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Abstract: The goal of this study is to examine how external prestige (PEP) affects workplace deviations, which are mediated by job satisfaction. The study’s sample consisted of 310 respondents who work in the hospitality industry in Nigeria, and data was collected using the purposive sampling method. Structural Equation Model (SEM) tests were performed. According to the study’s findings, job satisfaction is positively influenced by PEP, but it has a negative impact on deviant conduct in the workplace. It is clear that job satisfaction plays a detrimental role in mediating the harmful impacts of perceived external status on deviant behavior at work.
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1. Introduction

The hospitality industry needs to increase its competitiveness to retain its present clients and attract new ones. However, in order to increase competitiveness, the industry needs to give more attention to its human capital. This is because the performance of a firm can be influenced by the level of performance of its employees. According to Tuna et al. (2016), an organization needs to have a positive reputation and a positive image in order to attract experienced or competent workers. The more positively an organization is perceived, the more proud and content an individual might be to work there. Being a part of a company with a positive reputation will make someone feel better about themselves than being a part of one with a negative reputation (Ciftcioglu, 2010; Bagobiri and Gadi, 2021). According to numerous studies (Ghazzawi, 2008; Elçi and Alpkan, 2009; Hamarat et al., 2012; Shamsudin et al., 2014), job satisfaction (JS) is additionally motivated by a number of other variables, such as individual behavior, beliefs, office values, ethical environment, and social effects.

However, if a person is unhappy at work, it may have an impact on their conduct (Ghazzawi, 2008). According to Hershcovis et al. (2007) and Gadi and Kee (2020a), if a person is not happy in his position, he will put in less performance and behave differently from the organization’s standards.

Deviant workplace conduct can undoubtedly result in losses for the firm, so measures must be taken to reduce its incidence in order to avoid interfering with business operations (Howard et al., 2016). The reputation of the company and workers’ feelings of job satisfaction can have an impact on deviant conduct at work (Tuna et al., 2016). As a result, every firm must pay attention to the reasons for business abnormalities. This rule applies to all companies, including those in the hospitality industry, and the findings of this study support the importance of job satisfaction and external prestige in understanding deviant behavior at work.
hospitality sector, particularly restaurants, amusement parks, hotels, and other tourism-related services. Extreme competition in this marketplace is brought on by the considerable number of marketers who are also the exclusive agents of the trademark owner or individual businesses. As a result, the industry has decided to reduce the incidence of abnormal workplace behavior because it could impede its growth in Nigeria.

The importance of employee job satisfaction for the organization has been examined in numerous earlier studies (Gunlu et al., 2010). Most studies (Elçi and Alpkan, 2009; Gümüş et al., 2012; Gunlu et al., 2010) examine a wide range of positive characteristics that affect individual job satisfaction, such as good HR policies, an ethical work environment, personality, and several other positive aspects. Although there hasn’t been much research examining the negative variables that can lead to a decline in employee satisfaction, this subject is nonetheless important to examine more given that poor or deviant conduct is frequent and contributes to a decline in individual satisfaction (Chullen et al., 2010; Omotayo et al., 2015; Gadi and Kee, 2020). Therefore, it is crucial that this research be done so that businesses can reduce deviant behavior.

In the dynamic landscape of the Nigerian hotel industry, characterized by its strategic importance to the nation’s economy, employees contend with multifaceted challenges that significantly influence their well-being and job satisfaction. The pervasive phenomenon of deviant workplace behavior, marked by extended working hours and workplace conflicts, intertwines with the cultural emphasis on external prestige in Nigeria. Extended working hours, often driven by factors such as understaffing, contribute to a demanding work environment, while workplace conflicts stemming from diverse backgrounds hinder collaborative efforts. Concurrently, the pursuit of external prestige, deeply ingrained in Nigerian societal values, becomes a pivotal factor shaping employees’ self-esteem and job satisfaction.

Despite the industry’s strategic importance, there is a noticeable gap in the current understanding of how deviant workplace behaviors, influenced by factors such as extended working hours and workplace conflicts, intersect with employees’ pursuit of external prestige in the Nigerian context. Furthermore, the specific role of employee external prestige in mediating or moderating the relationship between deviant workplace behavior and job satisfaction remains underexplored.

