
MOTIVATING THE GHANAIAN WORKFORCE: SECTOR-SPECIFIC STRATEGIES FOR RED ENHANCING WORK ETHIC

***Jemima N. A. A. Lomotey**

University of Phoenix, Arizona.

Article Received: 26 April 2026

Article Revised: 16 May 2026

Published on: 05 June 2026

***Corresponding Author: Jemima N. A. A. Lomotey**

University of Phoenix, Arizona.

DOI: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.8205>

ABSTRACT

Work ethic among Ghanaian employees has been extensively measured but rarely improved through systematically implemented and evaluated interventions. Existing research has documented sector-specific challenges to punctuality and fluidity in manufacturing, hierarchical deference in finance, and work-life integration in technology, yet no study has designed, implemented, and evaluated interventions tailored to these sector-specific motivational profiles. This mixed-methods intervention study investigates the effectiveness of three workplace interventions: recognition programmes, mentorship arrangements, and flexible scheduling in enhancing work ethic across three Ghanaian sectors: manufacturing (punctuality-focused intervention), banking and finance (communication-focused intervention), and technology and telecommunications (work-life integration-focused intervention). Using a convergent parallel mixed-methods design, the study employed pre- and post-intervention surveys ($n = 270$ employees; 90 per sector) and 18 focus group discussions (6 per sector, $n = 108$ participants) over a six-month intervention period. Quantitative analysis using repeated-measures ANOVA and paired t-tests revealed significant improvements across all sectors: manufacturing work ethic scores increased by 28% ($d = 1.24$), banking work ethic scores increased by 34% ($d = 1.56$), and technology work ethic scores increased by 31% ($d = 1.42$). Recognition programmes were most effective in manufacturing (punctuality improved from 54% to 82% on-time arrival), mentorship was most effective in banking (direct communication comfort increased from 38% to 71%), and flexible scheduling was most effective in technology (work-life satisfaction increased from 42% to 79%). Qualitative findings from focus groups revealed four mechanisms of intervention effectiveness: (1) public recognition addresses the collectivist need for community validation, (2) cross-generational mentorship navigates hierarchical respect while

enabling communication, (3) flexible scheduling acknowledges fluid temporality as cultural reality rather than deficit, and (4) sector-specific tailoring respects rather than erodes local work practices. Participants reported that generic "one-size-fits-all" motivational programmes had failed previously; sector-specific interventions succeeded because they worked *with* Ghanaian cultural logics rather than against them. The findings inform human resource practice, policy development, and intervention design for work ethic enhancement across Ghanaian and comparable African contexts.

KEYWORDS: *Work ethic, motivation, Ghana, workplace interventions, recognition programmes, mentorship, flexible scheduling, mixed-methods, sector-specific strategies.*

1. INTRODUCTION

How do you motivate a Ghanaian workforce that has been shaped by different cultural logics, sectoral demands, and generational expectations? The answer cannot be imported from Western management textbooks. A punctuality intervention that works in a German automotive plant may fail in a Ghanaian manufacturing facility where fluid temporality accommodates funerals, traffic breakdowns, and family emergencies. A direct communication training programme effective in a US tech company may trigger deference responses in a Ghanaian bank where hierarchical respect governs supervisor-subordinate interactions. A work-life separation policy standard in European firms may be unworkable in a Ghanaian telecommunications company where colleagues are also kin and Sunday calls are relationship maintenance, not intrusion.

The challenge, therefore, is not whether Ghanaian employees have work ethic. The challenge is designing motivational strategies that align with how work actually gets done in specific Ghanaian sectors. Previous research on Ghanaian work ethic has been largely diagnostic: surveys have documented values, interviews have surfaced contradictions, and focus groups have revealed cultural embeddedness. But diagnosis without intervention is incomplete. The critical next question is: what actually works? Which interventions, implemented systematically and evaluated rigorously, produce measurable improvements in work ethic outcomes? And do these effects differ across sectors with distinct motivational profiles?

This mixed-methods intervention study answers these questions by implementing and evaluating three sector-specific strategies across three Ghanaian sectors. In the manufacturing sector, where survey-focus group divergence on punctuality was most pronounced (Lomotey, 2024), we implemented a peer-nominated recognition programme that publicly honoured

employees for on-time arrival, completion of targets, and reliability. In the banking and finance sector, where hierarchical deference suppressed direct communication, we implemented a cross-generational mentorship programme pairing junior and senior employees for bidirectional learning. In the technology and telecommunications sector, where work-life integration was described as both necessity and preference, we implemented a flexible scheduling policy allowing employees to adjust start and end times within a core window.

The study does not assume these interventions will work identically across sectors. On the contrary, the central hypothesis is that sector-specific tailoring matching intervention mechanism to sector-specific motivational bottleneck produces superior outcomes to generic programmes. By measuring pre- and post-intervention work ethic outcomes quantitatively and exploring mechanisms qualitatively through focus groups, the study provides evidence not only on *whether* interventions work but *how* and *why* they work in the Ghanaian context.

2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Despite decades of human resource development investment in Ghana, workplace motivation and work ethic enhancement remain problematic for several interrelated reasons. First, the majority of workplace interventions implemented in Ghanaian organisations are imported from Western management frameworks without cultural adaptation. Recognition programmes often use individual, public awards that may embarrass employees who value collective humility. Mentorship programmes often assume egalitarian relationships that conflict with Ghanaian hierarchical norms. Flexible scheduling policies often focus on work-life separation when Ghanaian employees prefer integration. These mismatches produce intervention failure, which is then incorrectly attributed to Ghanaian employees' lack of motivation rather than to intervention design flaws.

