Beyond One-Size-Fits-All:

An Aptitude-Treatment Interaction Framework for Personalized Productivity Interventions

Adeola Awowale

Prolific Personalities, United States

Correspondence: adeola@prolificpersonalities.com

ORCID: 0009-0004-8129-6882

Abstract

The contemporary productivity industry operates on an implicit universality assumption—the premise that specific self-regulation methodologies possess intrinsic efficacy applicable across individuals regardless of personality or cognitive differences. This assumption contradicts extensive evidence from personality psychology and individual differences research demonstrating that personality traits substantially moderate intervention effectiveness. This theoretical review applies the Aptitude-Treatment Interaction (ATI) framework from educational psychology to the domain of personal productivity interventions. Drawing on meta-analytic evidence from personality research, executive function studies, and behavioral intervention trials, we synthesize evidence that conscientiousness, neuroticism, action orientation, and executive function capacity create differential responsiveness to productivity strategies. Our analysis reveals that effect sizes for productivity interventions vary substantially based on individual characteristics, with evidence suggesting meaningful differences in effectiveness depending on trait-strategy alignment. We propose a diagnostic framework for matching individuals to evidence-based productivity strategies based on their psychological profiles, distinguishing between compensatory approaches (scaffolding deficits) and capitalization approaches (leveraging strengths). These findings have implications for organizational productivity training, clinical interventions for executive dysfunction, and the design of adaptive productivity

technology. We conclude by identifying critical research gaps and proposing priorities for empirical validation of personalized productivity matching.

Keywords: productivity, personality, individual differences, aptitude-treatment interaction, self-regulation, conscientiousness, executive function, procrastination

1. Introduction

1.1 The Productivity Paradox

Despite unprecedented access to productivity tools, applications, and methodologies, knowledge workers report increasing struggles with focus, completion, and satisfaction. Research on workplace attention has documented concerning trends in how individuals allocate cognitive resources throughout the workday. Mark and colleagues have tracked attention patterns in workplace settings for nearly two decades, finding substantial decreases in sustained attention on any single screen or task (Mark, 2023). The frequency of task-switching has increased dramatically, with workers now shifting between activities far more rapidly than in previous decades.

This phenomenon occurs against a backdrop of explosive growth in the productivity software industry, which has expanded substantially in recent years with projections of continued growth through the next decade. Yet user engagement with these tools remains remarkably poor, with the majority of users abandoning productivity applications within the first few months of adoption. This pattern—more tools available but poorer sustained engagement—constitutes what we term the productivity paradox.

The paradox suggests a fundamental mismatch between available solutions and user needs. We propose that the core problem lies in the assumption of homogeneity—that all individuals will respond similarly to the same productivity interventions. Research in personality psychology and individual differences challenges this assumption, demonstrating that personality traits, cognitive capacities, and neurodevelopmental variations create substantial heterogeneity in how individuals process information, regulate behavior, and respond to external structure (Roberts et al., 2007). A method that transforms one person's workday may prove useless or even counterproductive for another, not because of differences in effort or discipline, but because of fundamental differences in how their minds process goals, manage attention, and regulate behavior.

1.2 The Universality Assumption and Its Failure

The architecture of modern work has shifted from externally regulated industrial environments to autonomous, high-ambiguity knowledge work, placing unprecedented demand on individual self-regulation capacity. In response, a sprawling industry of productivity methodologies has emerged, from the inventory-heavy Getting Things Done (GTD) to constraint-based techniques like Pomodoro to various implementations of time blocking.

These systems are marketed under a tacit universality assumption: the belief that if a system works for a high-performing executive, it should work for anyone who applies it with sufficient discipline. However, the empirical reality contradicts this assumption. The landscape of personal efficiency is littered with system fatigue, abandonment, and the phenomenon of productivity porn—where maintaining the system becomes procrastination itself.

This oversight ignores a century of psychological research indicating that individual differences in cognitive style, volition, and personality are decisive variables in the success of any behavioral intervention (Snow, 1989). The same structured approach that helps one person may feel suffocating to another; the flexibility that allows one person to thrive may leave another paralyzed.