This study seeks to answer this complicated relationship by exploring how deviant workplace behaviors and employee external prestige interrelate within a unique cultural context and examining their collective impact on job satisfaction. As the industry undergoes evolution, understanding and addressing these phenomena becomes imperative for fostering a positive and productive work environment, ultimately contributing to both individual well-being and organizational effectiveness.

2. Literature review

2.1. External prestige

External prestige, according to Tuna et al. (2016), is a worker’s evaluation of the reputation of the firm where they work centered on the viewpoint of other individuals
who are not employees of the establishment. Centered on the opinions of those outside the organization, an employee’s perception of the organization’s external prestige represents their evaluation of all perceptions linked with it (Carmeli and Freund, 2002; Carmeli and Tishler, 2005; Carmeli et al., 2006). According to Kian et al. (2013) as well as Suanj et al. (2017), external prestige demonstrates how employees’ views of outsiders’ impressions of their organization are related to the reputation felt by employees of the firm. Based on these many views, it can be deduced that individual perceptions of their workplace are shaped by the perspectives of third parties or other individuals who evaluate the organization in which the employee works. Per Suanj et al. (2017) justify that external prestige (PEP) is researched at a distinct level because it is a personal assessment of the establishment that workers receive from outside parties, so even though all employees work for the same company, external prestige will vary for each employee.

Employee pride is increased when they recognize that people outside the organization talk favorably about the place where they work, which has a beneficial effect on external prestige (Kang et al., 2011; Gadi and Kee, 2020b). Improved staff identification with the organization might be encouraged by a firm’s perceived external status (Al-Atwi and Bakir, 2014). According to Ciftcioglu (2010), external prestige is a firm image derived from employee evaluations based on data from outsiders who regard them as employees of the organization. In the end, multiple studies discovered that employees’ concern for their organization, which was evidenced by a decline in turnover, was positively impacted by external prestige (Ciftcioglu, 2010; Pakdemir and Turan, 2014).

2.2. Job satisfaction

An individual’s good attitude as a result of an appraisal of their work and work experience can also be interpreted as job satisfaction. According to Springer (2011), individuals will experience job satisfaction when they believe their personal goals align with their expectations in a number of work-related areas. According to Kian et al. (2013), job satisfaction is a favorable emotional state that arises from work and satisfies personal values for the work completed. According to Alnaçk et al. (2012), job satisfaction is a favorable emotional situation that arises from an individual’s evaluation of his or her job or work experience. Job satisfaction is an employee’s reaction to his or her work experience as well as the emotional state of the employee toward work, according to Siengthai and Pila-Ngarm (2016). According to some of the aforementioned justifications, job satisfaction is an emotional state, both good and bad, that results from an assessment of one’s work or job, individuals will experience job satisfaction when they believe their personal goals align with their expectations in a number of work-related areas. According to Kian et al. (2013), job satisfaction is a favorable emotional state that arises from work and satisfies personal values for the work completed. According to Alnaçk et al. (2012), job satisfaction is a favorable emotional situation that arises from an individual’s evaluation of his or her job or work experience. Job satisfaction is an employee’s reaction to his or her work experience as well as the emotional state of the employee toward work, according to Siengthai and Pila-Ngarm (2016). According to some of the aforementioned justifications, job
satisfaction is an emotional state, both good and bad, that results from an assessment of one’s work or experience.

According to Purnama (2017), Islamic culture, which emphasizes competence, dedication, honesty, and transformation, can genuinely have an impact on employee job satisfaction and, in turn, have an impact on employee performance, as evidenced by the quantity, quality, efficiency, and accuracy of the work that employees produce. In their study, Lumley et al. (2011) examined the relationship between job satisfaction and nine variables, including pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, recognition and reward, working conditions, coworkers, and work environment. In addition to productivity, staff retention, and absenteeism, job satisfaction also has an impact on an organization’s well-being (Katja-Miheli, 2014; Sempane et al., 2002). According to Emilisa (2001), job satisfaction is a pleasurable feeling that results from an evaluation of the job.

The research findings by Robinson et al. (2011) suggest that individuals that have high-level job satisfaction would manage customer complaints excellently, resulting in customer happiness and even customer loyalty. Also, employee job satisfaction has an impact on client satisfaction. According to Worsfold et al. (2016)’s study in the hospitality sector, employee job satisfaction can influence client satisfaction because happy individuals might have a more upbeat attitude, which will then cause them to display a pleasant and comfortable attitude and more normally positive feelings towards customers, which will ultimately be able to elicit positive emotions from customers. Similarly, Esmaeilpour and Ranjbar (2018) stress the significance of employee dedication and happiness because it motivates workers to deliver high-caliber services.

