

## Conference Paper

# Why Do Millennials Perform Dysfunctional Behavior Toward an Organization? An Exploratory Study in an Urban Campus

Hastuti Naibaho, Endang Pitaloka, Yohanes Totok Suyoto

Department of Management & Jaya Launch Pad, Universitas Pembangunan Jaya, Banten, Indonesia

**ORCID**

Endang Pitaloka: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6516-2866>

**Abstract.**

Organizations can determine what constitutes dysfunctional behavior in several ways, often by aligning with the shared social values of the local society in which the organization operates. In relation to this, urban environments pose a particular challenge to organizations as its higher degree of diversity compared to rural areas. This exploratory study aims to identify the causes of millennials' dysfunctional behavior toward organizations. Further, the authors would explore the dimension characteristics of dysfunctional behavior of millennials toward an organization. This study was conducted on an urban campus, with 197 students from various study programs being the respondents. Data collection used open-ended questions distributed through online surveys, followed by focus group discussions to obtain more detailed answers. The results showed that the main targets of the students' dysfunctional behavior were the college itself, the lecturing staff, and the student-led organizations. The most common reasons for this behavior were disappointment with the goal and being encouraged by other students. The study also found that despite being aware that their actions were deemed unethical by the target, students who committed dysfunctional behaviors did not feel guilty because they believed the target deserved it. The findings of this study are useful for organizational behavior research, particularly in the study of dysfunctional behavior, as it provides empirical data to support that retaliation is one of the antecedents of dysfunctional behavior.

**Keywords:** revenge behavior, perception of justice, service failure recovery, consumer ethical standards

## 1. Introduction

Theoretically, generation could be categorized by the birth year namely: traditionalist (before 1945), baby boomers (1946-1964), generation X (1965-1980), Generation Y (1980-2002), and Generation Z (2003-now). Recently, generation Y or commonly called millennials is the largest group surpassing baby Boomers [1]. Millennials have several unique characteristics which make them different from the other generations. Millennials trust their opinion since they were raised by parents who taught them to hold high targets [2].

Corresponding Author: Endang Pitaloka; email: [oka@upj.ac.id](mailto:oka@upj.ac.id)

Published 18 July 2023

Publishing services provided by Knowledge E

© Hastuti Naibaho et al. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the TSBEC Conference Committee.

**OPEN ACCESS**

Moreover, millennials have high self-confidence so they believe that they are capable of making the right decisions. They also tend to avoid risk and try to take advantage of every opportunity (opportunistic).

The age of the oldest millennials is 42 years old and the youngest is 18 years old. It means that some millennials are college students at present. The millennials spend a lot of time on the campus for learning activities. Apart from attending lectures, they also spend time on the campus for non-academic activities such as joining a student organization. Student organization can develop the students' capacity and competencies. Yet, social dynamics which occur in organizations can motivate the millennials to perform dysfunctional behavior toward the organization. Dysfunctional behavior can occur when students consider that membership in the organization does not provide them benefits, whereas they are the generation who takes advantage of every opportunity [2].

Various studies on dysfunctional behavior have been conducted. Several constructs support this study even though they have similar operational definitions, such as counter-productive work behavior (CWB) and deviant work behavior. Naibaho and Meloche [3] conducted a review on negative work behavior and found that the CWB construct developed by Fox and Spector in 1999 is a construct developed from the aggressive behavior model developed by Dollar-Miller. Another construct of dysfunctional behavior is deviant behavior developed by Robinson and Bennet in 1995.

Studies on dysfunctional behavior found consistent results on the antecedents and consequences (outcomes). The result afterward can be used by organizations as references in designing policies to prevent dysfunctional behavior. However, most studies were conducted on employees' dysfunctional behavior. Numerous studies have also been conducted to study dysfunctional behavior in the context of the relationship between consumers and companies. The studies on the dysfunctional behavior of consumers are as follows: 1) illegitimate customer complaining behavior in hospitality service [4], 2) the implication of illegitimate complaints [5], 3) the consumer responses toward companies after service failure [6], and 4) the ways to respond customer complaints and recovery process of the customer relationship [7]. The results of these studies provide empirical data that aggressive or dysfunctional behavior of consumers can harm the organization in both short and long-term financial and non-financial losses. Moreover, consumers' dysfunctional behavior toward front office employees causes high stress level to the employees. The employees will perceive they are treated unfairly if the

company does not provide support for them to solve the consumers' dysfunctional behavior.

