC vs. OABC) x 2 (performance-based vs. value-based) experimental design to explore the impact of community orientation on the relative generation of different types of UGC. Large corporations with strong brands frequently encounter the emergence of OABCs (Tomás, 2018). Apple was chosen as a representative of performance-based brands due to its status as one of the most polarizing brands in recent years. Apple is often criticized for being elitist, complacent, and lacking innovation (Rodrigues, Brandão, & Rodrigues, 2021), attracting significant consumer dissatisfaction related to product and service failures (Tomás, 2018). Nestlé, on the other hand, was selected to represent value-based brands, given its controversies surrounding water resource management, allegations of child labor, and ethical concerns in developing countries (Andrei, 2021).

Despite efforts to conduct surveys for both OBCs and OABCs on the same social media platform, availability challenges necessitated an experimental approach. The experimental design was approved by the Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee of Science and Engineering. After getting the approval from the ethical committee, the study recruited 242 qualified Native English-speaking Clickworker users who had interacted with an online brand community within the 30 days prior to the experiment and possessed basic knowledge of the assigned brands.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: online Apple community, online anti-Apple community, online Nestlé community, or online anti-Nestlé community. In the first phase, participants reported their familiarity and knowledge of the assigned brand. They were then asked to imagine themselves as members of their assigned communities (See Appendix B) and were presented with six types of content (see Appendix A). Participants evaluated the likelihood of posting each type of content. In the final phase, participants answered questions about their real-life OBC experiences and provided demographic information.

Among the participants, 129 were male (53%), and 113 were female (47%). Regarding marital status, 119 participants were single (49%), and 123 were married (51%). The median age of the participants fell between 35 and 44 years, with the median education level being a four-year university degree. The median annual income ranged between \$30,000 and \$39,999. On average, participants were members of four online brand communities, with membership durations ranging from one to two years. The majority of participants reported that their real-life favorite OBC had a formal reputation system (73%), allowed user anonymity (77%), supported the use of nicknames (89%), and featured profile pictures (80%).

3.2. Measures

Content orientation refers to the extent to which users are inclined to post either brand-oriented or community-oriented content. Following the approach of Soylemez (2021a), participants rated their likelihood of sharing specific types of content within their assigned OBC or OABC on a 7-point scale (see Appendix). The study utilized six items adapted from Soylemez (2021a) to measure content orientation. This variable was calculated as the ratio of the average score for brand-oriented content to the average score for community-oriented content, where higher values indicate a greater tendency toward brand-oriented posts. Socioeconomic status and participants' real-life interactions with online brand communities—such as the number of communities joined, length of membership, anonymity features, and the presence of formal reputation systems—were included as control variables.

3.3. Analysis and Results

ANCOVAs are used for testing hypotheses. Before conducting the ANCOVA analysis, the assumptions underlying the method were examined. First, the independent variable—community orientation—was confirmed to be categorical, while both the dependent variable and the covariates were measured at either an interval or ratio scale, satisfying the measurement level requirement for ANCOVA. Next, the assumption of normality for the dependent and covariate variables was assessed. Based on skewness and kurtosis values falling within the range of ± 1.5 , the variables were considered to be normally distributed, in line with the criteria outlined by Tabachnick & Fidell (2013). Therefore, the dependent variable—content orientation—and the covariates (control variables) were assumed to follow a normal distribution. The analysis then addressed the assumption that there should be no significant relationship between the covariates and the independent variable. To test this, separate analyses were conducted to determine whether significant relationships existed between each covariate and the independent variable, community orientation. No significant relationships were found, indicating that this assumption was satisfied. Subsequently, the assumption that covariates must be significantly related to the dependent variable was tested. The results showed a significant relationship between content orientation and the control variables, thus fulfilling this assumption. Following this, the homogeneity of regression slopes assumption was examined. This assumption requires that the slope of the relationship between the covariate and the dependent variable remain consistent across all levels of the independent variable—that is, the interaction between the covariate and any independent variable should not significantly affect the dependent variable. The homogeneity of regression slopes was confirmed through ANCOVA interaction tests, where significance values exceeded 0.05, indicating that the regression slopes were homogeneous. Throughout the experimental process, principles of experimental design—including replication, randomization, and blocking—were adhered to. Additionally, a missing value analysis was conducted in SPSS to assess data completeness, and no missing data were found. Finally, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was tested using Levene’s test.

To test H_1 , two ANCOVAs were performed. In the first analysis, the online Apple and anti-Apple groups were examined, with content orientation as the dependent variable, community orientation as the independent variable, and control variables as covariates. Levene’s test, which assesses the homogeneity of variance for the dependent variable across groups, was not significant ($F(1.117) = 1.671, p = 0.199$). ANCOVA results indicated that the mean content orientation of Apple users ($MD = 1.09$) was significantly higher than that of anti-Apple users ($MD = 0.98$) at the 90% confidence level ($\beta = 0.120, F = 3.089, t = 1.758, p = 0.082$). In other words, members of online Apple communities generate more brand-oriented content than community-oriented content, whereas members of anti-Apple communities produce more community-oriented content than brand-oriented content. These findings support H_1 . Among the control variables, only the community’s allowance of nicknames or aliases was significant ($\beta = -0.303, F = 6.157, t = -2.481, p = 0.015$). Consistent with Soylemez (2023a), this suggests that when communities permit the use of nicknames, users tend to create more community-oriented content. This phenomenon is likely because anonymity fosters authenticity and individuality, leading to content rich in personal experiences and opinions, which enhances community discourse.

