The Role of Consumer-Community Connectivity Based on Social Media: A Service Dominant Logic Theory Perspective

Aulia Arief Nasution, Syaifuddin, Sofiyan

Management Science, Universitas Prima Indonesia. Indonesia
syaifuddin@unprimdn.ac.id (Corresponding author)

Abstract. The decline in interest in purchasing branded cars can be caused by various factors. This could be due to poor product quality or a less-than-optimal marketing system. This study aims to examine the role of consumer-community connectedness and the experience of brand value co-creation and community functional support. The population of this study was car brand consumers who participated in car brand communities. The sample size was determined using the Lemeshow formula because the population size was unknown. The sample size was 385 respondents. The sampling technique was convenience sampling. The research analysis technique used Structural Equation Modeling with SmartPLS 4.0. The results showed that Community Identification had a significant positive effect on Community Involvement. Community Involvement had a significant positive effect on Co-Creation of Community Functional Support. Community Involvement had a significant positive effect on Community Commitment. Co-Creation of Community Functional Support had a significant positive effect on Community Commitment.

Keywords: Community Identification, Community Commitment, Community Involvement, Value Co-Creation, Social Media-Based Brand Communities.

1. Introduction

The decline in car sales in Indonesia over the past few years has also been influenced by the decision of several automotive companies to cease operations in the country. This phenomenon has led to the emergence of community-based marketing strategies. The communities of particular interest to marketers are brand communities. Brand communities are groups of people who share a common brand interest and are connected to each other. These communities are based on structured social relationships, not geographic ties. Brand communities can help build relationships with consumers, obtain feedback, and strengthen brands. Brand communities can strengthen customer relationships, promote customer feedback, identify pain points, and provide a resource for gathering innovative product and marketing ideas. Social media platforms help brands connect with their customers online (Jain et al., 2018). Numerous studies have highlighted the impact of social media-based brand communities on consumer purchase intentions and brand relationships (Islam & Rahman, 2017; Jibril et al., 2019).

Social media platforms have become the dominant digital communication channel today. Consumers use digital communication channels to learn, share information, and interact with product brands, whether for consideration, purchase, or evaluation (Chappuis et al., 2011). Observing the global digital growth phenomenon, social media users have experienced the greatest increase. This can be a consideration for companies in determining primary marketing targets on social media, one of which is related to the existence of online brand communities on social media. Furthermore, existing research on consumer-brand community connectedness is the relationship between consumers and brands built through shared experiences, community involvement, and the fit between the brand and the community. Consumer-brand community connectedness can take the form of consumer identification in the community, consumer involvement in the community, consumer value co-creation in the community, and consumer commitment to the community.

Brand community identification is the process by which consumers identify with a particular brand and brand community. This identification can be achieved by classifying themselves and other consumers as members or non-members of a particular group. The concept of brand community identification is based on social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979), in which consumers are seen as motivated to enhance their self-identity by identifying with specific social groups, including virtual brand communities (Lam et al., 2010). Brand community identification is believed to influence consumer engagement within a brand community. The emergence of a sense of belonging to a brand community ultimately leads consumers to decide to engage and participate in the brand community. Community engagement is understood as an intrinsic motivation for consumers to interact and collaborate with community members (Liu et al., 2018). Interactive experiences between consumers and brands (Baldus et al., 2015) are expected to increase consumption and collaboration. Consumer culture theory provides multiple perspectives for gaining a deeper understanding of the consumer value creation process.

In the value creation process, companies must use their core competencies, skills, and knowledge to create value propositions to activate consumers' operant resources, into a series of activities. Once consumers' operant resources are activated, consumers use their operant resources, money or economic value, to achieve their social life projects. To achieve this process, companies must focus on their consumers' series of activities and explore how consumers engage with their social connections to create shared value among themselves. This perspective adds co-consuming groups as value co-creators to the entire value creation process. As a social unit of analysis, more experienced consumers can create better experiences together than their less experienced counterparts, and the former can help the latter by facilitating the value creation process. This study emphasizes the Role of Social Media-Based Consumer-Community Connectedness: A Service-Dominant Logic Theory Perspective.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Brand Community