Studies on educational institution settings have been conducted by previous researchers although the result on dysfunctional behavior in this setting is still limited. The previous studies focus on the dysfunctional behavior of students towards teachers or lecturers. The authors found several studies in educational institution settings such as *The Influence of Aggression on Students' Achievement: Evidence Form Higher Education* [8] and the level of student ethical sensitivity [9]. These studies focus on the types of students' aggressive behavior, the causes of aggressive behavior, the relationship between students' aggressive behavior and their academic achievement, and the relationship between the level of students' ethical sensitivity and educational level and specialization. These studies contribute to helping educational institutions to understand the social phenomenon that occurs in educational institutions.

The study on dysfunctional behavior, especially on millennial students through exploring comprehensive information from students' perspectives, gets a lack of attention from researchers. The authors presume that there are possible differences in antecedents (determinants) and dimensions between employees' dysfunctional behavior and students' dysfunctional behavior. The relationship between employees and organizations is between job holders and job providers, whereas the relationship between students and university is the relationship between consumers and service providers. In the social relationship between the company (job provider) and employees (job holder), the employees' behavior is controlled by the economic relationship in which the employees receive compensation from the company. The employees are on a lower power level than the company so the employees have the risk of losing their job (losing economic resources) if they perform harmful work behavior to the company. This causes employees to be very careful about their work behavior.

Whereas, the relationship between students and the organization is a different case. The student behavior is more uncontrolled since they have the opportunity to break the relationship because the students are the consumers of the university. When the students are disappointed with the organization, they can perform dysfunctional behavior toward the organization and it can harm the organization. The result of the study on consumers' dysfunctional behavior towards employees shows that consumers' dysfunctional behavior causes work stress to the employees [4]; consumers' aggressive behavior for unreasonable complaints burnout the employees, and high work stress for the employees, and negatively impact on the work performance of the employees [10]. There is a strong probability that students will disseminate the information about their

dissatisfaction with university and organizations due to their characteristics which is highly active in the digital world. The information dissemination of students' dissatisfaction with the university and organization will harm the organization because the public will have a negative perspective of the organization, and it will affect the sustainability of the university.

Dysfunctional behavior is an observable behavior performed by organizational members intended to impair the functioning of a team or organization [11]. This behavior violates the organizational norms which can reduce the performance of the organization. Studies on supervisors and employees of a company have found some differences among the organizational members in terms of habits and power. These differences can prevent the members of the organization to express ideas and feelings openly which can cause dysfunctional behavior [12]. When the members of the organization perform dysfunctional behavior, the most possible response of the other members is to behave defensively [11]. However, the attempt usually fails, and instead, it can reinforce the dysfunctional behavior and spread throughout the members of the organization.

Studies on consumers' dysfunctional behavior towards service providers found that consumers often perform dysfunctional behavior towards employees or companies due to illegitimate complaints. The purpose of the illegitimate complaints is to take advantage of the situation [4]. The consumers' dysfunctional behavior also occurs due to the perception that consumers are always right so that consumers have an opportunity to make illegitimate complaints. The consumers' reaction looking to the service recovery treatment on other consumers depends on their evaluation of other consumers' behavior and the legitimacy of the complaints. When the consumers perceive the company provides good service recovery for the illegitimate complaints, the customer will have more intention to complain in the future, instead, if the company provides poor service recovery, the consumers tend to have less intention to do illegitimate complaints [5].

Several studies concerned with aggressive behavior in the educational settings [1,8,9,13-16]. The results found that the students' aggressive behavior could be verbal aggression, anger with resentment, physical aggression, and suspicion [13]. Aggressive behavior is in the form of physical, verbal, suspicion, and resentment [17]. Aggressive behavior relates to the students' academic achievement. Students who perform aggressive behavior tend to achieve lower GPAs. The causes of the aggressive behavior are teacher-student relationships, peer problems such as pressure, perceived injustice from teachers and administration, and family problems. To overcome these issues, the university needs to create a mentoring program to monitor antisocial or aggressive behavior [8].

Generation Y, commonly known as millennials, is the first generation of the digital era born in the technology world. This makes millennials easy to adapt to new technological devices [18]. Generation Y is a group of individuals born from 1984 to 2002 [19]. Most of Generation Y have entered the labor market after achieving a bachelor's degree. They work a lot with employees from Generation X. Compared with Generation X born from 1965 to 1980, generation Y is more adaptable, more open to change, more creative, and they have a better entrepreneurial mindset [20]. Generation Y choose to work in the workplace they want and do what they like to do.