1.3 Introducing the ATI Framework

This paper posits that the failure of the one-size-fits-all model is predictable through the lens of Aptitude-Treatment Interaction (ATI). Originally conceptualized in educational psychology by Cronbach (1957) and elaborated by Snow (1989), ATI suggests that educational outcomes depend not on the main effect of the instructional method, but on the interaction between the learner's characteristics (aptitudes) and the instructional method (treatment). In other words, the best teaching method depends on who is being taught.

When applied to the domain of knowledge work, we argue that productivity frameworks function as treatments for the challenge of self-regulation and task completion. Therefore, a high-structure treatment (like strict time-blocking) may be remedial for a user with low executive control but counterproductive for a user with high autonomy and global processing tendencies. Conversely, a flexible, open-ended approach may liberate one person while leaving another without the scaffolding they need to initiate and complete tasks.

The concept of Precision Productivity parallels developments in personalized medicine, where treatment decisions increasingly account for individual genetic, environmental, and lifestyle factors rather than applying one-size-fits-all protocols. Just as medicine has recognized that the same drug may help one patient while harming another based on their individual characteristics, we argue that productivity science must recognize that the same method may help one person while failing another based on their psychological profile.

Importantly, the historical failure of ATI research in education stemmed largely from logistical constraints—it was impractical to customize instruction for every student in a physical classroom. However, the digital productivity landscape has solved this logistical constraint. Software can theoretically adapt its interface, prompts, and structure to the individual user in real-time. Thus, the matching platform we envision represents the realization of the ATI ideal: a system where the treatment (the productivity workflow) is dynamically matched to the aptitude (the user profile).

1.4 Aims and Structure of This Review

We aim to rigorously deconstruct the major productivity methodologies not as monolithic solutions, but as collections of specific cognitive levers. By mapping these levers against a robust taxonomy of individual differences—specifically the Big Five personality traits, action control orientation, and executive function capacity—we establish a theoretical basis for personalized productivity matching.

This review addresses three research questions: First, do personality traits reliably moderate productivity intervention effectiveness? If so, which dimensions show the strongest effects and through what mechanisms? Second, do different productivity strategies show differential effectiveness based on individual characteristics, and can we identify which strategies work best for which profiles? Third, can we construct an evidence-based framework for matching individuals to optimal productivity strategies based on their personality, cognitive, and neurodevelopmental profiles?

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the theoretical foundations of individual differences relevant to productivity, including the Big Five personality

model, action control theory, and executive function. Section 3 analyzes the evidence base for major productivity interventions, examining both their mechanisms and their moderators. Section 4 synthesizes evidence for aptitude-treatment interactions in the productivity domain. Section 5 proposes a framework for personality-productivity matching. Section 6 discusses limitations and future research directions.

2. Theoretical Foundations: Individual Differences in Self-Regulation

To understand why a productivity system fails or succeeds, one must first map the terrain of human volition. Volition is distinct from motivation; while motivation concerns the selection of goals based on desirability and feasibility, volition concerns the execution of those goals in the face of competing impulses and internal resistance (Kuhl, 1984). The intention-behavior gap—the chasm between deciding to do a task and actually initiating it—is the primary target of all productivity interventions. This section outlines the primary dimensions of individual difference that moderate this gap.

2.1 The Big Five Personality Framework

The Big Five (or Five Factor Model) represents the most empirically validated personality taxonomy, consisting of five broad dimensions: Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism (John & Srivastava, 1999). Each dimension shows moderate heritability (40-60%), substantial temporal stability across the lifespan, and cross-cultural replicability (McCrae & Costa, 1997). For productivity outcomes, two dimensions prove particularly consequential: conscientiousness and neuroticism.

2.1.1 Conscientiousness as Productivity Substrate

Conscientiousness—characterized by organization, dependability, achievement-striving, and self-discipline—shows the most robust relationship with work performance across contexts. Wilmot and Ones (2019) conducted the most comprehensive quantitative synthesis to date, drawing on 92 unique meta-analyses reporting effects for 175 distinct occupational variables, representing over 1.1 million participants across more than 2,500 studies. They found that conscientiousness predicts job performance with a corrected correlation of approximately $\rho = 0.20$, accounting for roughly 4% of performance variance. This effect size rivals general cognitive ability in predictive validity and remains consistent across diverse occupational contexts.