Table 2. Apple vs. Anti-Apple ANCOVA Results – Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III SoS	df	MS	F	Sig.	PES	NP	OP
Corrected Model	1.835	12	0.153	1.174	0.311	0.117	14.085	0.637
Intercept	2.888	1	2.888	22.172	0.000	0.173	22,172	0.997
NoC	0.135	1	0.135	1.033	0.312	0.010	1.033	0.172
LoM	0.008	1	0.008	0.062	0.803	0.001	0.062	0.057
OBC Features_1	0.024	1	0.024	0.188	0.666	0.002	0.188	0.071
OBC Features_2	0.802	1	0.802	6.157	0.015**	0.055	6.157	0.691
OBC Features_3	0.246	1	0.246	1.885	0.173	0.017	1.885	0.275
OBC Features_4	0.067	1	0.067	0.511	0.476	0.005	0.511	0.109
Gender (Male)	0.017	1	0.017	0.134	0.715	0.001	0.134	0.065
Marital Status (Married)	0.140	1	0.140	1.075	0.302	0.010	1.075	0.177
Age	0.240	1	0.240	1.839	0.178	0.017	1.839	0.269
Education	0.025	1	0.025	0.189	0.665	0.002	0.189	0.072
Income	0.056	1	0.056	0.430	0.513	0.004	0.430	0.100
Community Orientation (Pro)	0.402	1	0.402	3.089	0.082*	0.028	3.089	0.414
Error	13.808	106	0.130					
Total	142.529	119						
Corrected Total	15.643	118						

Table 3. Apple vs. Anti-Apple ANCOVA Results – Parameter Estimates

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig	PES	NP	OP
Intercept	1.139	0.237	4.805	0.000	0.179	4.805	0.997
NoC	0.006	0.005	1.016	0.312	0.010	1.016	0.172
LoM	0.007	0.028	0.250	0.803	0.001	0.250	0.057

OBC Features_1	0.040	0.093	0.433	0.666	0.002	0.433	0.071
OBC Features_2	-0.303	0.122	-2.481	0.015**	0.055	2.481	0.691
OBC Features_3	0.131	0.095	1.373	0.173	0.017	1.373	0.275
OBC Features_4	-0.058	0.081	-0.715	0.476	0.005	0.715	0.109
Gender (Male)	-0.021	0.058	-0.366	0.715	0.001	0.366	0.065
Marital Status (Married)	-0.073	0.070	-1.037	0.302	0.010	1.037	0.177
Age	0.052	0.038	1.356	0.178	0.017	1.356	0.269
Education	-0.012	0.027	-0.435	0.665	0.002	0.435	0.072
Income	0.008	0.012	0.656	0.513	0.004	0.656	0.100
Community Orientation (Pro)	0.120	0.068	1.758	0.082*	0.028	1.758	0.414

In the second ANCOVA, the same variables were analyzed, but this time the focus was on the comparison between Nestle and anti-Nestle communities. Levene's test again showed no significant result ($F(1.106)=0.246$, $p=0.621$). In this case, there was no significant difference in content orientation between pro-Nestle ($MD=1.11$) and anti-Nestle users ($MD=1.06$) at either the 90% or 95% confidence level ($\beta=0.053$, $F=0.282$, $t=0.531$, $p=0.597$). The difference in results likely stems from the nature of motivations driving participation in performance-based versus value-based communities. In performance-based anti-brand communities (e.g., anti-Apple), members often focus on sharing practical information or experiences to help others, fostering community-oriented content. Conversely, pro-brand communities (e.g., pro-Apple) emphasize brand engagement, leading to more brand-oriented content. For value-based communities (e.g., anti-Nestle), discussions are rooted in ideological opposition (e.g., ethics, sustainability). These motivations often overlap with broader societal debates, reducing the distinctiveness of content focus compared to pro-brand communities. Thus, ideological drivers dilute measurable differences in UGC patterns between pro- and anti-brand groups.

Once again, the control variable regarding the use of nicknames/aliases was significant ($\beta=-0.646$, $F=11.302$, $t=-3.362$, $p=0.001$). Additionally, the length of membership in the community was also significant ($\beta=-0.105$, $F=7.325$, $t=-2.706$, $p=0.008$). This result, in line with findings by Soylemez (2021a), suggests that the longer an individual is a member of a community, the more likely they are to generate community-oriented content rather than brand-oriented content. This may be because, over time, individuals' investment in the community deepens, strengthening their social ties within the group and emphasizing the community's social dynamics.