Generation Y is also characterized by multitasking skills [19]. Research conducted by VanMeter et al. [2] found that generation Y adheres to their ethical ideology in workplace leadership, teamwork, and ethical judgment. Millennials are also dependent on social media. This is a unique characteristic that distinguishes millennials from the other generations. Millennials put more value on social media in every situation [12]. This dependency enables the millennials to share their activities and experiences through social media such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram.

The students in university can join student organizations to actively participate during taking the course at the university. Millennials tend to share their experience through social media. When students gain experience in the organization, in university or in a student organization, there will be a possibility that they will share that experience through social media. This behavior can be categorized as dysfunctional behavior if the information shared by the students negatively affects the other members of the organization and the university's image.

The authors are interested to study the issue of dysfunctional behavior of millennials including the antecedents of students' dysfunctional behavior, the dimension of students' dysfunctional behavior, and media preferences for performing dysfunctional behavior among millennials. This study can enrich dysfunctional behavior literature and provide new insight for university in managing the relationship with the consumers (students). The result of this study also provides suggestions to improve the service quality in an educational institution as the service providers.

This study is an exploratory study since the aims of this study are to identify the causes of millennials' dysfunctional behavior toward organizations. Further, the authors would explore the dimension characteristics of dysfunctional behavior of millennials towards an organization. After exploring the causes and dimensions of students' dysfunctional behavior, the authors would analyze the media preferences that millennials use for performing the dysfunctional behavior towards organizations. This study focuses on finding the empirical data of the construct of students' dysfunctional behavior and

comparing the result with the construct of employees' dysfunctional behavior. The results of this study were expected to help the organization (university) to design an intervention to reduce the negative impacts of students' dysfunctional behavior.

The dysfunctional behavior construct has been dominated by research settings that involved employees as the respondent. Yet, dysfunctional behavior can also be carried out by members of the organization with different types of relationships, for instance, students and organizations (consumer-service providers). There is a greater opportunity for dysfunctional behavior in this relationship type since the members of the organization do not receive any financial benefits from the relationship. On the other hand, in this context, the organization (university) is dependent on the members of the organization (students). Studies on consumers' dysfunctional behavior towards service providers conducted by previous researchers are different from the context of this study. The previous research involved consumers in a short-term relationship. The relationship between consumers and the service provider was a one-time transaction relationship, whereas the student-university relationship is a long-term relationship. The students can break the relationship with the university as a last option due to rational or economic reasons, the students need to focus on finishing the course from the university. Therefore, the behavior that students possibly perform when they are disappointed with the university is dysfunctional behavior.

Dysfunctional research has so far focused on the relationship between employees and companies; and the relationship between companies and consumers. There has been research on consumer dysfunctional behavior that has examined, although not much, very little dysfunctional behavior in educational institutional settings. Existing research on dysfunctional behavior in educational settings is in higher education but at the university level, there is still a lack of research.

Different type of this relationship makes the possibility of different antecedents (causes) of dysfunctional behavior, dimensions of dysfunctional behavior, and media preferences used for dysfunctional behavior. The results of the previous studies are barely relevant to be used as references in designing an intervention for students' dysfunctional behavior due to the goals of employees to choose the organization is different from the objective of students choosing the university. This study is exploratory research with open questionnaires. The results of the summary of the respondents' answers were tabulated and grouped based on similar answers. The authors carried out the exploratory factor analysis to examine the dimensions of the variables. The research questions are as follows:

1. What factors cause students to perform dysfunctional behavior?

2. Are the dimensions of students' dysfunctional behavior the same as employees' dysfunctional behavior?
3. What are the media preferences that students used to perform dysfunctional behavior?

## 2. Methods

This study was conducted on students of a private university in South Tangerang, Indonesia. The sample of this study was determined using the cluster random sampling technique. Due to the large population, this study took 400 samples as the research respondents representing each cluster. The clusters of this study were divided based on the number of the study program.

Data were collected using an online questionnaire. After the questionnaire was compiled, the questionnaire was shared with the respondent through a google form. The data obtained through google form were tabulated and processed using specified analytical techniques. In addition, the authors also held a focus group discussion (FGD) with the representative students of each study program to collect the information about dysfunctional behavior intention and the types of dysfunctional behavior that they often do. The FGDs was also needed to confirm the students' answer to the open questionnaire.