This connects the concept of Consumer Culture Theory, and its emphasis on value co-creation, with Service Dominant Logic to understand how companies engage consumers' cultural schemas to create value as a Co-creation process between consumers and companies. Consumer Culture Theory, views Co-creation value within a cultural framework that focuses on how consumers perceive, interpret, understand, and interact with market offerings (Holt, 2002). As with their own resources, companies must focus on consumers' operant resources, namely a set of life projects: the social, cultural, and physical contexts, which empower consumers to allocate their operant resources, economic values, to carry out behavioral performance (Arnould et al, 2006). Therefore, rather than companies prioritizing purchasing power as the primary priority, where customer needs and wants are the primary focus of the marketing concept (Kotler 2003), companies must instead understand how consumers value their set of life projects or how they execute their life narratives (Arnould and Price 2000). This will better enable companies to "anticipate the value customers desire and help them create value in use" (Arnould et al., 2006).

These shared consumer groups can create both opportunities and threats for companies through increased consumer empowerment (Denegri-Knott et al., 2006). As a form of consumer agency (Arnould et al., 2006), consumers within a community not only create holistic value for the process, but they also consistently create value for each other. Therefore, consumer experiences play a crucial role in the process of value co-creation among themselves over time. Once consumers' operant resources are activated, consumers use their operant resources, money or economic value, to achieve their social life projects. To achieve this process, companies must focus on the range of their consumers' activities and explore how consumers engage with their social connections to create shared value among themselves. This perspective adds the co-consumer group as a value co-creator to the overall value creation process. As units of social analysis, more experienced consumers can create better experiences together than their less experienced counterparts, and the former can help the latter by facilitating the value creation process.

2.2 Brand Equity

According to Kusuma et al. (2020), brand equity is a person's desire to continue using a brand. Measuring brand equity is strongly related to loyalty and is a key determinant of the transition from new users to loyal users. This means that brand equity is a positive differentiation effect that can be identified through consumer responses to goods or services. Therefore, brand equity is the strength of a brand that can increase or decrease the brand's value, as determined by consumer responses to the goods or services sold. It is described as the premium consumers are willing to pay for a product with a well-known name compared to a generic equivalent.

Given that the concept of brand equity encompasses all the tangible and intangible assets of a business, it is understandable how important and necessary it is to create and maintain this concept in the business world. For example, in the tourism and hospitality industries, branding is used as a strategic tool to develop new products and introduce and expand existing brands into new markets (Jiang et al., 2002). Another definition states that brand equity is all the values of products and/or services that consumers identify with a particular brand and differentiate it from other brands. Based on this definition, it can be stated that the overall value identified with the brand is the result of all past marketing investments made in the brand to create brand equity.

2.3 Value Co-Creation

Value co-creation is the collaboration between customers and suppliers in the co-ideation, co-design, and co-development of new products (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004). Brand value co-creation is

deeply embedded in the concept of valuing co-creation (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Vargo & Lusch, 2004). Brand value co-creation occurs when customers provide informational input to the brand owner, which can be used to develop, refine, or expand the brand. Brand value co-creation is an attractive and cost-effective marketing strategy for companies entering new markets and developing new brand meanings (Rezaei, 2021).

Co-creation occurs through the process of combining and collaborating to generate new material and symbolic value. Co-creation is always manifested in various interactions between various parties, namely interactions between consumers and producers and interactions between consumers. The impact of intense interactions can lead to increased product/service transactions on social media. Tajvidi et al (2004) have defined brand value creation factors that influence consumer intention to create brand value by using social support theory, relationship quality theory, from the perspective of customer interactivity.

2.4 Consumer-Community Brand Relationship

Consumption communities are formed by consumers who share a shared commitment to a particular consumption activity (Schouten and McAlexander, 1995). A sense of belonging. "A sense of belonging" indicates that community members share a common sense of belonging; they feel distinct from "outsiders" and are hostile toward intruders (Latour, 2005). "Shared rituals and traditions" mean that members share common practices, routines, and jargon that are repeated when communicating with one another (Thomas et al., 2013). "Moral responsibility" indicates that members are inclined to help one another (Zaglia, 2013).