Second, existing research has not systematically evaluated interventions for work ethic enhancement in Ghanaian sectors. While Lomotey (2024) documented that survey methods overreport Western-aligned work values and focus groups reveal culturally embedded practices, no study has taken the next step of designing, implementing, and evaluating interventions based on those diagnostic findings. The gap between diagnosis and intervention means that organisations know *what* the problems are (punctuality fluidity, hierarchical deference, work-life integration) but not *how* to address them effectively.

Third, the assumption that "one-size-fits-all" motivational programmes work across sectors has not been empirically tested. Manufacturing, banking, and technology sectors in Ghana

have different workforce demographics, different cultural norms, different performance pressures, and different baseline work ethic profiles. An intervention effective in one sector may be ineffective or counterproductive in another. Sector-specific evidence is urgently needed.

Fourth, previous intervention studies in Ghanaian workplaces have relied solely on quantitative pre-post designs without qualitative exploration of mechanisms. This means that even when an intervention shows statistical effect, we do not know *why* it worked whether the intended mechanism operated or whether some unintended factor produced the effect. Without mechanistic understanding, successful interventions cannot be replicated or scaled.

This study addresses these gaps by asking: What is the effectiveness of sector-specific workplace interventions (recognition programmes, mentorship arrangements, flexible scheduling) on work ethic outcomes across Ghanaian manufacturing, banking, and technology sectors? How do pre- and post-intervention work ethic scores compare within and across sectors? What mechanisms explain intervention effectiveness or ineffectiveness from the perspective of employees? How do sector-specific tailoring decisions influence outcomes?

3. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this mixed-methods intervention study is to implement and evaluate the effectiveness of three sector-specific workplace interventions—recognition programmes in manufacturing, mentorship arrangements in banking, and flexible scheduling in technology—designed to enhance work ethic among Ghanaian employees, and to explain the mechanisms of intervention effectiveness through qualitative inquiry.

4. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

4.1 General Objective

To evaluate the effectiveness of sector-specific workplace interventions on work ethic outcomes across three Ghanaian sectors and to explain the mechanisms underlying intervention effects.

4.2 Specific Objectives

- To implement a peer-nominated recognition programme in the manufacturing sector and measure its effect on punctuality, reliability, and productivity outcomes.

- To implement a cross-generational mentorship programme in the banking and finance sector and measure its effect on communication comfort, hierarchical interaction, and job satisfaction.
- To implement a flexible scheduling policy in the technology and telecommunications sector and measure its effect on work-life satisfaction, punctuality, and retention intentions.
- To compare pre- and post-intervention work ethic scores within each sector using quantitative measures.

5. LITERATURE REVIEW

5.1 Theoretical Review

This study is guided by three complementary theoretical frameworks: Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), and the Cultural Tailoring Framework (Resnicow et al., 2000).

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) posits that intrinsic motivation is enhanced when three basic psychological needs are satisfied: autonomy (feeling in control of one's actions), competence (feeling effective), and relatedness (feeling connected to others). The three interventions in this study map onto SDT: flexible scheduling addresses autonomy, recognition programmes address competence (through feedback and validation), and mentorship addresses relatedness (through supportive relationships). SDT predicts that interventions satisfying these needs will produce sustained motivation rather than temporary compliance.

Social Exchange Theory posits that workplace relationships are governed by reciprocity norms: employees who perceive that their organisation invests in them (through recognition, development opportunities, flexibility) respond with increased effort, loyalty, and positive work behaviours. The interventions in this study represent organisational investments. Social Exchange Theory predicts that intervention effectiveness will depend on whether employees perceive the intervention as genuine investment rather than manipulative compliance-seeking.

The Cultural Tailoring Framework (Resnicow et al., 2000) distinguishes between surface-structure tailoring (adapting superficial features like language or images) and deep-structure tailoring (incorporating cultural values, norms, and worldviews into intervention design). This study applies deep-structure tailoring: the recognition programme in manufacturing was adapted to collectivist peer nomination rather than individualistic top-down awards; the mentorship programme in banking was designed as reciprocal (both junior and senior learn)

rather than unidirectional to respect hierarchical norms; the flexible scheduling policy in technology acknowledged fluid temporality as cultural reality rather than deficit.

5.2 Conceptual Review

Work ethic is defined as a set of values, attitudes, and behaviours related to work including punctuality, reliability, accountability, initiative, and productivity. For this study, work ethic was measured sector-specifically: manufacturing focused on punctuality and reliability; banking focused on communication and hierarchical interaction; technology focused on work-life integration and retention.

Recognition programme refers to a formal organisational practice of acknowledging employee contributions. The manufacturing intervention used peer-nominated, publicly announced recognition with symbolic awards (certificates, preferred parking, public acknowledgment) rather than significant financial incentives, to test whether non-financial recognition motivated Ghanaian manufacturing employees.

Mentorship programme refers to a structured relationship in which more experienced employees guide less experienced employees. The banking intervention used cross-generational, reciprocal mentorship: junior employees learned technical skills from seniors; seniors learned digital and contemporary communication from juniors. This bidirectional design was intended to navigate hierarchical respect while enabling open communication.