After six months, the authors closed the data collection process because respondents no longer submitted responses. However, the authors did not reach 400 research samples as planned because some students refused to participate in this study. The authors could not interact directly (face to face) with the students due to the Covid 19 pandemic so the authors could only encourage students' participation through email and telephone. The authors had explained and guaranteed the confidentiality of data and research results, but many students still worried about filling out the questionnaire or joining the FGDs because they thought that their answer could harm their status at the university. The final respondents of this study were 197 students.

The structure of the questionnaire is as follows. Part one is the introductory description of dysfunctional behavior to build the same understanding of dysfunctional behavior among the respondents. Part two is the open question which consists of six questions: 1) Have you ever performed dysfunctional behavior toward a university or student organization? 2) How often do you perform dysfunctional behavior? 3) What types of dysfunctional behavior have you ever performed? 4) What makes you perform the dysfunctional behavior? 5) What media do you use to perform the dysfunctional behavior?



6) When you performed dysfunctional behavior, what social media did you frequently use?

The data analysis technique was carried out using the descriptive analysis method. This technique was used since this research aimed to describe the dysfunctional behavior phenomenon captured from the information provided by the respondents. In addition, this study was also intended to identify the factors that cause millennial students to perform dysfunctional behavior towards organizations.

### 3. Results

The total respondent in the study is 197 students which consist of 77 males (39.08%) and 120 females (60.92%). Based on age characteristics, 115 students (58.38%) aged 18-20 years old; 39 students (19.79%) aged 21-25 years old; and 43 students (21.83%) aged older than 25 years old. Table 1 presents the summary of respondents' responses to the closed-ended questions (optional answers provided by authors) and respondents were allowed to choose more than one answer. The summary includes one or more answer options chosen by respondents on each question. Table 2 presents the summary of respondents' answer to the closed-ended question-part 2.

TABLE 1: The Summary of Respondents' Answer to Closed-ended Question-Part 1.

Question	Yes (Person)	No (Person)
Have you ever had any intention to perform dysfunctional behavior towards university?	23	174
Have you ever performed dysfunctional behavior towards university?	25	172
Have you ever had the intention to perform dysfunctional behavior towards your study program or the student organization of your study program?	27	170
Have you ever performed dysfunctional behavior towards your study program or the student organization of your study program?	33	164

Source: Authors' research (2021)

The authors also include some open-ended questions which require the respondents to elaborate their answers in their own words. In this part, not all respondents answered the question so the total respondent for open-ended questions differs from the total respondent for the closed-ended questions.

1. Question 1. What type of dysfunctional behavior or intention have you ever performed or considered to be performed? Most respondents (32%) answered; *"Violating the organization's rules"*.



TABLE 2: The Summary of Respondents' Answer to Closed-ended Question-Part 2.

Question	1-5 times per month	6-10 times per month	>10 times per month
How often do you perform dysfunctional behavior towards the university?	190 respondents	1 respondent	6 respondent
How often do you perform dysfunctional behavior towards your study program or student organization of your study program?	182 respondents	6 respondent	9 respondent

Source: Authors' research (2021)

2. Question 2. What type of dysfunctional behavior or intention have you ever performed or considered to be performed besides the answers provided in the previous question? Most respondents (28%) answered *"Giving low EDOM (lecturer evaluation by students) scores to lecturers who do not deliver the material clearly"*.
3. Question 3. What makes you perform the dysfunctional behavior or intention? *"Being provoked by friends"* was the top answer, answered by 30% respondents.
4. Question 4. What factors cause you to perform the dysfunctional behavior or intention besides the answers provided for this question? The majority respondent (35%) answers *"Campus policies don't match reality"*.
5. Question 5. What is your attitude towards dysfunctional behavior? The top answer is *"Students may perform that behavior when they face some difficulties and the university does not respond to their complaints"*.
6. Question 6. What media do you use to perform dysfunctional behavior? 51% respondents' answer *"Social Media"*. Question 7. When you perform dysfunctional behavior through social media, what social media do you use? The majority respondent (34%) answer *"Instagram"*.