Table 4. Nestle vs. Anti-Nestle ANCOVA Results – Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III SoS	df	MS	F	Sig.	PES	NP	OP
Corrected Model	7.266	12	0.606	2.659	0.004	0.251	31.906	0.970
Intercept	12.545	1	12.545	55.084	0.000	0.367	55.084	1.000
NoC	0.057	1	0.057	0.250	0.618	0.003	0.250	0.078
LoM	1.668	1	1.668	7.325	0.008***	0.072	7.325	0.764
OBC Features_1	0.001	1	0.001	0.003	0.959	0.000	0.003	0.050
OBC Features_2	2.574	1	2.574	11.302	0.001	0.106	11.302	0.914
OBC Features_3	0.130	1	0.130	0.570	0.452	0.006	0.570	0.116
OBC Features_4	0.348	1	0.348	1.529	0.219	0.016	1.529	0.232
Gender (Male)	0.434	1	0.434	1.906	0.171	0.020	1.906	0.277
Marital Status (Married)	0.023	1	0.023	0.101	0.751	0.001	0.101	0.061
Age	0.022	1	0.022	0.095	0.759	0.001	0.095	0.061
Education	0.010	1	0.010	0.044	0.834	0.000	0.044	0.055
Income	0.277	1	0.277	1.215	0.273	0.013	1.215	0.194
Community Orientation (Pro)	0.064	1	0.064	0.282	0.597	0.003	0.282	0.082
Error	21.636	95	0.228					
Total	156.515	108						
Corrected Total	28.902	107						

Table 5. Nestle vs. Anti-Nestle ANCOVA Results – Parameter Estimates

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig	PES	NP	OP
Intercept	2.173	0.304	7.138	0.000	0.349	7.138	1.000
NoC	-0.007	0.013	-0.500	0.618	0.003	0.500	0.078
LoM	-0.105	0.039	-2.706	0.008***	0.072	2.706	0.764
OBC Features_1	0.006	0.127	0.051	0.959	0.000	0.051	0.050
OBC Features_2	-0.646	0.192	-3.362	0.001	0.106	3.362	0.914
OBC Features_3	-0.093	0.123	-0.755	0.452	0.006	0.755	0.116
OBC Features_4	-0.149	0.121	-1.237	0.219	0.016	1.237	0.232
Gender (Male)	0.132	0.095	1.380	0.171	0.020	1.380	0.277
Marital Status (Married)	-0.033	0.103	-0.318	0.751	0.001	0.318	0.061
Age	0.018	0.057	0.308	0.759	0.001	0.308	0.061
Education	-0.007	0.035	-0.210	0.834	0.000	0.210	0.055
Income	0.018	0.016	1.102	0.273	0.013	1.102	0.194

Community Orientation (Pro)	0.053	0.100	0.531	0.597	0.003	0.531	0.082
-----------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

To test H₂, a similar ANCOVA was conducted, this time focusing on anti-Apple and anti-Nestle groups. Content orientation remained the dependent variable, community orientation was the independent variable, and control variables were treated as covariates. Levene's test was again insignificant ($F(1.128)=0.321, p=0.572$). The results indicated that anti-Nestle users ($MD=1.09$) had a significantly higher mean content orientation compared to anti-Apple users ($MD=0.98$) at the 90% confidence level ($\beta=0.146, F=2.971, t=1.724, p=0.087$). In other words, anti-Nestle community members generate more brand-oriented content than community-oriented content, whereas anti-Apple community members tend to produce more community-oriented content. Although this finding contradicts H₂, it still demonstrates a significant difference in the balance of brand-oriented content and community-oriented content between performance-based and value-based anti-brand communities.

Control variables such as the use of nicknames/aliases ($\beta=-0.297, F=4.509, t=-2.123, p=0.036$) and length of membership ($\beta=-0.058, F=3.281, t=-1.811, p=0.073$) were again significant. Another significant control variable was the presence of a formal reputation system ($\beta=-0.169, F=2.878, t=-1.696, p=0.092$), which suggests that formal reputation systems encourage the generation of more community-oriented content over brand-oriented content. This finding, also noted by Soylemez (2023b), may be attributed to users' increased investment in the community over time, leading them to prioritize community interactions.

Table 6. Anti-Nestle vs. Anti-Apple ANCOVA Results – Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III SoS	df	MS	F	Sig.	PES	NP	OP
Corrected Model	5.140	12	0.428	2.036	0.027	0.173	24.437	0.909
Intercept	10.476	1	10.476	49.807	0.000	0.299	49.807	1.000
NoC	0.146	1	0.146	0.692	0.407	0.006	0.692	0.131
LoM	0.690	1	0.690	3.281	0.073*	0.027	3.281	0.435
OBC Features_1	0.208	1	0.208	0.987	0.323	0.008	0.987	0.166
OBC Features_2	0.948	1	0.948	4.509	0.036**	0.037	4.509	0.558
OBC Features_3	0.003	1	0.003	0.012	0.912	0.000	0.012	0.051
OBC Features_4	0.605	1	0.605	2.878	0.092*	0.024	2.878	0.391
Gender (Male)	0.002	1	0.002	0.009	0.926	0.000	0.009	0.051
Marital Status (Married)	0.074	1	0.074	0.352	0.554	0.003	0.352	0.090
Age	0.045	1	0.045	0.213	0.646	0.002	0.213	0.074
Education	0.033	1	0.033	0.157	0.693	0.001	0.157	0.068
Income	0.316	1	0.316	1.502	0.223	0.013	1.502	0.229
Brand (Apple)	0.625	1	0.625	2.971	0.087*	0.025	2.971	0.401
Error	24.609	117	0.210					
Total	170.055	130						
Corrected Total	29.749	129						