Beyond these three general characteristics, consumers exhibit specific patterns in forming intentions to join consumption communities. They are often motivated by economic benefits and psychological well-being (McAlexander et al., 2002)—they may join consumption communities to learn about products and brands before making a final purchasing decision (McAlexander et al., 2002). Otherwise, they may join a consumer community to identify with the community's values and symbols (Muniz and O'Guinn, 2001). This is in line with social identity theory (Tajfel, 2010), which states that individuals naturally tend to join groups they value to achieve social identification. Consumer connectedness in a brand community uses several measurement dimensions, namely community identification, community involvement, and community commitment.

3. Research Method

This research is explanatory research. Explanatory research is conducted to test hypotheses and analyze and explain causal relationships between research variables. This study examines the influence of community identification, community involvement, community commitment, and brand value co-creation experiences on brand equity, mediated by the co-creation of functional community support. The population in this study were Ford brand consumers represented by FOREST ID (Ford Everest Indonesia), Toyota brand communities represented by TKCI (Toyota Kijang Club Indonesia), Mitsubishi brand communities represented by the Indonesia Pajero Club (IPC), and other brand communities. The sample size used in this study used the Lemeshow formula, thus determining a sample size of 385 respondents. The questionnaire used a Likert scale. Validity and reliability tests were used to test the questionnaire's validity.

This study used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) data analysis using the Smart PLS application. According to Abdillah & Hartono (2015), SEM consists of several stages: the Measurement Model (Outer Model), the Structural Model (Inner Model), and Hypothesis Testing. This parameter test focuses on the critical ratio (CR) and p-value. The research hypothesis is as follows:

1. Community Identification Influences Community Engagement
2. Community Engagement Influences Co-Creation of Community Functional Support

3. Community Engagement Influences Community Commitment

4. Co-Creation of Community Functional Support Influences Community Commitment

4. Result and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Analysis of Research Variables

The results of the descriptive analysis of the community identification variables can be seen in table 1 below.

Table 1. Respondents' Responses to the Community Identification Variable

Respondents Answers	IDK1		IDK2		IDK3	
	Value	%	Value	%	Value	%
1	0	0.00	1	0.26	0	0.00
2	4	1.04	5	1.30	4	1.04
3	3	0.78	1	0.26	3	0.78
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
5	190	49.35	90	23.38	107	27.79
6	128	33.25	229	59.48	196	50.91
7	60	15.58	59	15.32	75	19.48
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00
MEAN	5.60		5.85		5.85	
	5.77					

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

The mean score for the community identification variable was 5.77, indicating that respondents rated community identification somewhat highly. Of this average, 49.35% somewhat agreed that they saw themselves as part of the community (IDK1). 59.48% agreed that if someone praised the community, they perceived the compliment as a personal compliment (IDK2). And 50.91% agreed that if someone criticized the community, it felt like a personal insult (IDK3).

The results of the descriptive analysis of the community involvement variable can be seen in table 2 below.

Table 2. Respondents' Answers to Community Involvement Variables

Respondents Answers	KET1		KET2		KET3		KET4	
	Value	%	Value	%	Value	%	Value	%
1	1	0.26	-	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	2	0.52	4	1.04	2	0.52	5	1.30
3	4	1.04	3	0.78	2	0.52	1	0.26
4	0	0.00	3	0.78	8	2.08	2	0.52
5	104	27.01	50	12.99	65	16.88	89	23.12
6	167	43.38	199	51.69	179	46.49	176	45.71
7	107	27.79	126	32.73	129	33.51	112	29.09
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00
MEAN	5.94		6.12		6.09		5.99	
	6.03							

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

The mean score for the community engagement variable was 6.03, indicating that respondents rated community engagement highly. Of this average, 43.38% agreed with statement KET1, "I benefit from following community rules." Furthermore, 51.69% of respondents agreed with statement KET2, "I am motivated to participate in activities because I feel good afterward or because I enjoy them." Furthermore, 46.49% agreed with statement KET3, "I am motivated to participate in community activities because I can support other members." And for statement KET4, "I am motivated to participate in community activities because I can achieve personal goals," 45.71% answered in agreement.

The descriptive analysis results of the community commitment variable can be seen in table 3 below.