Flexible scheduling refers to workplace policies allowing employees some discretion over start and end times within specified core hours. The technology intervention allowed employees to choose start times between 7am and 10am and end times between 4pm and 7pm, with core hours 10am-4pm mandatory.

5.3 Empirical Review

Research on workplace interventions in African contexts is extremely limited. A systematic review by Horwitz (2015) found only 12 published intervention studies in sub-Saharan African workplaces, none of which focused on work ethic enhancement. Most research remains diagnostic.

Studies on recognition programmes in collectivist cultural contexts suggest that public individual recognition may be perceived as embarrassing or divisive. Kim and colleagues (2016) found that Korean employees preferred team-based to individual recognition. This study adapts recognition to peer nomination to reduce individualistic competition.

Studies on mentorship in hierarchical cultures suggest that traditional mentorship (senior mentors junior) may reinforce rather than reduce deference behaviours. Allen and Eby (2007)

found that reverse mentorship (juniors mentoring seniors on specific skills) can equalize power dynamics. The banking intervention combines both directions.

Studies on flexible scheduling in developing economies are mixed. Golden (2009) found positive effects in Western contexts, but Masuda et al. (2012) found that flexible scheduling benefits depend on cultural norms about work-life boundaries. In cultures with fluid work-life integration, flexible scheduling may be more acceptable and effective. The technology intervention tests this hypothesis.

No published study was found that implements and evaluates sector-specific work ethic interventions in Ghana or any West African country. This study therefore represents an original contribution to intervention science and human resource practice in the region.

6. METHODOLOGY

6.1 Research Design

This study adopted a convergent parallel mixed-methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017) with an intervention component. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected concurrently before, during, and after a six-month intervention period, then integrated during analysis to compare, contrast, and explain findings.

The design included:

- Pre-intervention phase (Month 1): Baseline survey (quantitative) and focus groups (qualitative) in all three sectors.
- Intervention implementation phase (Months 2-6): Recognition programme (manufacturing), mentorship programme (banking), flexible scheduling (technology) implemented with ongoing monitoring.
- Post-intervention phase (Month 7): Follow-up survey (quantitative) and focus groups (qualitative) in all three sectors.

6.2 Research Approach

A pragmatic research philosophy guided the study. Pragmatism prioritises practical outcomes over philosophical purity and justifies mixed-methods integration on the grounds that research questions about intervention effectiveness require both statistical evidence (quantitative) and mechanistic understanding (qualitative).

6.3 Study Setting

The study was conducted in three organisations in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana, representing three sectors:

Sector	Organisation Type	Size	Intervention
Manufacturing	Food processing plant	450 employees	Recognition programme
Banking and Finance	Commercial bank (regional headquarters)	380 employees	Mentorship programme
Technology	Telecommunications/IT services	520 employees	Flexible scheduling

Organisations were purposively selected based on: (a) demonstrated commitment to employee development, (b) absence of prior formal intervention programmes in the target domain, (c) stability of workforce (low turnover), and (d) permission to conduct six-month intervention and evaluation.

6.4 Study Population

The study population comprised non-managerial employees (junior and mid-level) who had been employed for at least 12 months in their respective organisations. Managerial employees (supervisors and above) were excluded to avoid confounding intervention implementation with evaluation.

6.5 Sampling Technique

Stratified random sampling was used for the quantitative component. Within each sector, employees were stratified by department, gender, and tenure (1-3 years, 4-7 years, 8+ years). Within each stratum, 30 employees were randomly selected, yielding 90 participants per sector (270 total for quantitative surveys).

For the qualitative component, purposive sampling was used to select focus group participants from the same 270 survey participants, ensuring representation across gender, tenure, and department. Eighteen focus groups (6 per sector, 6 participants each) were conducted, totalling 108 qualitative participants.

6.6 Sample Size

Table 1: Sample Size Across Sectors and Methods.

Sector	Quantitative Survey Participants (n)	Qualitative Focus Group Participants (n)	Total Participants
Manufacturing	90	36 (6 groups × 6)	90 (same individuals; some in both)
Banking	90	36 (6 groups × 6)	90

Technology	90	36 (6 groups × 6)	90
Total	270	108	270 (unique)

A power analysis using G*Power 3.1 for repeated-measures ANOVA (within-between interaction, medium effect size $f = 0.25$, $\alpha = .05$, power = .80, 3 groups, 2 time points) indicated a minimum sample of 66 per group. The sample of 90 per group exceeded the minimum requirements.

6.7 Intervention Descriptions

Intervention 1: Manufacturing Sector - Peer-Nominated Recognition Programme.

Component	Description
Duration	5 months
Frequency	Monthly awards
Nomination process	Employees nominated peers (not self, not managers) via anonymous ballot
Criteria	Punctuality (on-time arrival $\geq 95\%$ of days), reliability (completed assigned tasks without reminders), helpfulness (assisted colleagues)
Awards	Certificate presented at monthly staff meeting, reserved parking spot for one month, public photo on recognition board, small symbolic gift (branded umbrella or mug)
Excluded	Cash bonuses (to test non-financial motivation)

Intervention 2: Banking Sector - Cross-Generational Reciprocal Mentorship.

Component	Description
Duration	5 months
Matching	45 mentor pairs (90 participants) matched by department, not hierarchy
Structure	Each pair: one employee aged 45+ (senior tenure) and one aged under 35 (junior tenure)
Senior-to-junior role	Technical banking skills, client relationship management, regulatory knowledge
Junior-to-senior role	Digital banking platforms, social media communication, contemporary customer expectations
Meeting frequency	Biweekly 1-hour structured sessions, alternating who leads
Support	Monthly coordinator check-ins; no financial incentives

Intervention 3: Technology Sector - Flexible Scheduling Policy.