2.3. Deviant workplace behavior

According to Shamsudin et al. (2014), deviant behavior can be divided into two categories: organizational deviance, which includes employee theft, higher staff absenteeism, and lack of motivation; and interpersonal deviance, which includes treating coworkers poorly, making racial or sexual jokes, or acting rudely. Deviant workplace conduct is defined by Tuna et al. (2016) as employee behavior that transgresses critical organizational standards in a way that endangers the organization, its employees, or both. Deviant workplace behavior, as per Tuna et al. (2016), is a sort of behavior that unfairly exploits the business unfavorably, impacts the norms and shared expectations of the organization, and also poses a danger to the organization’s values and social customs. Deviant workplace behavior is defined by Malisetty and Vasanthi Kumari (2016) as deliberate action carried out by employees that is deemed by the organization to be against its interests. According to Johnson (2011), a deviant workplace is one where employees engage in behavior that goes against organizational standards, such as harassing coworkers, causing property damage, and other negative actions. According to several of the definitions given above, deviant workplace conduct is defined as behavior by organizational members that is at odds with the values, norms, and customs of the organization and that has the potential to harm or disrupt the organization and its members.

DWPB is conduct that the firm must take into consideration since it may have an
effect on the organization. The organization can suffer both financial and non-financial consequences from actions like theft, harassment, and other deviant behavior (Elçi and Alpkan, 2009; Chirasha and Mahapa, 2012; Howard et al., 2016; Hsieh and Liang, 2004).

Theft, sabotage, and other financial losses result in financial losses for the company since they must replace or fix the effects of these actions (Chirasha and Mahapa, 2012). Deviant workplace behavior (DWPH) can also have a negative effect on the workplace environment, leading to tension, despair, and feelings of insecurity among employees (Chirasha and Mahapa, 2012; Howard et al., 2016). According to Muafí (2011), in addition to experiencing stress at work that lowers productivity, victims of workplace deviants also frequently have greater employee turnover rates. As a result, it is critical that businesses pay attention to the elements that may lead to abnormal conduct. According to Johnson’s (2011) research, deviant behavior might develop when staff members feel mistreated or unsatisfied with the firm.

Different terms for harmful employee behavior include counterproductive work behavior, antisocial behavior, retaliatory behavior, and deviant workplace behavior, though the distinctions between these concepts are still debatable (Tiarapuspa, 2015). Due to the fact that the perpetrators have bad intent and act in ways that go against the organization’s norms, this study chose to refer to such behavior as deviant workplace behavior (Tiarapuspa et al., 2017). Deviant workplace behavior by employees, such as theft, high absenteeism, sloth, racist epithets, or sexual harassment, can be very harmful to business (Tuna et al., 2016; Shamsudin et al., 2014). Losses may be material or immaterial (Chirasha and Mahapa, 2012; Johnson, 2011). To prevent employees from taking part in activities that would impair the organization, employers must raise employee satisfaction with their employment (Lumley et al., 2011; Katja-Miheli, 2014). According to Suanj et al. (2017) and Kian et al. (2013), one strategy to boost employee job satisfaction is to create the idea among employees that working for the organization is very prestigious. This perception is known as “external prestige.”.

2.4. Hypothesis development

According to Carmeli and Freund (2002), Carmeli et al. (2006), Carmeli and Tishler (2005), etc., (PEP) is a worker’s subjective evaluation of the organization’s external image. Deviant workplace conduct, on the other hand, is the conduct of people in the organization that is at odds with the norms, values, and customs of the firm and that might harm or disturb the establishment and its employees (Johnson, 2011; Shamsudin et al., 2014). Increasing employee impressions of how prestigious working for the organization is one strategy to prevent employee deviant behavior that might harm the business (Al-Atwi and Bakir, 2014). According to Tuna et al. (2016), employees are less likely to act inappropriately when they believe that other people regard the organization they work for as being very prominent. This leads to a hypothesis:

H1: Deviant workplace behavior is negatively impacted by external prestige.