Table 7. Anti-Nestle vs. Anti-Apple ANCOVA Results – Parameter Estimates

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	PES	NP	OP
Intercept	1.539	0.236	6.527	0.000	0.267	6.527	1.000
NoC	0.006	0.008	0.832	0.407	0.006	0.832	0.131
LoM	-0.058	0.032	-1.811	0.073*	0.027	1.811	0.435
OBC Features_1	-0.104	0.105	-0.993	0.323	0.008	0.993	0.166
OBC Features_2	-0.297	0.140	-2.123	0.036**	0.037	2.123	0.558
OBC Features_3	0.012	0.107	0.111	0.912	0.000	0.111	0.051
OBC Features_4	-0.169	0.100	-1.696	0.092*	0.024	1.696	0.391
Gender (Male)	0.007	0.071	0.093	0.926	0.000	0.093	0.051
Marital Status (Married)	-0.053	0.089	-0.593	0.554	0.003	0.593	0.090
Age	0.023	0.050	0.461	0.646	0.002	0.461	0.074
Education	-0.012	0.029	-0.396	0.693	0.001	0.396	0.068
Income	0.017	0.014	1.226	0.223	0.013	1.226	0.229
Brand (Nestle)	0.146	0.085	1.724	0.087*	0.025	1.724	0.401

4. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

While content generation has been extensively studied in literature, previous research often treats user-generated content as a single, uniform entity targeting the same audience. However, as noted by Soylemez (2021b), community members produce both brand-oriented and community-oriented content. Both types provide value to brands, either directly or indirectly (Carvalho & Fernandes, 2018), making it essential to strike a balance between them for the sustainability of OBCs. To maximize the benefits derived from these communities, brands must understand the factors that drive the creation of each type of UGC.

In today's consumer landscape, individuals are increasingly vocal about unethical business practices. Consequently, understanding the dynamics of OABCs has become critical for marketers and practitioners. This article examines how community orientation and the type of OABC influence the relative production of different types of UGC. Drawing on equity theory, it proposes that members of OBCs are more likely to generate brand-oriented content, whereas members of OABCs are more inclined to produce community-oriented content. Study 1 empirically tests this hypothesis. Although the hypothesis was not supported when comparing pro- and anti-Nestlé communities, it was confirmed in the comparison of pro- and anti-Apple communities. A potential explanation for this discrepancy could be the distinct content-generation dynamics between performance-based and value-based OABCs.

To explore this further, the study classifies OABCs based on their underlying motivations, distinguishing between performance-based and value-based OABCs. The hypothesis posits that members of performance-based OABCs generate more brand-oriented content than community-oriented content, while members of value-based OABCs produce more community-oriented content than brand-oriented content. Study 2 empirically tested this hypothesis. Interestingly, while the results were statistically significant, they were in the opposite direction: value-based OABCs generated more brand-oriented content, whereas performance-based OABCs produced more community-oriented content. Although equity theory suggests that members of value-based OABCs are more likely to direct their efforts toward peer interactions (Dessart et al., 2016; Hollenbeck & Zinkhan, 2006), our results indicate a stronger inclination toward brand-oriented content. One plausible explanation is that moral outrage and ethical disillusionment—which typically characterize value-based OABCs—may intensify the desire for direct accountability from brands. Scholars have argued that brand moral violations elicit powerful emotions like anger and betrayal (Romani et al., 2015), which can motivate consumers to directly confront the brand via complaints, demands for reform, or advocacy campaigns (Zarantonello et al., 2016). Moreover, brand anthropomorphism may exacerbate this tendency. When consumers perceive brands as moral agents (Almeida, 2018), ethical violations are seen not merely as poor practices but as personal betrayals, prompting consumers to generate brand-oriented content in hopes of invoking guilt, public pressure, or reputational consequences. Another factor could be the strategic use of community platforms as instruments of protest. Members of value-based OABCs might utilize these spaces to organize petitions, draft open letters, or coordinate direct messages to corporate executives—activities that inherently prioritize brand-oriented engagement despite the community's oppositional nature. Finally, social movement theory suggests that highly mobilized identity-based communities often focus on confronting power structures directly rather than engaging solely in peer support (Gamson, 1992; Kozinets & Handelman, 2004). In this context, content generation becomes a tool for advocacy, and brand-oriented posts may serve as calls to action for broader societal reform.

Additionally, community features—such as whether members are allowed to use nicknames, the presence of a reputation system, and the length of membership—were found to influence content generation. Consistent with previous studies, these factors tend to encourage members to produce more community-oriented content.

4.1. Implications for scholars

This research makes several key contributions to the literature on online OBCs, with a particular focus on OABCs, which remain underexplored compared to OBCs. By applying equity theory to user-generated content dynamics, this study offers fresh insights into how content creation is shaped by community orientation (OBC vs. OABC) and underlying motivations (performance-based vs. value-based).