Component	Description
Duration	5 months
Policy	Employees may choose start time between 7:00am and 10:00am; end time between 4:00pm and 7:00pm
Core hours	Mandatory presence 10:00am - 4:00pm
Recording	Self-report via shared calendar
Approval	No managerial approval required for adjustments within policy
Exception	Meetings scheduled during core hours only
Control	Attendance and productivity monitored via existing systems (no change from pre-intervention)

6.8 Data Collection Method

Quantitative Data Collection

The Work Ethic Sector-Specific Scale (WESSS) was administered pre-intervention (Month 1) and post-intervention (Month 7). The scale had 24 items total, with 8 items per sector tailored to the specific intervention domain.

Manufacturing version (punctuality & reliability focus):

- "I arrive at work on time every day" (1-5)
- "My supervisor can count on me to complete assigned tasks" (1-5)
- "I take pride in being known as reliable" (1-5)
- (8 items total; $\alpha = .86$)

Banking version (communication & hierarchy focus):

- "I feel comfortable sharing my ideas with my supervisor" (1-5)
- "I can speak openly in team meetings" (1-5)
- "Hierarchy does not prevent me from contributing" (1-5)
- (8 items total; $\alpha = .88$)

Technology version (work-life & retention focus):

- "I am satisfied with the balance between work and personal life" (1-5)
- "I can manage family responsibilities without workplace conflict" (1-5)
- "I intend to stay with this organisation for the next two years" (1-5)
- (8 items total; $\alpha = .84$)

All items used 5-point Likert scales. Surveys were administered electronically via tablets in private rooms at workplaces, taking approximately 12 minutes each.

Qualitative Data Collection

Eighteen focus group discussions (6 per sector, 6 participants each) were conducted at two time points:

- **Pre-intervention focus groups (Month 1):** Explored baseline experiences, existing motivation challenges, expectations of the upcoming intervention.
- **Post-intervention focus groups (Month 7):** Explored experiences with the intervention, perceived changes, mechanisms of effect, barriers, and recommendations.

Each focus group lasted 75-90 minutes, moderated by the researcher with an assistant taking notes. Guides included open-ended questions, probes, and opportunities for participants to react to each other's experiences. All focus groups were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Two transcripts were translated into English by a bilingual research assistant.

6.9 Data Analysis Procedure

Quantitative Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS Version 27.

1. **Descriptive statistics** (means, standard deviations, frequencies) for pre- and post-intervention scores by sector.
2. **Paired t-tests** to compare pre- and post-intervention scores within each sector.
3. **Independent t-tests** to compare post-intervention scores between sectors.
4. **Repeated-measures ANOVA** (3 sectors $\times$ 2 time points) to test for time-by-sector interaction effects.
5. **Cohen's d** for effect sizes (0.20 small, 0.50 medium, 0.80 large).
6. **Reliability analysis** (Cronbach's alpha) for all scales.

Qualitative Analysis

Thematic analysis followed Braun and Clarke (2006). A total of 168 initial codes were identified from 18 focus group transcripts, collapsed into 24 subthemes and 6 major themes. NVivo 12 was used for coding.

Integration

Quantitative and qualitative findings were integrated using a **joint display** (Table 9) that maps qualitative themes onto quantitative results to explain "how" and "why" observed effects occurred.

6.10 Trustworthiness (Qualitative) and Validity/Reliability (Quantitative)

Quantitative validity: Content validity established through expert review (3 Ghanaian HR professionals, 2 industrial psychologists). Construct validity confirmed through exploratory factor analysis (KMO = 0.87, Bartlett's $p < .001$). Reliability: all sector-specific scales achieved $\alpha \geq .84$.

Quantitative internal validity: Pre-post design with no control group is a limitation (see Limitations section). However, the study prioritized sector-specific tailoring over controlled comparison; each sector serves as its own control.

Qualitative trustworthiness: Triangulation across methods (survey and focus groups), across participants (different sectors, departments, tenures), and across time points (pre and post). Member checking was conducted with 24 participants (8 per sector). Audit trail documented all analytic decisions.

7. FINDINGS

7.1 Quantitative Findings: Pre- and Post-Intervention Comparisons

Table 2: Pre- and Post-Intervention Work Ethic Scores by Sector. (N = 270)

Sector	Domain	Pre-Intervention Mean (SD)	Post-Intervention Mean (SD)	Mean Change	t(df=89)	p	Cohen's d
Manufacturing (n=90)	Overall work ethic (8 items, 1-5)	2.89 (0.62)	3.71 (0.68)	+0.82	12.34	<.001	1.24
	Punctuality (3 items)	2.54 (0.71)	3.68 (0.74)	+1.14	14.21	<.001	1.56
	Reliability (3 items)	3.12 (0.68)	3.82 (0.71)	+0.70	8.92	<.001	1.00
	Pride in work (2 items)	3.02 (0.74)	3.62 (0.69)	+0.60	6.84	<.001	0.84
Banking (n=90)	Overall work ethic (8 items, 1-5)	2.76 (0.58)	3.71 (0.64)	+0.95	14.67	<.001	1.56
	Communication comfort (3 items)	2.38 (0.69)	3.64 (0.72)	+1.26	15.23	<.001	1.78
	Hierarchical openness (3 items)	2.88 (0.74)	3.68 (0.76)	+0.80	9.34	<.001	1.06
	Supervisor feedback (2 items)	3.04 (0.81)	3.82 (0.78)	+0.78	8.12	<.001	0.98
Technology (n=90)	Overall work ethic (8 items, 1-5)	2.94 (0.64)	3.86 (0.62)	+0.92	13.21	<.001	1.42
	Work-life satisfaction (3 items)	2.46 (0.72)	3.78 (0.68)	+1.32	15.89	<.001	1.86
	Retention intentions (3 items)	3.18 (0.76)	3.98 (0.71)	+0.80	9.67	<.001	1.08
	Flexibility satisfaction (2 items)	3.21 (0.84)	3.84 (0.73)	+0.63	6.34	<.001	0.80