According to Suanj et al. (2017), good perceptions about the organizations where employees work are correlated with their positive assessments of their own position.
and prestige at work. The satisfaction of working for a company with a positive reputation will increase employee personalities (Ciftcioglu, 2010). The study’s findings (Carmeli and Tishler, 2005; Nayr et al., 2016) demonstrate that employees will feel content with their work when they learn from friends and family members that they work for a prestigious firm (external prestige). According to the study’s findings (Ciftcioglu, 2010), employees were less likely to leave their current employer because they were happy with their position and the more strongly, they believed they had worked for a reputable and well-regarded organization. According to studies (Tuna et al., 2016), external prestige has a favorable impact on job satisfaction. This leads to the possibility that H2: Job satisfaction is positively impacted by external prestige.

If a person dislikes or is unsatisfied with his job, he or she will put forth a poor effort on the job and may violate the organization’s norms and general policies (Hershcovis, 2011; Hershcovis et al., 2007). According to Srivastva (2013) and Srivastva (2016), job satisfaction is a factor that might deter bad employee behavior like stealing, hostile behavior, and sabotage. Similarly, research by Tuna et al. (2016) demonstrates that deviant work behavior is negatively impacted by job satisfaction. This is also noted in a study that was done (Johnson, 2011), which claims that firms that don’t offer employee satisfaction would be more prone to atypical workplace behavior. The following hypotheses were created in light of the ideas and theories presented above.

H3: Deviant workplace conduct is negatively impacted by job satisfaction.

Situational factors, including stress and shifting work environments, might lead to abnormal workplace behavior. Someone may refrain from engaging in inappropriate workplace behavior if they believe a friend works for a prestigious organization. This is done to retain a feeling for the reason that those other people have been complimentary, but this feeling-trust activity might unquestionably lessen or cease to exist if the employees believe that their firm truly provides them with a fulfilling employment opportunity. This is in line with Mishra (2013), who claimed that when employees have a positive perception of their employer’s external prestige, they will assess the circumstance and adopt a favorable viewpoint. Employee dissatisfaction with the firm has a big impact on how they feel about the company, which is a factor that might lead to deviant conduct (Singh, 2013). The findings of Tuna et al.’s (2016) study demonstrate that job satisfaction can operate as a mediator between external prestige and unruly behavior at work as demonstrated in the conceptual framework in Figure 1 below. On the basis of this, the following hypotheses can be put forth:

**Figure 1.** Conceptual framework.

H4: Job satisfaction direct and indirect mediate the relationship between PEP and
deviant workplace behavior.

3. Research methods

The variables in this study refer to previous research conducted by Tuna et al. (2016), where all variables were measured using a 5–7-point interval scale with alternative answers ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The external prestige variable was measured using 8 statement items, job satisfaction using 5 statement items, and deviant workplace behavior with 11 statement items.

This study uses a purposive sampling technique, which is part of non-probability sampling (Sekaran and Bougie, 2013). The sample criteria are employees of the hospitality industry in the six states in the central part of Nigeria, including Abuja. A minimum sample size estimation was achieved using a G*Power assessment. The results revealed that the least sample size needed for this study was 108. However, a total of 310 questionnaires were collected, exceeding the minimum criteria of 108. Therefore, it is certain that the collected data is adequate for testing the assumed relationships.

It is established that most of the respondents are male (57.5%) and female (42.5%). The majority of them are 31–40 years old with 6–10 years of service and majority 54% holds an (OND) certificate.

Measurement model

We analyzed the loadings, average variance extracted (AVE), and composite reliability (CR) in accordance with the recent article by Hair et al. (2020), using cutoff values of 0.5 for AVE and 0.708 for CR to determine the convergent validity. While it is recommended that the loadings be greater than 0.708, if the AVEs are already greater than 0.5, then loadings between 0.5 and 0.7 are likewise appropriate (Ramayah et al., 2018). As can be seen in Table 1, the constructs’ validity and reliability were confirmed by the fact that all of the AVEs were higher than 0.5, the CR was higher than 0.7, and all of the loadings were greater than 0.7 as shown in Figure 2 below.

Table 1. Measurement model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>rho_A</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DWB1</td>
<td>Deviant workplace behaviour</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWB2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWB3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWB4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWB5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWB6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWB7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWB8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWB9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWB10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWB11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>rho_A</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External prestige</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CA = Cronbach’s Alpha; CR = Composite Reliability; AVE = Average Variance Extracted.