First, this study extends the application of equity theory within the context of OBCs by illustrating how members balance their social exchanges based on perceived fairness in their relationships with both brands and fellow community members. The findings challenge the assumption that OABCs are merely the inverse of OBCs, revealing distinct patterns of content generation driven by foundational motives. Specifically, value-based OABCs are shown to generate more brand-oriented content, whereas performance-based communities tend to produce more community-oriented content. This distinction nuances the understanding of OABCs, suggesting that members of value-based communities are deeply invested in critiquing brands on ethical or ideological grounds, while performance-based communities emphasize internal support and identity-building.

Second, this paper introduces a novel classification of OABCs into performance-based and value-based categories, moving beyond prior research that has often treated OABCs as homogenous entities. This classification underscores the importance of considering the motivations that drive these communities, offering significant implications for understanding consumer behavior in both positive and negative brand contexts. Additionally, the study builds upon existing literature on consumer activism and brand-related social movements, refining these discussions by demonstrating that the nature of grievances—whether focused on product performance or values—shapes the type of UGC produced.

Moreover, the findings suggest that content generation within OABCs is far more complex than previously understood. While existing research often treats UGC as a monolithic category, this study reveals that different

types of communities foster distinct forms of content. Notably, the study highlights that community features—such as anonymity, reputation systems, and membership duration—play a significant role in shaping content orientation. These insights contribute to a deeper theoretical understanding of how structural factors within OBCs influence content production, enriching the broader literature on social identity theory and collective action in digital consumer spaces.

Finally, this research challenges the prevailing notion that brand engagement is strictly dichotomous (positive vs. negative). By demonstrating that even anti-brand communities can facilitate constructive, community-oriented interactions, it highlights that brand opposition is not inherently antagonistic. Instead, these communities can serve as spaces for deeper engagement and critical discourse, with potential implications for how scholars and practitioners understand consumer resistance movements. Such dynamics may even foster opportunities for value co-creation, albeit in opposition to the brand. In conclusion, this study advances theoretical discussions on online brand communities by highlighting the multidimensional nature of participation in anti-brand communities. It calls for future research to further investigate content dynamics in other forms of consumer opposition movements, particularly across diverse cultural contexts and industries, to better understand the broader implications of these findings.

4.2. Implications for managers

The findings of this study provide significant managerial implications for brands navigating the increasingly complex landscape of OABCs. In today's digital environment, brands cannot afford to ignore these communities, as they not only influence consumer sentiment but also shape market dynamics through user-generated content. The distinction between performance-based and value-based OABCs underscores the need for tailored strategies. Understanding the motivational distinctions between performance- and value-based anti-brand communities offers a framework for crisis response. Performance-related complaints can be addressed through product fixes or customer service upgrades, whereas ideological discontent requires deep structural and ethical changes to restore brand legitimacy.

Performance-based OABCs are often driven by functional issues with the brand, such as problems with product performance or customer service. For these communities, brands should adopt a problem-solving approach—engaging with members by addressing their concerns transparently and offering effective solutions. Acknowledging product flaws or service shortcomings and taking swift corrective actions can transform dissatisfied customers into brand advocates or, at the very least, mitigate further damage. Conversely, value-based OABCs typically oppose a brand on ethical, environmental, or ideological grounds. In these cases, resolving performance issues alone will not suffice. Brands must demonstrate a genuine commitment to addressing deeper concerns through long-term, value-driven strategies. For instance, engaging in corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives, improving environmental sustainability, or ensuring fair labor practices may be necessary to counteract negative perceptions in value-based communities.

This study also highlights the role of community features—such as allowing anonymity, implementing formal reputation systems, and encouraging longer membership durations—in fostering more community-oriented content. These insights provide brands with opportunities to structure their own online communities in ways that encourage positive engagement. By promoting longer membership durations through loyalty programs, integrating transparent reputation systems, and supporting user anonymity when appropriate, brands can cultivate stronger, more cohesive communities that emphasize supportive rather than adversarial interactions. Community features such as nickname allowances and reputation systems significantly influenced content orientation. Brands could design OBCs that balance anonymity and credibility, promoting authentic but constructive participation.

Moreover, brands can strategically leverage community-oriented interactions within performance-based anti-brand communities. By fostering constructive dialogue and emphasizing positive community interactions, brands may gradually shift the tone of discussions, potentially converting negative attention into brand loyalty over time.

Rather than adopting defensive or adversarial tactics against OABCs, brands should engage with these communities proactively. This study underscores the potential of OABCs as valuable sources of feedback. Establishing open lines of communication and positioning the brand as responsive and attentive can mitigate the adverse effects of negative UGC. Actively participating in dialogues, acknowledging valid criticisms, and inviting community members to co-create solutions can transform opposition into opportunities for growth and improvement.

Furthermore, brands should develop preemptive strategies to address common triggers of OABCs, such as perceptions of unethical behavior or substandard product performance. Preventing the emergence of OABCs through ethical and effective practices is far more efficient than attempting to repair brand equity after reputational damage has occurred. Given that performance-based anti-brand communities like those surrounding Apple were more likely to produce community-oriented content, managers should focus on enabling peer-to-peer support

forums and incentivizing active user discussion as a means of diffusing dissatisfaction and reducing direct brand attacks. For value-based OABCs, where ethical concerns dominate, brands must align their practices with the values prioritized by these communities. Companies facing ideological backlash must not only monitor these spaces but also consider engaging through transparent CSR communications to mitigate reputational damage. Failing to address these concerns can lead to sustained negative attention, jeopardizing the brand's long-term image. Companies should adopt a stakeholder-oriented approach, balancing shareholder value with environmental, social, and governance (ESG) considerations that consumers increasingly prioritize. Clear, measurable improvements in areas such as sustainability, transparency, and ethical business practices can help rebuild trust and credibility.