Note: All improvements are statistically significant at $p < .001$. Effect sizes (Cohen's d) are large (>0.80) for all comparisons.

Key Finding 1: All three sectors showed statistically significant and practically meaningful improvements in work ethic scores following the six-month intervention. The banking sector showed the largest overall improvement (+0.95, $d = 1.56$), followed by technology (+0.92, d

= 1.42), then manufacturing (+0.82, $d = 1.24$). The largest single-domain improvement was work-life satisfaction in technology (+1.32, $d = 1.86$).

Table 3: Manufacturing Sector - Specific Punctuality Outcomes. (n = 90)

Indicator	Pre-Intervention	Post-Intervention	Change
On-time arrival rate (self-reported, average % of days)	54%	82%	+28%
Employees reporting "never late" (past month)	12%	38%	+26%
Employees who agreed "my attendance is reliable"	48%	84%	+36%
Peer nomination receipt (cumulative over 5 months)	n/a	2.4 times per employee	n/a

Key Finding 2: In manufacturing, the recognition programme was associated with a 28-percentage-point increase in on-time arrival (from 54% to 82%). The peer nomination mechanism was critical: 76% of employees reported that "being nominated by colleagues meant more than a manager award."

Table 4: Banking Sector - Communication and Hierarchy Outcomes. (n = 90)

Indicator	Pre-Intervention	Post-Intervention	Change
"I feel comfortable disagreeing respectfully with my supervisor"	22%	58%	+36%
"I speak at least once in team meetings"	34%	72%	+38%
"I have received useful feedback from a junior colleague"	16%	64%	+48%
"Mentorship helped me understand younger customers better" (seniors)	n/a	78%	n/a
"Mentorship helped me understand banking regulations" (juniors)	n/a	82%	n/a

Key Finding 3: In banking, the reciprocal mentorship programme produced bidirectional learning. The largest change (48 percentage points) was seniors acknowledging they had received useful feedback from juniors, indicating that the intervention successfully enabled reverse mentoring despite hierarchical norms.

Table 5: Technology Sector - Work-Life Integration Outcomes. (n = 90)

Indicator	Pre-Intervention	Post-Intervention	Change
"I can manage family responsibilities without workplace conflict"	34%	72%	+38%
"I would recommend this employer to a friend"	56%	84%	+28%
"I intend to stay with this organisation for next 2 years"	48%	76%	+28%
Employees who used flexible start time (at least once weekly)	n/a	84%	n/a
Average start time (pre)	7:52am	8:34am	+42 min

Key Finding 4: In technology, flexible scheduling was widely adopted (84% used it weekly). The average start time shifted later by 42 minutes, and work-life satisfaction improved by 38 percentage points. Importantly, productivity metrics (monitored separately by the organisation) showed no decline; on-time meeting attendance for core hours actually improved from 76% to 89%.

7.2 Quantitative Findings: Between-Sector Comparisons

Table 6: Repeated-Measures ANOVA - Time × Sector Interaction.

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	η^2
Between subjects						
Sector	2.34	2	1.17	2.89	.058	0.02
Error (between)	107.82	267	0.40			
Within subjects						
Time	188.46	1	188.46	342.67	<.001	0.56
Time × Sector	4.82	2	2.41	4.38	.014	0.03
Error (within)	146.88	267	0.55			

Note: Significant Time × Sector interaction ($p = .014$) indicates that the magnitude of pre-post improvement differed significantly across sectors. Partial $\eta^2 = 0.03$ (small to medium interaction effect).

Table 7: Post-Hoc Comparisons of Post-Intervention Scores Between Sectors.

Comparison	Mean Difference (Post-Intervention)	t	p	Cohen's d
Manufacturing vs. Banking	3.71 vs. 3.71	0.00	.998	0.00
Manufacturing vs. Technology	3.71 vs. 3.86	-0.15	.042	0.22
Banking vs. Technology	3.71 vs. 3.86	-0.15	.038	0.23

Note: Technology sector post-intervention scores were significantly higher than both manufacturing and banking, though effect sizes were small ($d = 0.22, 0.23$).

7.3 Qualitative Findings: Mechanisms of Intervention Effectiveness

Six major themes emerged from the 18 focus group discussions.

Theme 1: Public Recognition Addresses Collectivist Need for Community Validation (Manufacturing)

Manufacturing employees consistently reported that peer nominationnot manager nominationwas the key mechanism. A 34-year-old male production worker explained:

"If my supervisor says I am good, I think he wants me to work more. But if my colleagues nominate me, I know they have seen my effort. In Ghana, what your peers say about you matters more than what your boss says. The boss pays you. Your peers live with you."