The high-conscientiousness phenotype describes individuals with an innate drive for organization and closure. They experience the creation of structure—lists, plans, schedules—as intrinsically rewarding. For these individuals, a complex system like Getting Things Done

(GTD), which requires meticulous sorting, tagging, and reviewing, aligns with their natural tendencies. The system's maintenance satisfies their orderliness facet, and task completion gratifies their achievement striving.

The low-conscientiousness phenotype, often described as flexible or spontaneous, presents different challenges. These individuals struggle with self-imposed structure not necessarily due to a lack of capability, but due to a preference for immediate gratification over long-term planning and a lower intrinsic reward from organizational activities. For this group, high-maintenance productivity systems fail because the cost of maintaining the system—the meta-work—exceeds their volitional budget. They require low-friction interventions that provide guidance without requiring extensive upkeep.

However, the relationship between conscientiousness and performance shows important moderators. Wilmot and Ones (2019) found that occupational complexity attenuates conscientiousness effects—highly conscientious individuals demonstrate stronger performance advantages in structured, routine roles than in complex knowledge work requiring creativity and cognitive flexibility. In high-complexity jobs, fluid intelligence, executive function, and openness to experience may contribute more to performance variance than conscientiousness alone.

2.1.2 Neuroticism and Emotional Regulation

Neuroticism—characterized by anxiety, emotional instability, and negative affectivity—shows negative correlations with job performance and productivity metrics (Barrick & Mount, 1991). However, this main effect obscures important interactions. Steel's (2007) comprehensive meta-analysis of procrastination research, synthesizing 691 correlations across 216 studies, demonstrates that neuroticism moderates procrastination patterns, with high neuroticism predicting avoidance-based procrastination driven by anxiety and fear of failure rather than poor time management skills.

In the context of productivity, high neuroticism often manifests as analysis paralysis. When a system offers too many choices—for example, an open-ended project management board with unlimited customization—the high-neuroticism user may perceive each choice as a potential threat or failure point. This leads to excessive deliberation and avoidance. The anxiety triggered

by decision-making can paradoxically prevent the very action the productivity system was meant to facilitate.

Critically, neuroticism may create differential susceptibility to interventions. Research on behavioral interventions suggests that individuals high in neuroticism and low in conscientiousness may benefit most from structured productivity interventions, while high conscientiousness individuals may show minimal gains from the same interventions (Belsky & Pluess, 2009). This pattern—stronger intervention effects for those with weaker baseline self-regulation—appears consistently across behavioral intervention research and represents a key example of aptitude-treatment interaction.

The combination of traits proves critical. A user with high neuroticism and high conscientiousness—the anxious perfectionist—requires a very different system than one with high neuroticism and low conscientiousness—the avoidant procrastinator. The former needs a system to limit their over-planning and perfectionism, perhaps through rigid time-boxing that forces completion, while the latter needs a system to lower the barrier to entry and bypass fear, perhaps through micro-commitments and self-compassion practices.

2.2 Action Control Theory

Developed by Julius Kuhl (1984, 1994), Action Control Theory provides a critical mechanical explanation for variance in self-regulatory success. It distinguishes between two opposing modes of control: action orientation and state orientation. This distinction may be more predictive of productivity outcomes than broad personality traits alone, as it directly addresses the intention-behavior gap.

2.2.1 Action Orientation

Action-oriented individuals operate in what Kuhl terms a metastatic (change-inducing) mode. When they perceive a discrepancy between a current state and a desired goal state, their cognitive apparatus automatically recruits the resources necessary to bridge that gap. This involves sophisticated regulation of affect: they can rapidly down-regulate the negative affect associated with failure or difficulty and up-regulate the positive affect required for initiation.

Key characteristics of action orientation include decisiveness—a low threshold for initiation that does not require perfect conditions to act—and resilience under demand. Research indicates that action-oriented individuals often perform better under high-pressure conditions, as the pressure acts as a signal to mobilize resources rather than a trigger for anxiety. They maintain access to their intention memory even under stress, allowing them to execute plans without hesitation.

Crucially, action-oriented individuals possess the ability to disengage from futile goals. This prevents the resource drain of sunk cost fixation, freeing up working memory for achievable tasks. When a project is clearly failing, they can redirect their energy rather than perseverating on the lost investment.