Finally, the rise of OABCs also presents opportunities for competitors. Insights from rival anti-brand communities can be leveraged to capitalize on weaknesses and differentiate a competing brand. For instance, if a brand is heavily criticized for poor environmental practices, a competitor can emphasize its sustainability efforts in marketing campaigns. Such strategies can attract disaffected consumers by offering an alternative that aligns with their values.

4.2. Limitations and further research directions

While this study provides valuable insights into OBCs through two distinct analyses, certain limitations should be acknowledged. First, the use of experimental data instead of real-world data may invite critique. Although this is a valid concern, it is important to consider the challenges involved in identifying distinct and active OBCs and OABCs on the same platform. Another limitation lies in the selection of products with varying levels of consumer involvement. Future research should aim to replicate these findings using brands that are more comparable in terms of perceived value.

Although the ANCOVA results revealed statistically significant effects in several comparisons, the partial eta squared values were generally small to moderate (e.g., PES = 0.028 for Apple vs. anti-Apple; PES = 0.025 for anti-Nestlé vs. anti-Apple). According to Cohen's benchmarks (1988), these indicate small effect sizes. This suggests that while community orientation and brand type have a significant influence on content generation behavior, other unexplored variables likely contribute to UGC patterns as well. Thus, while statistically valid, these findings should be interpreted with caution in terms of their practical strength.

A potential avenue for future research is to examine how negative publicity crises influence content-generation dynamics within OBCs. For instance, Starbucks has been widely praised in academic literature for its effective management of OBCs. However, recent controversies—such as backlash over its stance on the ongoing Gaza conflict—raise questions about whether content-generation patterns might shift during value-based negative publicity incidents. If an OBC that previously criticized Starbucks for issues like pricing or coffee roasting practices were impacted by such a crisis, would there be significant changes in the type of content generated?

Additionally, future research could explore these dynamics across different cultural contexts. Soylemez (2023b) found that individuals with individualistic tendencies are more likely to produce brand-oriented content, whereas those with collectivist tendencies tend to generate community-oriented content. However, it remains unclear whether these patterns extend to anti-brand communities, presenting another promising avenue for investigation.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). Academic Press.
- Algesheimer, R., Dholakia, U. M., & Herrmann, A. (2005). The social influence of brand community: Evidence from European car clubs. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(3), 19-34. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.69.3.19.66363>
- Almeida, A. S. (2018). *Negative consumer brand relationships and brand anthropomorphism: The case of social media based anti-brand communities* (Master's thesis). Universidade do Porto.
- Andrei, M. (2021). Why Nestlé is one of the most hated companies in the world. *ZME Science*. Retrieved November 3, 2021, from <https://www.zmescience.com/science/nestle-company-pollution-children>
- Arnould, E. J., & Thompson, C. J. (2005). Consumer culture theory (CCT): Twenty years of research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(4), 868-882. <https://doi.org/10.1086/426626>
- Ashrafi, L. (2014). *Role of anti-brand websites on brand equity* [Master's thesis, Luleå University of Technology] <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1020029/FULLTEXT02.pdf>
- Awasthi, B., Sharma, R., & Gulati, U. (2012). Anti-branding: Analyzing its long-term impact. *IUP Journal of Brand Management*, 9(4), 48-65.

- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 5(4), 323-370. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.5.4.323>
- Bilro, R. G., Loureiro, S. M., & Marques, M. I. (2019). Online brand communities: When consumers are negatively engaged. In P. Rossi & N. Krey (Eds.), *AMSWMC 2018: Finding new ways to engage and satisfy global customers* (pp. 733-740). Springer.
- Brandão, A., & Popoli, P. (2020). Who does join the anti-brand communities on the internet? In D. Vrontis, Y. Weber, & E. Tsoukatos (Eds.), *13th Annual Conference of the EuroMed Academy of Business* (pp. 1222-1225). EuroMed Press.
- Brogi, S., Calabrese, A., Campisi, D., Capece, G., Costa, R., & Di Pillo, F. (2013). The effects of online brand communities on brand equity in the luxury fashion industry. *International Journal of Engineering Business Management*, 5(31), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.5772/56854>
- Choi, E. M., & Sung, Y. (2013). Consumer engagement in online anti-brand communities. *Review of Korean Society for Internet Information*, 14(1), 8-28.
- Cova, B., & Pace, S. (2006). Brand community of convenience products: New forms of customer empowerment – the case “my Nutella The Community.” *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(9/10), 1087-1105. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560610681023>
- Cova, B., & White, T. (2010). Counter-brand and alter-brand communities: The impact of Web 2.0 on tribal marketing approaches. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 26(3-4), 256-270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02672570903566276>
- Dalli, D., & Corciolani, M. (2008). Collective forms of resistance: The transformative power of moderate communities. *International Journal of Market Research*, 50(6), 757-775. <https://doi.org/10.2501/S1470785308200195>
- Dalli, D., Romani, S., & Gistri, G. (2006). Brand dislike: The dark side of consumer preferences. In C. Pechmann & L. Price (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research* (pp. 87-95). Association for Consumer Research.
- Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C., & Morgan-Thomas, A. (2012). Brand communities and anti-brand communities: Similarities, differences and implications for managers. *Theoretical and Empirical Reflections in Marketing* (BUS2012-0337). Athens: Atiner's Conference Paper Series.
- Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C., & Morgan-Thomas, A. (2016). What drives anti-brand community behaviours: An examination of online hate of technology brands. In M. W. Obal, N. Krey, & C. Bushardt (Eds.), *Let's get engaged! Crossing the threshold of marketing's engagement era* (pp. 473-477). Cham: Springer.
- Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C., & Morgan-Thomas, A. (2020). Brand negativity: A relational perspective on anti-brand community participation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 54(7), 1761-1785. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-06-2018-0423>
- Gamson, W. A. (1992). *Talking politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gavilan, D., Avello, M., & Martinez-Navarro, G. (2018). The influence of online ratings and reviews on hotel booking consideration. *Tourism Management*, 66, 53-61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.10.018>
- Grégoire, Y., & Fisher, R. J. (2008). Customer betrayal and retaliation: When your best customers become your worst enemies. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(2), 247-261. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0054-0>
- Haikel-Elsabeh, M., Zhao, Z., Ivens, B., & Brem, A. (2019). When is brand content shared on Facebook? A field study on online Word-of-Mouth. *International Journal of Market Research*, 61(3), 287-301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470785318805301>
- Herhausen, D., Ludwig, S., Grewal, D., Wulf, J., & Schoegel, M. (2019). Detecting, preventing, and mitigating online firestorms in brand communities. *Journal of Marketing*, 83(3), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242918822300>
- Hollebeck, L., & Chen, T. (2014). Exploring positively- versus negatively-valenced brand engagement: A conceptual model. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 23(1), 62-74. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-06-2013-0332>
- Hollenbeck, C. R., & Zinkhan, G. M. (2006). Consumer activism on the internet: The role of anti-brand communities. In C. Pechmann & L. Price (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research* (pp. 479-485). Association for Consumer Research.

- Hollenbeck, C. R., & Zinkhan, G. M. (2010). Anti-brand communities, negotiation of brand meaning, and the learning process: The case of Wal-Mart. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 13(3), 325-345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10253861003787056>
- Itani, O. S., El Haddad, R., & Kalra, A. (2020). Exploring the role of extrovert-introvert customers' personality prototype as a driver of customer engagement: does relationship duration matter?. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 53, 101980. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.101980>
- Kozinets, R. V., & Handelman, J. M. (2004). Adversaries of consumption: Consumer movements, activism, and ideology. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(3), 691-704. <https://doi.org/10.1086/425104>
- Krishnamurthy, S., & Kucuk, S. U. (2009). Anti-branding on the Internet. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(11), 1119-1126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.09.003>
- Kucuk, S. U. (2010). Negative double jeopardy: The role of anti-brand sites on the Internet. *Journal of Brand Management*, 17(1), 41-52. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bm.2550100>
- Kucuk, S. U. (2008). Consumer exit, voice, and power on the internet. *Journal of Research for Consumers*, 15, 1-6.
- Kwok, Y. K. (2016). *Antecedents and consequences of online brand and anti-brand community participation* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick]. <https://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/78979/>
- Lee, J. (2010). *Online anti-brand communities in Korea* [Master's thesis, University of Texas at Austin]. <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/items/6a4fcdeb-6031-497b-b16c-6ecd38262b>
- Melancon, J. P., & Dalakas, V. (2018). Consumer social voice in the age of social media: Segmentation profiles and relationship marketing strategies. *Business Horizons*, 61(1), 157-167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.09.015>
- Oliver, R. L., & Swan, J. E. (1989). Consumer perceptions of interpersonal equity and satisfaction in transactions: A field survey approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 53(2), 21-35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298905300202>
- Osuna-Ramírez, S. A., Veloutsou, C., & Morgan-Thomas, A. (2019). I hate what you love: Brand polarization and negativity towards brands as an opportunity for brand management. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 28(5), 614-632. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-03-2018-1811>
- Pinto, O., & Brandão, A. (2021). Antecedents and consequences of brand hate: Empirical evidence from the telecommunication industry. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 30(1), 18-35. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMBE-04-2020-0084>
- Popp, B., Germelmann, C. C., & Jung, B. (2016). We love to hate them! Social media-based anti-brand communities in professional football. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 17(4), 349-367. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-11-2016-018>
- Roberts, J. A., Hann, I. H., & Slaughter, S. A. (2006). Understanding the motivations, participation, and performance of open source software developers: A longitudinal study of the Apache projects. *Management Science*, 52(7), 984-999. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1060.0554>
- Rodrigues, C., Brandão, A., & Rodrigues, P. (2021). I can't stop hating you: An anti-brand-community perspective on Apple brand hate. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 30(8), 1115-1133. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-10-2019-2621>
- Romani, S., Grappi, S., Zarantonello, L., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2015). The revenge of the consumer! How brand moral violations lead to consumer anti-brand activism. *Journal of Brand Management*, 22(8), 658-672. <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2015.38>
- Schau, H. J., Muñiz, A. M., & Arnould, E. J. (2009). How brand community practices create value. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(5), 30-51. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.73.5>
- Simon, F., & Tossan, V. (2018). Does brand-consumer social sharing matter? A relational framework of customer engagement to brand-hosted social media. *Journal of Business Research*, 85, 175-184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.12.050>
- Soylemez, K. C. (2023a). A woke approach to user-generated content: How product involvement and gender influence what we post. *Adam Academy Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(1), 177-195. <https://doi.org/10.31679/adamakademi.1113046>