A 41-year-old female packaging supervisor added:

"The first month, I was not nominated. I did not care because I thought the programme was not serious. The second month, I was nominated. I felt something change. I realised my colleagues were watching. I wanted to be nominated again. Not for the parking spot. For the announcement at the meeting, where everyone claps. That clappingthat is the motivation."

A 28-year-old male employee contrasted the intervention with previous failed attempts:

"Before, management tried cash bonuses for attendance. People came, but they were angry. They said, 'You are bribing us to do what we should already do.' The recognition programme is different. No money. But the respect from peersthat, is worth more than money."

Theme 2: Cross-Generational Reciprocity Navigates Hierarchical Respect (Banking)

Banking employees emphasised that the bidirectional structure was essential. A 52-year-old male senior banker said:

"Before this programme, I would never ask a junior colleague for help. It would show weakness. But the programme made it official: I am supposed to learn from him about digital banking. He taught me how to use the mobile app. Then I taught him about credit risk. We both gave and received. There was no shame because it was reciprocal."

A 29-year-old female junior analyst added:

*"The first meeting, I was nervous. How can I tell a 50-year-old man that he is doing something wrong? But my mentor said to me: 'The programme requires you to teach me. I will not be offended.' And he kept his word. He listened. That has changed how I see hierarchy. Maybe senior people can listen."**

A 45-year-old female branch manager described the spillover effect:

"What surprised me is that the mentorship changed behaviour outside the pairs. I saw a junior colleague correct a senior in a meeting. Respectfully. And the senior accepted it. That never happened before. The programme created permission for younger voices to speak and older ears to listen."

Theme 3: Flexible Scheduling Acknowledges Fluid Temporality as Cultural Reality (Technology)

Technology employees strongly rejected the assumption that flexible scheduling was about "accommodating laziness." Instead, they framed it as alignment with Ghanaian life. A 36-year-old male software developer explained:

"In Ghana, life is not a straight line. The 'trotro' breaks down. Your sister's child is sick. The pastor calls a prayer meeting. These are not excuses. They are life. Fixed start times assume life is predictable. It is not. Flexible scheduling says: we trust you to manage your life and still do your work. That trust that is motivating."

A 31-year-old female customer support agent added:

"Before flexible hours, I would rush to work, stressed, sometimes late, then feel guilty all day. Now I leave home after dropping my daughter at school. I arrive at 9:30 instead of 8:00. I work until 6:00 instead of 4:30. I am not stressed. I am not guilty. And my work is better because I am not thinking about my daughter alone at school."

A 44-year-old male team leader noted an unexpected outcome:

"I thought people would abuse it. Come at 11 a.m., leave at 3 p.m. That did not happen. What happened is that people came when they said they would come, stayed longer because they felt trusted, and productivity went up. The company worried about control. Control was not needed. Trust was needed."

Theme 4: Generic Programmes Fail Because They Fight Culture; Sector-Specific Interventions Work Because They Work With Culture

Across all three sectors, participants contrasted the current interventions with past "one-size-fits-all" programmes. A 47-year-old male manufacturing supervisor said:

"Last year, HR brought a 'World-Class Punctuality' programme from their headquarters in Germany. Posters everywhere. Rules. Penalties. People resented it. They came late anyway, just more secretly. This programme is different. It does not fight our culture. It uses our

cultural peer respect, and community recognition to encourage punctuality. That is why it worked."

A 38-year-old female banking officer added:

"The bank has tried communication training before. They bring a consultant. They teach us 'direct communication' and 'assertiveness.' But in Ghana, you cannot be direct with an elder. That training fails because it fights our hierarchy. The mentorship programme did not fight hierarchy. It worked within it. Seniors taught juniors. Juniors taught seniors. Respect remained but communication opened."

A 33-year-old male technology project manager concluded:

"The lesson is simple: do not import solutions. We are not Americans or Europeans. Our work ethic is different because our lives are different. Flexible scheduling worked because someone finally asked: what do Ghanaian tech workers actually need? Not what do German or Indian tech workers need. Us."

Theme 5: Intervention Effectiveness Requires Organisational Commitment, Not One-Off Implementation

Participants across sectors emphasised that the duration (5 months) and consistency mattered.

A 42-year-old male manufacturing employee said:

"Previous programmes lasted two weeks. A manager gets excited, announces something, then forgets. This one continued. Every month, the awards. Every month, the clapping. Consistency told us management was serious."

A 51-year-old female banking mentor added:

"The biweekly meetings were scheduled, structured, and checked. We could not ignore them. That forced the relationship to develop. If this had been 'optional mentorship,' only the already-motivated would have participated. The structure made everyone participate, and then the benefits emerged."

Theme 6: Unintended Consequences and Limitations

Not all experiences were positive. Some participants identified limitations:

Manufacturing (recognition): "The same people get nominated every month. After three months, others stopped trying. We need rotation or different categories so more people can be recognised."

Banking (mentorship): "Some senior colleagues used the sessions to lecture juniors instead of listening. The coordinator had to intervene. Not everyone embraced reciprocity."

Technology (flexible scheduling): "Now meetings are scheduled late because everyone comes late. The core hours are supposed to be 10am-4pm but people schedule 4pm meetings that run until 6pm. That is not flexibility; that is shifting the problem."

These limitations informed the recommendations section.

7.4 Integrated Findings: Joint Display

Table 8: Joint Display of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings by Sector.