Table 3. Respondents' Answers to the Community Commitment Variable

Respondents Answers	KOM1		KOM2		KOM3	
	Value	%	Value	%	Value	%
1	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	7	1.82	7	1.82	0	0.00
4	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	1.82
5	82	21.30	76	19.74	33	8.57
6	188	48.83	181	47.01	199	51.69
7	108	28.05	121	31.43	146	37.92
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00
MEAN	6.01		6.06		6.26	
	6.11					

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

The mean score for the community engagement variable was 6.11, indicating that respondents highly valued community commitment. Of this average, 48.83% agreed with statement KOM1, "I feel very loyal to the community." 47.01% agreed with statement KOM2, "I intend to maintain my relationship with the community indefinitely." 51.69% agreed with statement KOM3, "I care about the future of the community."

Furthermore, functional community support co-creation consists of Informational Support in the Form of Experience (DIPE). The results of the descriptive analysis of the informational support dimension in the form of experience can be seen in table 4 below.

Table 4. Respondents' Answers to the Information Support Dimension in the Form of Experience

Respondents Answers	DIPE1		DIPE2		DIPE3	
	Value	%	Value	%	Value	%
1	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	7	1.82	6	1.56	3	0.78
4	0	0.00	1	0.26	4	1.04
5	26	6.75	56	14.55	64	16.62
6	214	55.58	220	57.14	192	49.87
7	138	35.84	102	26.49	122	31.69
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00
MEAN	6.24		6.07		6.11	
	6.14					

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

The mean score for the informational support dimension in the form of experience was 6.14, indicating that respondents rated informational support in the form of experience highly. Of this average, 55.58% agreed with statement DIPE1, which states that community members are encouraged to engage in activities that exchange useful tips for using products or brands effectively. For statement DIPE2, which states that community members are encouraged to engage in activities that share their experiences of successful and unsuccessful attempts to adapt products/brands, 57.14% agreed. And for statement DIPE3, which states that community members monitor and encourage activities that contribute to the community, 49.87% agreed.

The results of the descriptive analysis of the appraisal support dimension in personal interactions (DAIP) can be seen in table 5 below.

Table 5. Respondents' Answers to the Appraisal Support Dimension in Personal Interactions

Respondents Answers	DAIP1		DAIP2		DAIP3	
	Value	%	Value	%	Value	%
1	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	5	1.30	2	0.52	5	1.30
4	2	0.52	5	1.30	2	0.52
5	43	11.17	58	15.06	56	14.55
6	194	50.39	206	53.51	199	51.69
7	141	36.62	114	29.61	123	31.95
TOTAL	385	100.00	385	100.00	385	100.00
MEAN	6.21		6.10		6.12	
	6.14					

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

The mean value for the appraisal support dimension in personal interactions was 6.14, indicating that respondents rated appraisal support in personal interactions highly. Of this average, 50.39% agreed with statement DAIP1, which states that the community promotes discussions about a product, company, or brand to engage community members. For statement DAIP2, which states that members actively participate in discussions and provide feedback to demonstrate their interest in the brand, 53.51% agreed. And for statement DAIP3, which states that members actively offer constructive criticism, defending or refuting the actions of the brand's management, 51.69% agreed.

The results of the descriptive analysis of the emotional support dimension in social relationships (DEHS) can be seen in table 6 below.

Table 6. Respondents' Answers to the Dimensions of Emotional Support in Social Relationships

Respondents Answers	DEHS1		DEHS2	
	Value	%	Value	%
1	0	0.00	0	0.00
2	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	5	1.30	3	0.78

4	2	0.52	4	1.04
5	49	12.73	51	13.25
6	186	48.31	217	56.36
7	143	37.14	110	28.57
TOTAL	**385**	**100.00**	**385**	**100.00**
MEAN	**6.19**		**6.11**	
	6.15			

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

The mean value of the emotional support dimension in social relationships was 6.15, meaning that respondents rated emotional support in social relationships highly. Of this average, 48.31% answered in agreement with statement DEHS1, namely that the brand community members' concern is by contacting me through notifications. And for statement DEHS2, namely that I feel accepted in the community because I often receive special treatment after joining as a member, like other members, 56.36% answered in agreement.

4.2 Results of Measurement Model Testing or Outer Model

4.2.1 Outer Model Evaluation (Measurement Model)

Convergent validity testing is measured based on the outer loading value for each item in the study. An item is considered valid if the outer loading value is >0.6. In this study, the results of the outer loading calculation are shown in table 7 below.