### 3.1. Results of Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with student representatives

The participants in the FGD conducted by the authors were 8 students who represented ten study programs. The representatives from the Psychology Study Program and the Product Design Study Program refused to participate in this FGD. Although the authors had given all the participants incentives (e-money), the students from those study programs were not interested to participate. The authors had tried to collect FGD

participants for one month so the research team decided to conduct the FGDs with participants from 8 study programs.

### 3.1.1. Students' motivation for dysfunctional behavior

Based on the information obtained from the FGDs, the motivation of the students to perform dysfunctional behavior is due to disappointment towards the target subject and the perception that they have been treated unfairly by the target subject of the dysfunctional behavior such as lecturers, staff, and organization administrators. The dysfunctional behavior performed by students is a form of revenge against the target subject that they perceive deserves the behavior. FGD participants said that the target subjects of the dysfunctional behavior deserve to receive the unethical behavior. The FGD participants also said that they also performed the dysfunctional behavior because their friends provoked them, even though they did not experience the disappointment directly. The students who were provoked have the same perception as their friends who provoked them that the target subject deserves the behavior.

The motivation of students to perform the dysfunctional behavior give negative consequences, they do not feel guilty doing the behavior even though they are aware that the behavior is not right. The results of this FGD discussion are in line with the summary of the students' answers to closed and open questionnaires about the causes of dysfunctional behavior. The causes are as follows: 1) disappointment with promises made before they became students, 2) disappointment with lecturers (lecturers are boring in teaching, lecturers are strict in assignment submission, and lecturers are often angry for no reason), 3) disappointment with campus facilities (at university level), 4) disappointment with the organization administrators, and 5) disappointment with the behavior of the university staffs (commonly the Education and Finance Bureau). The disappointment of one student with the targets of the dysfunctional behavior can influence other students to perform dysfunctional behavior. In other words, disappointment at the individual level can lead to collective dysfunctional behavior. The results of this study are interesting because this study found that dysfunctional behavior is multilevel in which the antecedent of dysfunctional behavior at the individual level can cause dysfunctional behavior at the team level.

The second interesting finding of this study obtained from the summary of the questionnaire and FGDs is that the millennials are aware of the ethical/moral standards in the social environment (campus) that they should obey. When they perform dysfunctional behavior, they are aware that the behavior is not right but they do not feel guilty. Even,

if they perform the dysfunctional behavior for a long period (more than once) since they perceive that the behavior is normal as a form of disappointment with the target of dysfunctional behavior.

The millennial students could not expect the target subject to change their behavior because the target subject has power, but the students can oppose the target subject by provoking other students to take revenge by doing dysfunctional behavior together. The authors view this finding as a phenomenon of moral/ethical shift of millennials and alteration of thinking mechanisms to judge acceptable and unacceptable behavior of millennials. These findings will be able to lead to the development of social contract theories such as social exchange theory and justice theory.

### 3.1.2. Target subjects of students' dysfunctional behavior

Based on the results of the FGDs and the summary of students' answers on closed and open questionnaires, the target subjects of dysfunctional behavior are student organizations and/or student organization administrators, at the study program level and the university level. Another target subject of dysfunctional behavior is lecturers. Students do not often perform dysfunctional behavior towards university because students perceive that the power of the university level is very strong so they have concerns that they will have difficulty completing the course if they perform dysfunctional behavior at the university level. When they perform dysfunctional behavior toward the student organization, they perceive that the power of the students' organization will not affect them on campus because they have friends that they can invite to form collective power.

The rational mechanism of dysfunctional behavior towards study programs, especially lecturers, is also the same as dysfunctional behavior towards student organizations. Students perceive that the power of a lecturer is not greater than the collective power of students. Lecturers have dependent on students in terms of EDOM scores (lecturer evaluation by students) at the end of each semester. When a lecturer behaves not according to the students' expectations, they will provoke their classmates to give a bad EDOM assessment.

The interesting point from this finding is that even though students are provoked by friends to perform dysfunctional behavior towards the organization and/or lecturers and they realize that their behavior is unethical, but they do not feel guilty doing that behavior. For example, a student explained that at several points of EDOM questions, the lecturers actually deserve to get a good score if the students answer the question objectively, but sometimes the students give the lecturers a low score. When the authors

asked the students about their feeling, the FGD participants said they do not feel guilty doing that behavior. Information from this FGD is also in line with the summary of the student's answers to the closed and open questionnaires, such as students feeling "fine/normal" after performing dysfunctional behavior towards lecturers and organization.