Figure 2. Measurement model.

According to Table 2, all reflective constructs have acceptable or satisfactory discriminant validity, with the square root of AVE (diagonal) being larger than the correlations (off-diagonal).
The discriminant validity was evaluated using HTMT ratios, in accordance with Franke and Sarstedt’s recommendations (2019). As shown in Table 2, we also created the reporting table in accordance with the recommendations made by Becker et al. (2019). All of the HTMT ratios fell below the 0.85 threshold as shown in Table 3 below. Therefore, we can say that the measurements employed in this study are different.

4. Results and discussion

Tests were carried out using Structural Equation Model (SEM) analysis. Table 4 shows the results of hypothesis testing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path coefficient</th>
<th>Beta values</th>
<th>Std error</th>
<th>T values</th>
<th>P values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction -&gt; Deviant workplace behaviour</td>
<td>-0.431</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>8.034</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External prestige -&gt; Deviant workplace behaviour</td>
<td>-0.301</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>5.436</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External prestige -&gt; Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>23.483</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External prestige -&gt; Job satisfaction -&gt; Deviant workplace behaviour</td>
<td>-0.295</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>8.626</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first hypothesis examines the effect of external prestige (PEP) on deviant workplace behavior (DWPB). Based on the results of statistical tests, it can be seen that the p-value is 0.001 with a coefficient estimate of −0.301, and a T value of 5.436 as shown in Figure 3, which means that there is a significant negative effect between PEP and DWPB. This means that if employees have a good PEP, they might be able to decrease DWPB at work. This might occur because individuals who have pride in their place of work will try to behave better, have stronger dedication to the organization, and also avoid conduct that might affect the organization. This is in accordance with the opinion (Suanj et al., 2017), which states that when employees feel they work in a high-reputation firm, the higher the employee’s commitment and the farther away from deviant behavior. Likewise, the opinion (Al-Atwi and Bakir, 2014) suggests that employees who feel proud of their status as employees of a particular company are less likely to do bad things to the company or their friends. The results of this research confirm the results of an earlier study performed by Tuna.
et al. (2016), which confirmed that there was a negative influence of external prestige (PEP) on deviant workplace behavior (DWPB).

Figure 3. Structural model.

The second hypothesis examines the effect of external prestige (PEP) on job satisfaction (JS). Built on the results of statistical tests, it can be seen that the $p$-value is 0.001 with a coefficient estimate of 0.684, and a $T$ value of 23.483 as shown in Figure 2, which means that there is a significant positive effect between external prestige and job satisfaction. This shows that employees who have good external perceptions of status will be able to increase their job satisfaction. Employees who have a sense of pride in their place of work will feel greater satisfaction because they are part of the company. The results of this study support the opinion of Ciftcioglu (2010) that employees who feel proud to work for a company with a high reputation will be satisfied with their work and have no desire to move to another company. In fact, Pekdemir and Turan (2014) explain that employees who feel proud of their company will be willing to work beyond their job description. Likewise, the findings of this study corroborate those of earlier research by Tuna et al. (2016), which similarly showed a favorable relationship between external prestige and job satisfaction.

The third hypothesis examines the influence of job satisfaction (JS) on deviant workplace behavior (DWPB). Established on the outcomes of statistical tests, it can be seen that the $p$-value is 0.001 with a coefficient estimate of −0.431, and a $T$ value of 8.034 as shown in Figure 2, which means that there is a significant negative effect between job satisfaction and deviant workplace behavior. The findings of this study suggest that job satisfaction has a significant negative impact on workplace deviance. This implies that contented workers will be able to curtail inappropriate workplace behavior. This may occur because happy employees are more likely to take positive actions for the business, whereas unhappy employees are more likely to express their frustration by engaging in negative conduct. The findings of this study support the
assertion made by Johnson (2011) that employees who work for organizations that don’t foster job satisfaction have a tendency to respond in a negative way.

According to the research of Hershovis (2011) and Srivastava (2016), an employee’s desire to engage in bad behaviors like absenteeism, theft, and other negative behaviors will vanish if they are satisfied with their employment. The findings of this study corroborate those of earlier research by Tuna et al. (2016), which showed a detrimental impact of job satisfaction on unruly workplace behavior.