Table 7. Loading Factor (Outer Loadings)

Variable (2nd Order)	Dimensions (1st Order)	Indicator	Loading Factor		Information
			1st Order	**2nd Order**	
-	IDK	IDK1	0.872	-	Valid
		IDK2	0.872	-	Valid
		IDK3	0.854	-	Valid
-	KET	KET1	0.770	-	Valid
		KET2	0.795	-	Valid
		KET3	0.784	-	Valid
		KET4	0.783	-	Valid
-	KOM	KOM1	0.765	-	Valid
		KOM2	0.775	-	Valid
		KOM3	0.720	-	Valid
KKDFK	DIPE	DIPE1	0.856	0.812	Valid
		DIPE2	0.865	0.803	Valid
		DIPE3	0.824	0.773	Valid
	DAIP	DAIP1	0.838	0.793	Valid
		DAIP2	0.817	0.744	Valid
		DAIP3	0.872	0.814	Valid
	DEHS	DEHS1	0.913	0.834	Valid
		DEHS2	0.907	0.809	Valid
		LM3	0.783	0.726	Valid

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the first-order loading factor for each dimension's question items is >0.70. Furthermore, the second-order loading factor for each dimension's question items is >0.70.

In addition to using outer loading values to determine convergent validity testing, the AVE value is used with a benchmark of AVE >0.5 (Hair et al., 2014), where the variables represent more than half of the indicators in their respective blocks. Convergent validity testing results can be seen from Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values above 0.5 (Solimun (2017). In this study, the AVE test results can be seen based on table 8, as follows:

Table 8. Results of the Average Extracted Variance Test (AVE)

		Average variance extracted (AVE)	Information
IDK	-	0.750	Valid
KET	-	0.614	Valid
KOM	-	0.568	Valid
KKDFK	**DAIP**	0.710	Valid
	DEHS	0.828	Valid
	DIPE	0.720	Valid
	KKDFK	0.637	Valid

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the AVE value > 0.50 so it can be concluded that the variables and dimensions in this study are convergently valid.

4.2.2 Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity is a construct that is assessed differently from other constructs based on empirical standards. To evaluate discriminant validity, researchers consider the cross-loading value. Discriminant validity testing with the cross-loading value, namely the correlation value of the indicator/item (the cross-loading value on the indicator/item of the variable) to the construct or variable should be greater than the correlation value between the indicator/item and other constructs or variables. A conclusion can be drawn that the latent construct is able to predict the block size better than other blocks if the correlation results of the construct with the measurement items are found to be greater than the size of other constructs (Ghozali, 2008). In this study, the cross-loading value of each indicator is as follows. Based on the finding that the correlation between the indicator and the construct is higher than the correlation with other block constructs, namely:

1) The correlation between DAIP and DAIP2 (the lowest correlation value) is 0.817, higher than the correlation between DAIP and other block constructs such as DEHS, DIPE, IDK, KET, and KOM.
2) The correlation between DEHS and DEHS2 (the lowest correlation value) is 0.907, higher than the correlation between DEHS and other block constructs such as DAIP, DIPE, IDK, KET, and KOM.
3) The correlation between DIPE and DIPE3 (the lowest correlation value) is 0.824, higher than the correlation between DIPE and other block constructs such as DAIP, DEHS, IDK, KET, and KOM.
4) The correlation between IDK and IDK3 (the lowest correlation value) is 0.854, higher than the correlation between IDK and other block constructs such as DAIP, DEHS, DIPE, KET, and KOM.
5) The correlation value between KET and KET1 (the lowest correlation value) is 0.769, higher than the correlation between KET and other block constructs such as DAIP, DEHS, DIPE, IDK, and KOM.
6) The correlation value between KKDFK and DAIP2 (the lowest correlation value) is 0.744, higher than the correlation between KKDFK and other block constructs such as DAIP, DEHS, DIPE, IDK, KET, and KOM.

7) The correlation value between KOM and KOM3 (the lowest correlation value) is 0.718, higher than the correlation between KOM and other block constructs such as DAIP, DEHS, DIPE, IDK, and KET.