### **3.1.3. Forms of student dysfunctional behavior**

Based on the results of the questionnaire and the results of the FGDs, the authors found the forms of dysfunctional behavior that are often done by students are:

1. At the individual level - The target subjects are the lecturers. The students give them low EDOM scores and share negative information about the lecturers with their friends and their community. If their target subjects are students, the dysfunctional behavior that is performed is violence/bullying of college friends;
2. At the Organizational Level – The target subject is the organization. The students do not participate in the organization's events and provoke other friends to do the same behavior. If the target subject is the university, the dysfunctional behavior is destroying university facilities and telling their disappointment to his friends or community.

### **3.1.4. Media preferences to perform the dysfunctional behavior**

The media that are commonly used by students to perform dysfunctional behavior are:

1. Direct action - not attending and not participating in organization's activities, giving low EDOM scores to lecturers, damaging facilities, violence against other students;
2. Using social media – sharing negative information about lecturers, student organizations, and universities through Instagram, WhatsApp, and Line. These three social media are the most common media used by the students to perform dysfunctional.

## **4. Discussion**

The findings of this study provide new information about dysfunctional behaviors, particularly at the level of antecedents and dysfunctional behaviors. The dysfunctional

behavior performed by millennials (in this case university students), generally shows that their reason to perform the dysfunctional behavior is disappointment and revenge. Although the doer of dysfunctional behavior is social and hierarchically lower than the target subject of dysfunctional behavior, the doer of dysfunctional behavior does not feel under power because the demonstrated dysfunctional behaviors are directed to dysfunctional behavior at the team level (collective dysfunctional behavior). The result of this research indicates that the antecedents of dysfunctional behavior at the individual level will result in dysfunctional behavior on the individual level and team level. This result shows that dysfunctional behavior is multilevel, that is dysfunctional behavior at the individual level and team level. The dysfunctional behavior dimension is multidimensional, which means that dysfunctional behavior is at the individual level, team level, and organization level.

The second appealing result is that the doers of dysfunctional behavior realize that their dysfunctional behavior is wrong (morally not right), but unfortunately they do not regret that behavior because they consider that the targets of dysfunctional behavior deserve to get that treatment. Furthermore, when their target subject of dysfunctional behavior indeed made something that does not meet their expectation once only, their dysfunctional behavior will remain forever. For instance, if a lecturer makes them disappointed or upset because the lecturer is strict in assignment submission or makes one student upset or angry with the lecturer's action, then EDOM score given to the lecturer will remain bad as long as the student is still in the university as a student. This result goes in line with Deontic Justice Theory [21] which states that people are highly sensitive toward unfair treatment that was experienced by other people when that action breaks moral norms and social behavior which are established by the people. Unfortunately, ethical behavior standards used by students are the ones that are established by the doers of dysfunctional behavior. The doers provoke their friends to do dysfunctional behavior toward the target subject of dysfunctional behavior by building an argument that the target subject did unethical behavior toward the doers. The other students who witnessed and perceived that the doers receive unfair treatment will give support to the dysfunctional behavior [22]. This makes students realize that their behaviors are wrong but they do not feel guilty to do that dysfunctional behavior.

This is interesting because the results of this study suggest that dysfunctional behaviors are going to take place over a long period of time. This result will also lead to a new study on the standards of ethical-moral/behavior of millennials and an instruction to do recovery services to restore the broken relationship between consumers and service providers. Thus, the consumer's perception that the university can give a good service

quality can be restored. A university needs to create a course, workshops and training to help students to improve ethical standards and ethical sensitivity that have been suggested by previous researchers [9].

When the dysfunctional behaviors are not done through direct action (face to face), the dysfunctional behaviors are performed through social media, such as Instagram, WhatsApp group, Facebook, Line group, and Twitter. These social media are used to mock and curse the target subject of dysfunctional behavior. Based on the frequency, the number of students who perform dysfunctional behavior about 1-5 times a month is around 190 students and the target subject is the university. Dysfunctional behavior performed around 6-10 times in a month and more than 10 times in a month are dysfunctional behavior that is targeted to study programs and student organizations.

The results of this study suggest that the most common target of students' dysfunctional behavior is the study program, in this case, the lecturer or student organization. This finding supports the result of FGD. At the university level, they have many disappointments to the university such as facilities and regulations which makes students get difficulties, but students do not perform dysfunctional behavior as a form of revenge because they perceive that the power of the university is stronger than their collective power. This result is interesting because it indicates a behavioral phenomenon grounded in dependency and power. Millennials assess acceptable and unacceptable behavior based on their power ability and rational reason. This circumstance again leads to the standard ethical mechanism which has changed in the generation of millennials.