2.2.2 State Orientation

State-oriented individuals operate in what Kuhl terms a catastatic (change-preventing) mode. When faced with demand, ambiguity, or failure, their processing capacity becomes consumed by intrusive thoughts related to their current or past state, rather than the future action required. This is not a lack of motivation—state-oriented individuals often want to achieve their goals desperately—but rather a functional helplessness of the executive system.

State orientation manifests through several facets. Preoccupation involves uncontrollable thoughts about past failures or emotional distress that consume the limited capacity of working memory, leaving insufficient resources for processing the current task. The individual feels paralyzed despite wanting to act. Hesitation specifically relates to the inability to initiate an intended action. The state-oriented individual may sit in front of a computer for hours, fully intending to work, yet unable to cross the threshold of initiation. This is often misdiagnosed as laziness but is neurocognitively distinct—it represents an inhibition of the motor and action pathway by the emotional regulation system. Volatility describes the tendency to be easily derailed by competing impulses or distractions, reflecting a lack of the shielding mechanism that protects the current intention from interference.

The existence of state orientation fundamentally challenges the utility of simple list-based productivity systems for this population. A list of tasks provides information about what to do, but it provides no volitional support for the initiation deficit. For a state-oriented user, a long list may serve primarily as a stimulus for rumination—I am so behind, I will never finish this—

thereby increasing the negative affect that inhibits action. This suggests a theoretical necessity for compensatory interventions that bypass the need for internal initiation, such as implementation intentions or external accountability structures.

2.3 Executive Function and Cognitive Control

Executive functions represent domain-general cognitive processes supporting goal-directed behavior (Diamond, 2013). The tripartite model identifies three core components: working memory (the ability to maintain and manipulate information over brief intervals), inhibitory control (the ability to suppress prepotent responses), and cognitive flexibility (the ability to shift between mental sets or tasks). Meta-analytic evidence demonstrates that executive functions correlate more strongly with academic and work performance than do broad personality traits, particularly for complex tasks requiring sustained attention and planning (Poon, 2018).

2.3.1 Working Memory Capacity

Working memory capacity shows substantial individual variation, with adults typically holding approximately four information chunks simultaneously (Cowan, 2001). This capacity predicts a wide range of consequential outcomes, including academic performance, complex problem-solving ability, and fluid intelligence. Critically for productivity, working memory capacity also predicts attention control and resistance to distraction (Engle, 2002).

The relevance to productivity systems is direct: complex productivity methodologies impose working memory demands. A system requiring the user to maintain multiple projects, contexts, and next actions in mind while deciding what to do may exceed the working memory capacity of some users, leading to system abandonment. Conversely, systems that externalize information—writing everything down, using visual cues, creating automatic reminders—reduce working memory demands and may be particularly beneficial for individuals with lower working memory capacity.

2.3.2 Executive Dysfunction in ADHD

Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), affecting 5-10% of adults globally, fundamentally impairs executive function with medium-to-large effect sizes across domains.

Willcutt and colleagues' (2005) meta-analysis found ADHD groups show deficits across multiple executive domains: inhibitory control (d = 0.61), working memory (d = 0.63), planning and organization (d = 0.69), and task switching (d = 0.46).

These deficits directly impair productivity through several mechanisms: difficulty initiating tasks despite intention (task initiation failure), impaired time perception and estimation (time blindness), reduced capacity to maintain focus despite conscious effort, and weakened ability to delay gratification or resist immediate rewards (temporal discounting). Standard productivity advice often assumes intact executive function—for example, just start or use willpower—making such advice ineffective or counterproductive for individuals with executive dysfunction.

The prevalence of ADHD means that a substantial minority of the population requires fundamentally different productivity approaches than neurotypical advice provides. For these individuals, external scaffolding must replace internal control; immediate rewards must substitute for delayed gratification; and environmental design must compensate for limited willpower. Treating ADHD individuals with neurotypical strategies predictably fails and often increases shame and self-blame.

2.4 Individual Differences in Procrastination

Steel's (2007) comprehensive meta-analysis identified key predictors of procrastination: task aversiveness (r = 0.38), self-efficacy (r = -0.38), impulsiveness (r = 0.41), delay of gratification (r = -0.32), and conscientiousness (r = -0.55). Critically, procrastination correlates only weakly with time management skills (r = -0.22), challenging the assumption that productivity struggles stem primarily from poor planning abilities.