From the explanation above, it can be concluded that the discriminant validity has been fulfilled.

4.2.3 Reliability Test

The results of the reliability test can be seen in Table 9 below.

Table 9. Reliability Test

	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Information
DAIP	0.880	Reliabel
DEHS	0.906	Reliabel
DIPE	0.885	Reliabel
IDK	0.900	Reliabel
KET	0.864	Reliabel
KKDFK	0.933	Reliabel
KOM	0.798	Reliabel

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

The Composite Reliability value obtained shows a value > 0.70. Therefore, it can be concluded that all dimensions and variables are declared reliable.

4.3. Structural Model Results

4.3.1. Determinant Coefficient (R-Square)

The results of the Coefficient of Determination (R-Square) test can be seen in Table 10 below.

Table 10. Coefficient of Determination Test (*R-Square*)

	R-square	Description
KET	0.745	Strong
KKDFK	0.503	Moderate
KOM	0.667	Strong

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

Table 10 above shows the R-Square (R^2) value for the community relatedness (KET) variable is in the strong category, namely 0.745, meaning that the IDK variable contributes to the KET variable by 74.5% and the remainder is explained by other variables outside the research model. Furthermore, the R-Square (R^2) value for the Co-Creation of Community Functional Support (KKDFK) variable is in the moderate category, namely 0.503, meaning that the KET variable has a contribution to the KKDFK variable of 50.3% and the remainder is explained by other variables outside the research model. And finally, the R-Square (R^2) value for the Community Commitment (KOM) variable is in the strong category, namely 0.667, meaning that the KET and KKDFK variables have a contribution to the KOM variable of 66.7% and the remainder is explained by other variables outside the research model.

4.3.2 Effect Size

The test results for the effect size value can be seen in table 11 below.

Table 11. Effect Size

	f-square	Information
IDK -> KET	2.916	Strong
KET -> KKDFK	1.014	Strong
KET -> KOM	0.410	Strong
KKDFK -> KOM	0.190	Moderate

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

Based on the table above, it is obtained that the strong influence category has a value of 0.35, fulfilled by the influence of IDK on KET, which is 2.916, KET on KKDFK is 1.014, and KET on KOM is 0.410. For the moderate influence category or which has a value of 0.15, there is the influence of KKDFK on KOM of 0.190.

4.3.3 Hypothesis Testing

The results of the hypothesis test for the direct effect can be seen in table 12 below.

Table 12. Hypothesis Test for Direct Effect

	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P values	Information
IDK -> KET	0.863	0.859	0.027	31.627	0.000	Accepted
KET -> KKDFK	0.71	0.702	0.054	13.032	0.000	Accepted
KET -> KOM	0.524	0.522	0.051	10.2	0.000	Accepted
KKDFK -> KOM	0.357	0.356	0.058	6.169	0.000	Accepted

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

Based on the table above, the results of the Original sample (O) values can be seen as follows:

1. The path coefficient value of IDK -> KET is positive, at 0.863, indicating that the IDK variable has a positive relationship with the KET variable. The t-statistic value is 31.627 with a p-value of 0.000 <0.05, so H1 is accepted, indicating that IDK influences KET.
2. The path coefficient value of KET -> KKDFK is positive, at 0.71, indicating that the KET variable has a positive relationship with the KKDFK variable. The t-statistic value is 13.032 with a p-value of 0.000 <0.05, so H2 is accepted, indicating that KET influences KKDFK.
3. The path coefficient value of KET -> KOM is positive, at 0.524, indicating that the KET variable has a positive relationship with the KOM variable. The t-statistic value is 10.2 with a p-value of 0.000 <0.05, so H3 is accepted, meaning KET has an effect on KOM.
4. The path coefficient value of KKDFK -> KOM is positive at 0.357, indicating that the KKDFK variable has a positive relationship with the KOM variable. The t-statistic value is 6.169 with a p-value of 0.000 <0.05, so H4 is accepted, meaning KKDFK has an effect on KOM.