## 5. Conclusion

This research provides empirical data that the target subject of students' dysfunctional behavior is individual (college-mate, lecturer), organization (university, student organization, and organization administrators). The antecedents of dysfunctional behavior are the disappointment of the doer of dysfunctional behavior and also the provocation from close friends who also feel disappointed toward the target subject of dysfunctional behavior. The media that is used by millennials to perform dysfunctional behavior is by direct action along with using social media (mostly Instagram).

## Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Universitas Pembangunan Jaya for supporting our research. We also thank anonymous reviewers which help the authors improve this research.

## References

- [1] Wiedmer T. Generation do differ: Best practices in leading traditionalists, boomers, and generation X, Y, and Z. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*. 2015;82:51-58.
- [2] VanMeter RA, Grisaffe DB, Chonko LB, Roberts JA. Generation Y's ethical ideology and its potential workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2013;117(1):93-109.
- [3] Naibaho H, Meloche J. Does leader-member exchange (LMX) quality always yield positive outcomes for organizations? LMX as the moderating variable of the formation of counter-productive work behavior's Ripple effect. *Organizational Cultures: An International Journal*. 2016;16(4):1-12.
- [4] Kim K, Baker MA. The customer isn't always right: The implications of illegitimate complaints. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*. 2020;61(2):113-127.
- [5] Sembada A, Tsarenko Y, Tojib D. The positive effects of customers' power on their behavioral responses after service failure. *Journal of Service Research*. 2016;19(3):337-351.
- [6] Knox G, Van Oest R. Customer complaints and recovery effectiveness: A customer base approach. *Journal of Marketing*. 2014;78(5):42-57.
- [7] Peng J-C, Chiu S-F. An integrative model linking feedback environment and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 2010;150(6):582-607.
- [8] Uludag O. The influence of aggression on students' achievement: Evidence from higher education. *Procedia–Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2013;(89):954-958.
- [9] Huang Z, Miao L. Illegitimate customer complaining behavior in hospitality service encounters: A frontline employee perspective. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*. 2016;40(6):655-684.
- [10] Grandey AA. When "the show must go on": Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal*. 2003;46(1):86-96.
- [11] Cole MS, Bruch H, Walter F. Affective mechanisms linking dysfunctional behavior to performance in work teams: A moderated mediation study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2008;93(5):945-958.
- [12] Choi NH, Dixon AL, Jung JM. Dysfunctional behavior among sales representatives: The effect of supervisory trust, participation, and information controls. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*. 2013;23(3):181-198.
- [13] Buss AH, Perry M. The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1992;63(3):452–459.



- [14] Kikas E, Peets K, Tropp K, Hinn M. Associations between verbal reasoning, normative beliefs about aggression, and different forms of aggression. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 2009;19(1):137–149.
- [15] Abasiubong F, Abiola T, Udofia O. A comparative study of aggression amongst Nigerian university students in Niger Delta region. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*. 2011;16(1):86–93.
- [16] Yaratan H, Uludag O. The impact of verbal aggression on burnout: An empirical study on university students. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2012(46):41-46.
- [17] García-León A, Reyes GA, Vila J, Pérez N, Robles H, Ramos MM. The aggression questionnaire: A validation study in student samples the Spanish. *Journal of Psychology*. 2002;5(1):45-53.
- [18] Bencsik A, Horváth-Csikós G, Juhász T. Y and Z Generations at workplaces. *Journal of Competitiveness*. 2016;8(3):1804-1728.
- [19] Christopher SA, Chiarella EM, Waters D. Can Generation Y nurses supply areas of shortage? New graduate challenges in today's job market. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2015;33(2):35-43.
- [20] Keene DL, Handrich RR. Loyalty, longevity and leadership: A multigenerational workforce update. *The Jury Expert*. 2015;27(2):1-8.
- [21] Folger R. Fairness as Deonance. In: Gilliland S, Steiner D, Skarlicki D. (Eds), *Theoretical and cultural perspectives on organizational justice* (3-33). Information Age Publishing; 2001.
- [22] O'Reilly J, Aquino K. A model of third parties' morally motivated responses to mistreatment in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*. 2011;36(3):526–543.