This finding has profound implications for intervention design. If procrastination stemmed primarily from poor time management, then teaching time management skills would be the appropriate intervention. But the weak correlation suggests that procrastination is driven more by emotional factors (task aversiveness, low self-efficacy) and trait impulsiveness than by skill deficits. Effective interventions must therefore address these emotional and motivational factors rather than simply teaching planning techniques.

Ferrari and colleagues have distinguished among procrastinator subtypes: arousal procrastinators who seek stimulation and for whom deadlines increase motivation; avoidance procrastinators who are fear-driven and avoid tasks to protect self-esteem; and decisional procrastinators who experience decision paralysis. Each type requires different intervention approaches, further undermining the universality assumption.

3. Evidence Review: Productivity Interventions and Their Mechanisms

To implement an ATI-based matching logic, we must deconstruct the major productivity methodologies. We analyze them not as brands or complete systems, but as bundles of cognitive mechanisms, identifying the specific executive functions they replace or augment and the individual differences that moderate their effectiveness.

3.1 Constraint-Based Systems

Constraint-based systems function by imposing artificial limitations on the work environment. They replace internal executive control—choosing what to do and when—with external rules. This category includes the Pomodoro Technique, time blocking, and time boxing.

3.1.1 The Pomodoro Technique

The Pomodoro Technique prescribes fixed cycles of 25 minutes of focused work followed by 5-minute breaks, with longer breaks after four cycles. Its active ingredient is externalized inhibition: the physical timer serves as a surrogate for the prefrontal cortex's inhibitory control. By breaking work into brief intervals, it reduces the vigilance decrement associated with sustained attention and lowers the activation energy for initiation by creating micro-deadlines.

Ariga and Lleras (2011) demonstrated that brief diversions from a task vastly improve focus on prolonged tasks, preventing the vigilance decrement that normally occurs after 20-30 minutes of sustained attention. This provides theoretical support for the break structure of the Pomodoro Technique, though the specific 25-minute interval was originally proposed based on personal experience rather than systematic research.

The technique appears well-suited for individuals who are state-oriented or hesitant, as the short duration reduces the intimidation factor of the task and bypasses the rumination threshold that prevents initiation. It may also benefit individuals with low inhibition or ADHD traits by compensating for the inability to self-regulate distractions through external time boundaries.

However, the technique may interact negatively with certain profiles. Individuals who are prone to flow states or who process information globally may find the forced break at 25 minutes actively disruptive, interrupting the deep cognitive schema formation required for complex,

abstract tasks. Anecdotal reports from ADHD communities suggest that rigid timing can interrupt productive hyperfocus states while failing to prevent task-switching during non-hyperfocus periods. Individuals high in conscientiousness may find the structure unnecessary, while those high in neuroticism may experience anxiety from the time pressure.

3.1.2 Time Blocking and Time Boxing

Time blocking involves pre-planning each day by assigning specific time blocks to specific tasks. Time boxing adds the constraint that the task must be completed within the allocated time. The active ingredient is temporal concretization: by assigning a task to a specific hour, the system forces translation from abstract construal (Write Report) to concrete construal (Tuesday, 2-4 PM), combating the planning fallacy.

Time blocking appears well-suited for individuals low in conscientiousness, providing external structure they lack internally, and for those high in personal need for structure. However, users high in psychological reactance may experience calendar claustrophobia and rebel against their own schedules.

3.2 Cognitive-Associative Systems

Cognitive-associative systems are not organizational methods but programming protocols. They utilize associative learning to link situational cues directly to behavioral responses, bypassing conscious deliberation at the moment of action.

3.2.1 Implementation Intentions

Implementation intentions involve forming specific if-then plans linking situational cues to behavioral responses: When situation Y occurs, I will do behavior X. Gollwitzer and Sheeran's (2006) meta-analysis of 94 studies involving over 8,000 participants found that implementation intentions significantly increase goal achievement with a medium-to-large effect size ($d = 0.65$) compared to goal intentions alone.

The mechanism operates through cue-response binding—creating strong associations between environmental cues and behavioral responses that bypass conscious deliberation. The if-then format essentially pre-programs the response, so that when the cue is encountered, the behavior

is triggered automatically rather than requiring a new decision in the moment. This is particularly valuable because it is precisely in the moment of action that state-oriented individuals tend to hesitate.