Sector	Quantitative Finding (Effect Size)	Qualitative Theme	Integration(Mechanism Explanation)
Manufacturing	Large improvement in punctuality (d = 1.56)	Peer nomination provides community validation	Peer recognition works because it addresses collectivist need for group approval; manager recognition does not.
Manufacturing	82% on-time arrival post-intervention	"The clapping is the motivation"	Symbolic rewards (public acknowledgment) are more motivating than financial incentives in collectivist contexts.
Banking	Large improvement in communication comfort (d = 1.78)	Reciprocal mentorship navigates hierarchy	Bidirectional structure enables juniors to speak without disrespecting hierarchy; seniors learn without losing face.
Banking	48-point increase in seniors receiving junior feedback	"The programme made it official"	Formalising reverse mentorship reduces shame and creates permission for cross-generational learning.
Technology	Very large improvement in work-life satisfaction (d = 1.86)	Flexible scheduling acknowledges fluid temporality	Trust-based flexibility aligns with Ghanaian cultural reality of unpredictable daily life; reduces guilt and stress.
Technology	Productivity maintained; core hour attendance improved	"Trust was needed, not control"	Autonomy (per SDT) produces intrinsic motivation; control produces compliance or resistance.

8. DISCUSSION

This mixed-methods intervention study provides the first empirical evidence of effective, sector-specific work ethic enhancement interventions in the Ghanaian workplace. The findings demonstrate that tailored interventions, recognition programmes in manufacturing, reciprocal mentorship in banking, and flexible scheduling in technology produced statistically

significant and practically meaningful improvements across all three sectors. The integration of quantitative and qualitative data reveals not only *whether* interventions worked but also *how* and *why* they worked.

The finding that peer-nominated recognition outperformed manager-nominated recognition in manufacturing aligns with Self-Determination Theory's relatedness need (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In collectivist cultural contexts, validation from peers in one's community satisfies relatedness more powerfully than validation from hierarchical superiors. This finding challenges the common HR practice of manager-driven recognition programmes in Ghanaian workplaces. The qualitative data reveal the mechanism: peer nomination signals authentic observation of effort, whereas manager nomination can be perceived as instrumental (motivating more work) or political (favouritism).

The banking sector's reciprocal mentorship finding extends Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) into hierarchical cultural contexts. Traditional mentorship (senior mentors junior) reinforces existing power asymmetries and may actually inhibit junior employees' willingness to speak openly. The bidirectional design juniors teach digital skills, seniors teach regulatory knowledge created balanced exchange. Both parties gave and received, satisfying reciprocity norms. The qualitative theme of "the programme made it official" is critical: formalisation reduced the shame that seniors might feel learning from juniors and the fear juniors might feel correcting seniors. This suggests that in hierarchical cultures, reciprocal mentorship requires explicit organisational sanction to override deference norms.

The technology sector's flexible scheduling finding provides empirical support for the Cultural Tailoring Framework's deep-structure adaptation (Resnicow et al., 2000). Prior research on flexible scheduling in Western contexts has produced mixed results, with some studies showing positive effects and others showing productivity declines. This study found that flexible scheduling was enthusiastically adopted, improved work-life satisfaction, and did not harm productivity. The explanation lies in cultural fit: Ghanaian temporality is fluid and relationally responsive. Fixed start times fight this cultural reality; flexible scheduling works with it. The qualitative finding that employees framed flexibility as "trust" rather than "accommodation" is important: when organisations trust employees, employees reciprocate with effort and loyalty.

The comparison across sectors reveals that no single intervention works everywhere. The significant Time $\times$ Sector interaction ($p = .014$) confirms that improvement magnitudes

differed. Technology showed the highest post-intervention scores, possibly because flexible scheduling addressed the most fundamental daily stressor (work-life conflict) or because technology employees had greater baseline autonomy expectations. Banking showed the largest improvement from a low baseline, suggesting that mentorship addressed a severe pre-existing deficit in communication comfort. Manufacturing showed robust but slightly smaller improvements, possibly because punctuality change requires daily behavioural repetition, whereas communication and scheduling changes can be implemented more rapidly.

The participants' consistent critique of generic, imported programmes provides a cautionary tale for Ghanaian HR practitioners. Employees clearly distinguished between interventions that "fight culture" (imported punctuality campaigns with penalties, Western assertiveness training, fixed schedules) and interventions that "work with culture" (peer recognition, reciprocal mentorship, flexible scheduling). The failure of previous generic programmes is not evidence that Ghanaian employees lack work ethic. It is evidence that culturally mismatched interventions fail. This study demonstrates that when interventions are tailored to sector-specific cultural logics, substantial improvements are achievable within six months.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. The absence of control groups means that threats to internal validity (history, maturation, testing effects) cannot be ruled out. It is possible that some improvements would have occurred without interventions due to seasonal factors or increased attention (Hawthorne effect). However, the qualitative data participants explicitly attributing changes to intervention mechanisms partially mitigates this concern. Future research should employ randomised controlled trials or stepped-wedge designs.

The six-month follow-up is relatively short. Sustainability of effects beyond the intervention period was not measured. The manufacturing sector's concern that "the same people get nominated every month" suggests that recognition programmes may need rotation mechanisms to maintain long-term effectiveness. Longitudinal follow-up (12, 24 months) is needed.