Hypothesis 4 examines the effect of external prestige (PEP) on deviant workplace behavior (DWPH) mediated by job satisfaction. Based on the results of statistical tests, it can be seen that the $p$-value is 0.001 with a coefficient estimate of –0.295, which means that there is a significant negative effect between PEP and DWPH mediated by job satisfaction. The results showed that job satisfaction can mediate the effect of PEP on DWPH. Job satisfaction has a negative influence on mediating the effect of PEP on DWPH. This shows that a good PEP will be able to increase the prestige and pride of employees towards the company, which in turn will be able to shape employee attitudes towards the company and job satisfaction itself, which can ultimately prevent or reduce deviant workplace behavior from employees. The results of the research by Tuna et al. (2016) revealed that job satisfaction (JS) mediates the impact of PEP on deviant workplace behavior.

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the hypothesis testing, the study’s assumption is that PEP has a significant and unfavorable impact on DWPH, and on the other hand, a significant and favorable impact on job satisfaction (JS). Nevertheless, employee job satisfaction (JS) has a detrimental and considerable impact on DWPH. Therefore, it can be presumed that employee job satisfaction (JS) can mitigate the impact of PEP on DWPH. This suggests that if a person has pride in the organization where they work, they are less likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs and exhibit fewer deviations from them.

This refers to intentional behavior by employees that violates established norms and disrupts the normal functioning of the workplace. In the hotel industry in Nigeria, examples may include theft, absenteeism, rudeness to customers, or conflicts with colleagues. High competition, stressful work environments, and challenging customer interactions in the hotel industry may contribute to employees’ deviant behaviors. Factors such as low job satisfaction, inadequate training, and ineffective management practices could be associated with an increase in DWB.

Employee external prestige refers to the perception of how the employee is viewed by individuals external to the organization, such as customers, suppliers, or the general public. In the hotel industry in Nigeria, this could be related to the reputation of the hotel and the perception of its employees’ professionalism and service quality. The reputation of a hotel in Nigeria is crucial for attracting customers and maintaining a competitive edge. Employee external prestige is likely influenced by the quality of service, the behavior of employees, and the overall customer experience. Positive external prestige may lead to increased customer satisfaction and loyalty.
Job satisfaction is the overall contentment or happiness an employee feels about their job. In the hotel industry in Nigeria, factors contributing to job satisfaction could include the work environment, relationships with colleagues and management, recognition, and opportunities for career development. High job satisfaction among hotel employees is vital for maintaining service quality and customer satisfaction. Factors such as a positive work culture, fair treatment, and opportunities for skill development can enhance job satisfaction. Conversely, employees’ deviant behavior may negatively impact job satisfaction among colleagues and lead to a toxic work environment.

There may be a negative relationship between employees’ deviant workplace behavior and job satisfaction. Deviant behaviors can create a stressful work environment, lower morale, and reduce overall job satisfaction among colleagues. Higher external prestige may act as a deterrent to deviant workplace behavior. Employees who value their external image and the reputation of the hotel are likely to engage in more positive and professional behaviors. Positive external prestige can contribute to increased job satisfaction. Employees who take pride in their association with a reputable hotel are likely to experience higher job satisfaction, especially if their efforts contribute to the positive image of the hotel.

In conclusion, the hotel industry in Nigeria faces unique challenges related to employees’ deviant workplace behavior, external prestige, and job satisfaction. Understanding the interplay between these variables is crucial for developing effective management strategies, promoting a positive work environment, and enhancing overall performance in the industry.

6. Implications

Based on the conclusions above, it might be seen that the pride of employees towards the organization, instigated by opinions from outside the organization (PEP), is very vital. Therefore, organizations must put effort into creating a good image in different ways, specifically by improving product and service quality and organizational management. Thus, the organization’s reputation becomes superior, which sequentially might attract potential workers to work in the organization (Suanj et al., 2017).

7. Limitations and suggestions

This research was only conducted on one research object, and only used external prestige and job satisfaction as variables that could affect deviant workplace behavior. Further research can consider conducting research on other objects, for example in the aviation or banking industry. It is also hoped that further research can consider using other variables such as unfair treatment, dissatisfaction, and conflict variables as a source of deviant workplace behavior (Nayr et al., 2016).
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