Implementation intentions prove particularly effective for exercise adherence (d = 0.86), healthy eating (d = 0.51), health screening behaviors (d = 0.96), and reducing procrastination (d = 0.47). Research by Bayer and Gollwitzer (2007) found that implementation intentions work better for individuals with poor self-regulation ability—those who struggle most with goal pursuit show the largest benefits. This represents a key example of differential susceptibility to intervention based on individual characteristics.

This pattern has crucial implications for matching: implementation intentions appear most beneficial for state-oriented and ruminative individuals, for whom the pre-programming bypasses the hesitation that normally prevents action. By pre-deciding the response to obstacles—including internal obstacles like anxiety—the user does not need to expend willpower in the moment of stress. For highly action-oriented individuals who naturally bridge the intention-action gap, the tedious process of writing out if-then plans may feel redundant and inefficient.

Boundary conditions identified by Webb and Sheeran (2007) indicate that implementation intentions work best when the cue is salient and specific, when the individual has sufficient control over the response, and when the behavior is not highly complex. They show weaker effects for open-ended creative tasks compared to routine behaviors.

3.3 External Memory and Capture Systems

External memory systems rely on capturing, sorting, and externalizing information to free up working memory capacity. They leverage the Zeigarnik effect—the brain's tendency to hold onto unfinished tasks, consuming cognitive resources—by closing the loop in an external system.

3.3.1 Getting Things Done and Related Systems

Getting Things Done (GTD), developed by David Allen, involves capturing all tasks in a trusted external system, clarifying each item by identifying the next physical action, organizing by context and project, reviewing regularly, and engaging based on context and energy.

The core principles have strong theoretical grounding. Masicampo and Baumeister (2011) showed that unfulfilled goals cause intrusive thoughts, but making a specific plan significantly reduces intrusive thoughts and improves cognitive performance—supporting GTD's principle that capturing tasks with next actions creates psychological closure. Claessens and colleagues' (2007) meta-analysis found time management behaviors correlate positively with job performance (rho = 0.24) and negatively with stress (rho = -0.20).

GTD appears well-suited for individuals high in conscientiousness and those high in openness with many interests who need a system to corral divergent ideas. However, GTD may be poorly suited for individuals low in conscientiousness combined with state orientation. The weekly review can trigger shame and rumination in state-oriented users, and maintenance costs may lead to system abandonment.

3.4 Environmental and Social Scaffolding

3.4.1 Body Doubling

Body doubling involves working in the presence of another person—virtual or in-person—who is also working, providing external accountability and attentional anchoring. Zajonc's (1965) work on social facilitation demonstrated that the mere presence of others enhances performance on well-learned tasks. Bond and Titus's (1983) meta-analysis confirmed this effect (d = 0.43). Accountability research shows commitment to another person increases task completion by 40-65% compared to private commitment (Lerner & Tetlock, 1999).

Body doubling appears particularly well-suited for individuals with ADHD-inattentive presentation, for whom task initiation is the primary challenge. However, individuals with comorbid social anxiety may find observation uncomfortable.

3.4.2 Environmental Design

Environmental design involves structuring one's physical and digital environment to reduce the need for willpower by removing temptations and creating cues for desired behaviors. This approach aligns with research by Wood (2019) showing that individuals with high trait self-control do not actually exert more willpower; instead, they have built better habits and structured better environments through situation selection. Self-control predicts outcomes through habit formation as a mediating variable, reframing productivity from moral willpower to intelligent systems design.

For productivity specifically, environmental design might include using website blockers to prevent access to distracting sites during work hours, keeping the phone in another room during deep work, setting up the workspace the night before so that starting work requires no decision-making, and removing social media apps from devices.

Environmental design may be particularly valuable for individuals with low inhibitory control, including those with ADHD, for whom removing the temptation is more effective than trying to resist it. Rather than engaging in an unwinnable battle against distraction, the individual never encounters the distraction in the first place.

3.5 Energy and Rhythm-Based Approaches

Energy management approaches recognize that cognitive capacity varies 20-30% throughout the day following circadian rhythms, with peak alertness typically occurring 2-4 hours after waking (Schmidt et al., 2007). Chronotype—individual variation in circadian timing—creates substantial heterogeneity in optimal scheduling, with approximately one-third of adults showing strong evening preference (Roenneberg et al., 2007).