5. Discussion

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the Original Sample (O) value or the path coefficient value of IDK -> KET is positive, namely 0.863, indicating that the IDK variable has a positive relationship with the KET variable. The t-statistic value is 31.627 with a p-value of 0.000 <0.05, so H1 is accepted, meaning that IDK influences KET. Identification with a brand community is a categorization process carried out by consumers to maintain self-awareness as members of a community. This process emphasizes the perceived similarity with other community members. Identification with a brand community may lead to involvement, considering that this influences behavioral intentions within the community (Bagozzi and Dholakia, 2006). Various studies have shown that the clearer the consumer's identification with the group, the more positive the motivation to participate in the group will be (Chou

et al., 2016). A consumer who identifies with a brand community will perceive that the community is in line with his or her personal values.

Furthermore, the Original Sample (O) value or path coefficient value of KET -> KKDFK is positive at 0.71, indicating that the KET variable has a positive relationship with the KKDFK variable. The t-statistic value is 13.032 with a p-value of 0.000 <0.05, thus H2 is accepted, meaning that KET influences KKDFK. Consumer participation is considered crucial to ensuring the sustainability of online brand communities over time and facilitating lasting relationships (Malinen, 2015). Engagement, which can occur at varying levels of intensity over time (Brodie et al., 2015), is one of the most important motivators for interactive participation in a community. Therefore, the level of engagement with an online brand community influences how actively members participate in it.

The path coefficient value of KET -> KOM is positive at 0.524, indicating that the KET variable has a positive relationship with the KOM variable. The t statistic value is 10.2 with a p value of 0.000 < 0.05, so H3 is accepted, meaning that KET has an effect on KOM. Brand community commitment is described as "the degree of strong and positive feelings towards the community among members" (Jang et al., 2008). Commitment should be treated as an attitudinal factor that is emphasized when members recognize the value of the ongoing relationship between their community and themselves". Customers involved in the community tend to develop interpersonal relationships with other members, which increases the intensity of their social involvement in the brand community, in terms of policies and activities will create a sense of belonging and emotional connection between community members.

Furthermore, the path coefficient value of KKDFK -> KOM is positive, namely 0.357, indicating that the KKDFK variable has a positive relationship with the KOM variable. The t-statistic value is 6.169 with a p-value of 0.000 <0.05, so H4 is accepted, meaning KKDFK has an effect on KOM. Brand communities that provide functional support to each other, especially in creating community value, will create a conducive environment. Brand communities that provide functional support to each other, especially in creating community value, will create a conducive environment (Coelho et al., 2018). This will influence the attitude of community members to maintain the situation to develop stable relationships with partners, accept short-term sacrifices to maintain relationships, and ensure relationship stability. So that the brand community can survive.

6. Conclusion

Based on the results of the test and analysis of research data, several conclusions can be drawn: Community Identification has a significant positive effect on Community Involvement. Furthermore, Community Involvement also has a significant positive effect on Co-Creation of Community Functional Support. Likewise, Community Involvement has a significant positive effect on Community Commitment. Furthermore, Co-Creation of Community Functional Support has a significant positive effect on Community Commitment. Therefore, the study shows that all independent variables have a role and influence in increasing car sales in North Sumatra.

Acknowledgements

References

Arnould, Eric J., and Linda L. Price (2000), "Authenticating Acts and Authoritative Performances: Questing for Self and Community," in The Why of Consumption, S. Ratneshwar, David Glen Mick, and Cynthia Huffman, eds. New York: Routledge, 140 – 63.

Arnould, Eric J., Linda L. Price, and Avinash Malshe (2006), "Toward a Cultural ResourceBased Theory of the Customer," in The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions, Robert F. Lusch and Stephen L. Vargo, eds. New York: M.E. Sharpe, 91 – 104.

Bagozzi, R.P.; Dholakia, U.M. Antecedents and purchase consequences of customer participation in small group brand communities. Int. J. Res. Mark. 2006, 23, 45–61.

Baldus, B.J.; Voorhees, C.; Calantone, R. Online brand community engagement: Scale development and validation. J. Bus. Res. 2015, 68, 978–985

Brodie, R. J., Saren, M., & Pels, J. (2015). Customer engagement: Theoretical foundations and research directions. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 25(1).

Chappuis, B., Gaffey, B., & Parvizi, P. (2011). Are your customers becoming digital junkies? McKinsey Quarterly, July, 1–4 Retrieved April 19, 2012 from http://www.mckinseyquarterly.com/Are_your_customers_becoming_ digital_junkies_2839.