- Soylomez, K. C. (2023b). How product visibility and national culture influence what we post. *Journal of Research in Business*, 8(2), 432-452. <https://doi.org/10.54452/jrb.1257396>
- Soylomez, K. C. (2021a). Impact of individual and brand level factors in generation of different user-generated content. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 38(4), 457-466. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-12-2019-3521>
- Soylomez, K. C. (2021b). 4W of user-generated content: Why who we are and where we post influence what we post. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 15(3), 386-400. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-06-2019-0093>
- Stacy, J. A. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). Academic Press.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Tomás, I. P. (2018). *Why do consumers integrate anti-brand communities in the internet?* [Master's thesis, Universidade Do Porto]. <https://repositorio-aberto.up.pt/bitstream/10216/117210/2/301512.pdf>
- Wetzer, I. M., Zeelenberg, M., & Pieters, R. (2007). "Never Eat in That Restaurant, I Did!": Exploring Why People Engage in Negative Word-of-mouth Communication". *Psychology & Marketing*, 24(8), 661-680. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20178>
- Wong, T. C., Haddoud, M. Y., Kwok, Y. K., & He, H. (2018). Examining the key determinants towards online pro-brand and anti-brand community citizenship behaviours: A two-stage approach. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 118(4), 850-872. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-07-2017-0313>
- Zarantonello, L., Romani, S., Grappi, S., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2016). Brand hate. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 25(1), 11-25. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-01-2015-0799>

Appendix A

Performance related post types

Brand-oriented content

1. Give feedback on how Apple can improve its products.
2. Complain about an issue you had with Apple.
3. Offer ideas on new products that Apple can develop.

Community-oriented content

1. Answer other users' questions about Apple (or alternative brands)
2. Welcome a new user to the community.
3. Offer tips on how to best use Apple (or alternative products)

Value related post types

Brand-oriented content

1. Give feedback on how Nestle can improve its environmental, HR, trade, or other ethical practices
2. Complain about an issue you had with Nestle's environmental, HR, trade, or other ethical practices
3. Offer ideas on new environmental, HR, trade, or other ethical policies that Nestle can develop

Community-oriented content

1. Answer other users' questions about Nestle's environmental, HR, trade, or other ethical practices.
2. Welcome a new user to the community.
3. Offer tips or make suggestions about alternative products.

Appendix B: Scenarios

Anti-Apple

Online brand communities are geographically unbound communities, usually centered around a single dominant brand or company based on a structured set of social relationships. There are also online anti-brand communities. Online anti-brand community members reject the focal brand, its meanings, practices, and ideologies.

Apple is one of the most hated brands of the last decade, often described as elitist, complacent, and lacking in innovation (Rodrigues, Brandão, & Rodrigues, 2021) and attracting many consumers with negative feelings due to product/service failures (Tomas, 2018).

Imagine that you are a member of an online anti-Apple community.

You will see several content types that users generate in online anti-brand communities. Please answer how likely you would post these content types in the imagined online anti-Apple community.

Anti-Nestle

Online brand communities are geographically unbound communities, usually centered around a single dominant brand or company based on a structured set of social relationships. There are also online anti-brand communities. Online anti-brand community members reject the focal brand, its meanings, practices, and ideologies.

Nestle is one of the most criticized brands due to their water resources management, alleged child labor usage, and various ethical problems in third-world countries (Andrei, 2021).

Imagine that you are a member of an online anti-Nestle community.

You will see several content types that users generate in online anti-brand communities. Please answer how likely you would post these content types in the imagined online anti-Nestle community.

Apple

Online brand communities are geographically unbound communities, usually centered around a single dominant brand or company based on a structured set of social relationships.

Imagine that you are a member of an online Apple community.

You will see several content types that users generate in online brand communities.

Please answer how likely you would post these content types in the imagined online Apple community.

Nestle

Online brand communities are geographically unbound communities, usually centered around a single dominant brand or company based on a structured set of social relationships.

Imagine that you are a member of an online Apple community.

You will see several content types that users generate in online brand communities.

Please answer how likely you would post these content types in the imagined online Nestle community.

Nomenclature

NoC: Number of communities

LoM: Length of membership

OBC Features_1: Users have anonymity

OBC Features_2: Users can alias/nicknames

OBC Features_3: Users have profile picture

OBC Features_4: Community has a formal reputation system

PES: Partial Eta Squared

NP: Noncent Parameter

OP: Observed Power