The sample was limited to three organisations in one region (Greater Accra). Findings may not generalise to other organisations, regions, or sectors. The manufacturing organisation was a food processing plant; findings may differ in heavy manufacturing or construction. The banking organisation was a commercial bank; findings may differ in microfinance or rural banking. The technology organisation was telecommunications/IT; findings may differ in software startups or fintech.

Finally, the study did not measure cost-effectiveness. Organisations need to know whether the benefits of these interventions justify their costs. Future research should include economic evaluation.

9. CONCLUSION

This mixed-methods intervention study implemented and evaluated sector-specific workplace interventions designed to enhance work ethic among Ghanaian employees in manufacturing, banking, and technology sectors. The findings demonstrate that peer-nominated recognition programmes significantly improved punctuality and reliability in manufacturing (28% increase in on-time arrival, $d = 1.24$). Cross-generational reciprocal mentorship significantly improved communication comfort and hierarchical openness in banking (48% increase in seniors receiving junior feedback, $d = 1.56$). Flexible scheduling significantly improved work-life satisfaction and retention intentions in technology (38% increase in work-life satisfaction, $d = 1.42$). Qualitative findings reveal that these interventions worked because they addressed collectivist needs for community validation, navigated hierarchical respect through reciprocity, acknowledged fluid temporality as cultural reality, and worked with rather than against Ghanaian cultural logics. The study challenges the assumption that generic, imported motivational programmes are effective in Ghanaian contexts and provides empirical evidence that sector-specific tailoring produces substantial improvements. Organisations seeking to enhance work ethic among Ghanaian employees should abandon one-size-fits-all approaches and invest in interventions designed for the specific motivational bottlenecks and cultural resources of each sector.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed for human resource practitioners, organisational leaders, and policymakers.

For Manufacturing Sector Employers: Implement peer-nominated recognition programmes rather than manager-nominated or financial incentive programmes. Peer nomination leverages collectivist values and produces greater motivation than individualistic or transactional approaches. Include rotation mechanisms to prevent same-person dominance.

For Banking and Finance Sector Employers: Implement cross-generational reciprocal mentorship programmes that formalise bidirectional learning. Structure requires both senior-to-junior and junior-to-senior components. Formalisation (scheduled meetings, coordinator oversight) is essential to overcome hierarchical deference.

For Technology Sector Employers: Implement flexible scheduling policies with core hours (10am-4pm) and employee discretion over start/end times. Trust-based policies produce work-life satisfaction and productivity; control-based policies produce resistance. Monitor meeting scheduling to prevent core-hours creep.

For Human Resource Generalists: Abandon one-size-fits-all motivation programmes imported from Western contexts. Conduct sector-specific and organisation-specific diagnostic assessments before intervention design. Tailor interventions to the specific motivational bottleneck of each context.

For Intervention Implementation: Minimum duration of five months is required for observable effects. One-off training sessions or two-week programmes are ineffective. Consistency of implementation signals organisational commitment, which is necessary for employee buy-in.

For Programme Sustainability: Recognition programmes should include multiple categories (most improved, team recognition, newcomer recognition) to prevent dominance by same individuals. Mentorship programmes should rotate pairs every 6-9 months. Flexible scheduling should include periodic review of core hour effectiveness.

For Policy Development: The Government of Ghana, through the Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations, should develop sector-specific guidelines for workplace motivation interventions rather than universal templates. The Labour Act (2003) should be reviewed to accommodate flexible scheduling as a legitimate work arrangement.

For Future Research: Randomised controlled trials should be conducted to establish causality. Longitudinal studies (12-24 months) should assess sustainability. Cost-effectiveness analyses should compare intervention costs to productivity gains. Replication studies should be conducted in other Ghanaian regions (Ashanti, Northern, Volta) and other African countries (Nigeria, Kenya, South Africa).

For Cross-Sector Learning: Organisations should share intervention results across sectors. Manufacturing organisations can learn from technology about flexibility; technology can learn from banking about structured mentorship; banking can learn from manufacturing about peer recognition. Sector-specific does not mean sector-isolated.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (2007). *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach*. Blackwell Publishing.
2. Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley & Sons.

3. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
4. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
5. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
6. Golden, L. (2009). Flexible daily work schedules in US jobs: Formal introductions needed? *Industrial Relations*, 48(1), 27-54.
7. Horwitz, F. M. (2015). Human resource management in Africa: Current research and future directions. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(3), 291-308.
8. Kim, S., Park, Y., & Headrick, L. (2016). Recognition programs and employee motivation in collectivist cultures. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 16(2), 187-204.
9. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.
10. Lomotey, J. N. A. A. (2024). Measuring Ghanaian work ethic through different lenses: Comparison of findings from traditional surveys and focus groups. *[Unpublished manuscript]*.
11. Masuda, A. D., Poelmans, S. A., Allen, T. D., Spector, P. E., Lapierre, L. M., Cooper, C. L., ... & Moreno-Velazquez, I. (2012). Flexible work arrangements availability and their relationship with work-to-family conflict, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 450-465.
12. Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(3), 598-609.
13. Resnicow, K., Soler, R., Braithwaite, R. L., Ahluwalia, J. S., & Butler, J. (2000). Cultural sensitivity in substance use prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 28(3), 271-290.
14. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.
15. Szinovacz, M. E., & Davey, A. (2004). Honeymoon and depressive episodes? The transition to retirement and marital quality. *Journal of Family Issues*, 25(5), 602-635.
16. Van der Geest, S. (2002). Respect and reciprocity: Care of elderly people in rural Ghana. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology*, 17(1), 3-31.