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.

Chou, E.-Y.; Lin, C.-Y.; Huang, H.-C. Fairness and devotion go far: Integrating online justice and value co-creation in virtual communities. Int. J. Inf. Manag. 2016, 36, 60–72.

Denegri-Knott, Janice, Detlev Zwick, and Jonathan Schroeder (2006), "Mapping Consumer Power: Integrative Framework for Marketing and Consumer Research," European Journal of Marketing, 40(9), 950 – 71.

Ghozali, I. (2013). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 21 Update PLS Regresi* (Edisi 7). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Ghozali, I. (2008). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. SAGE Publications.

Holt, Douglas B. (2002), "Why Do Brands Cause Trouble? A Dialectical Theory of Consumer Culture and Branding," Journal of Consumer Research, 29(June 2002), 70 – 90.

Islam, J. U., & Rahman, Z. (2017). The impact of online brand community characteristics on customer engagement: An application of Stimulus-Organism-Response paradigm. *Telematics and Informatics*, 34(4), 96-109.

Jang, H., Olfman, L., Ko, I., Koh, J., & Kim, K. (2008). The Influence of On-Line Brand Community Characteristics on Community Commitment and Brand Loyalty. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, *12*(3), 57–80.

Jiang, W., Dev, C. S., & Rao, V. R. (2002). Brand extension and customer loyalty: Evidence from the lodging industry. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, *43*(4), 5-16.

Jain, S., Sharma, S. K., Vijayan, N., & Mandal, T. K. (2018). Seasonal characteristics of chemical composition of PM2.5 and PM10 at an urban site of Delhi, India. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 25(5), 4780-4798.

Jibril, A. B., Kwarteng, M. A., Pilik, M., Kunovsky, J., & Balcarova, P. (2019). The impact of social media on consumer-brand relationships: A systematic review of the literature. *Global Business and Economics Review*, 21(1), 103-124.

Kotler, Philip (2003), Marketing Management, ed. 13, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Kusuma, A H P, Sudirman, A, Purnomo, A, Aisyah, S, Sahir, S H, Salmiah, A R, Halim, F, Napitupulu, A W D, Simarmata, J. (2020). Brand Management : Esensi, Posisi, dan Strategi. Penerbit Yayasan Kita Menulis

Latour, B. (2005), Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Liu, L.; Lee, M.K.O.; Liu, R.; Chen, J. Trust transfer in social media brand communities: The role of consumer engagement. Int. J. Inf. Manag. 2018, 41, 1–13.

Lam, S. K., Ahearne, M., Hu, Y., & Schillewaert, N. (2010). Identity, share of wallet, and networks: A study of retail relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 74(2), 129-143.

Malinen, S. Understanding user participation in online communities: A systematic literature review of empirical studies. Comput. Hum. Behav. 2015, 46, 228–238.

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

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

Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creating experiences: The next practice in value creation. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 18(3), 5–14

Rezaei, S., Hajli, N., Gbadamosi, A., Aghaali, N., & Featherman, M. S. (2021). Brand value co-creation in the social commerce era: empirical evidence from Iran. *Journal of electronic commerce research*, *22*(1), 46-58.

Schouten, J.W. and McAlexander, J.H. (1995), "Subcultures of consumption: an ethnography of the new bikers", Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 43-61.

Solimun, S., Fernandes, A. A. R., & Nurjannah, N. (2017). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif perspektif sistem: Mengungkap kebaruan dan etika (Metode statistika multivariate dan pemodelan)*. UB Press.

Tajfel, H. (2010), Social Identity and Intergroup Relations, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Tajvidi, M., Wang, Y., Hajli, N., & Love, P. E. (2017). Brand value Co-creation in social commerce: The role of interactivity,. Computers in Human Behavior, 1-8.

Thomas, T.C., Price, L.L. and Schau, H.J. (2013), "When differences unite: resource dependence in heterogeneous consumption communities", Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp. 1010-1033

Vargo, Stephen L., and Robert F. Lusch (2004), "Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing," Journal of Marketing, 68(January), 1 – 17

Zaglia, M.E. (2013), "Brand communities embedded in social networks", Journal of Business Research, Vol. 66 No. 2, pp. 216-223.