Energy-based approaches may be particularly valuable for individuals experiencing burnout, for whom attempting high productivity throughout the day is unsustainable. By concentrating demanding work in peak periods and scheduling easier tasks during low periods, total output may remain similar while subjective wellbeing improves.

4. Aptitude-Treatment Interactions: Evidence for Differential Effectiveness

The preceding sections have established two foundational points: individuals differ substantially in personality, action orientation, and executive function capacity; and productivity interventions differ in their mechanisms and the demands they place on users. This section synthesizes evidence that these individual differences moderate intervention effectiveness—that is, that some people benefit more from specific strategies than others, and that matching strategies to profiles improves outcomes.

4.1 The Moderation Hypothesis

The moderation hypothesis states that personality traits and cognitive capacities interact with intervention type to determine outcomes. Rather than some interventions being universally better than others, the best intervention depends on who is using it. Three patterns of evidence support this hypothesis: trait-by-intervention interactions observed in randomized trials, differential patterns among procrastinator subtypes, and the distinctive requirements of individuals with executive dysfunction.

4.2 Evidence for Trait-by-Intervention Interactions

4.2.1 Self-Regulation Interventions

Research on self-regulation interventions has begun to examine whether personality traits moderate treatment effects. The evidence suggests that individuals with weaker baseline self-regulation—lower conscientiousness, higher neuroticism, state orientation—show larger benefits from structured interventions than those with stronger baseline self-regulation. This pattern is consistent with the differential susceptibility framework proposed by Belsky and Pluess (2009), which posits that some individuals are more responsive to environmental influences, both positive and negative, than others.

Bayer and Gollwitzer's (2007) research on implementation intentions found that individuals with poor self-regulation ability showed the largest benefits from forming if-then plans. This suggests that productivity interventions may function as prosthetics for executive function, most valuable when internal capacity is limited and less necessary when internal capacity is sufficient.

While direct evidence quantifying personality-by-intervention interactions with precise effect sizes remains limited in the productivity domain specifically, the pattern of differential susceptibility observed across behavioral interventions provides theoretical support for the personalization approach. Future research should prioritize randomized controlled trials that explicitly test whether matching strategies to personality profiles improves outcomes compared to random assignment.

4.2.2 Procrastination Subtypes

Steel's (2007) finding that procrastination correlates minimally with time management skills but strongly with impulsiveness and task aversiveness suggests that treating all procrastination identically will be ineffective. Different procrastination subtypes likely require different interventions.

Arousal procrastinators, who seek stimulation and are motivated by deadlines, may benefit from artificial deadlines, time pressure, and gamification that creates the arousal they crave. Avoidance procrastinators, who are fear-driven and protect self-esteem through delay, may require emotional regulation strategies, self-compassion practices, and good enough framing that reduces the perceived stakes of performance. Decisional procrastinators, who experience decision paralysis, may benefit from simplified choices, external decision-making frameworks, and accountability structures that reduce the burden of choice.

This subtype-based approach to procrastination intervention represents a specific application of the broader ATI framework: the best treatment depends on the nature of the underlying difficulty.

4.2.3 Executive Dysfunction as Test Case

Individuals with ADHD or other forms of executive dysfunction represent an important test case for the personalization hypothesis. The effect sizes for executive dysfunction ($d = 0.46$-0.69 across domains; Willcutt et al., 2005) are large enough that generic productivity advice assuming intact executive function is likely to fail for this population.

For individuals with executive dysfunction, effective strategies must compensate for specific deficits: external scaffolding rather than internal control, immediate rewards rather than delayed

gratification, environment design rather than willpower, and body doubling for accountability. These represent compensation strategies—providing externally what cannot be generated internally.

The fact that standard productivity advice fails predictably for this substantial minority of the population provides prima facie evidence for the personalization approach. If one profile requires fundamentally different strategies, it becomes plausible that other profiles may also require tailored approaches, even if the differences are less dramatic.

4.3 Capitalization versus Compensation Models

Within the ATI framework, there are two primary strategies for matching aptitude to treatment: capitalization and compensation.

The capitalization model matches the system to the user's strengths, assuming that performance is maximized when the user operates in a mode that aligns with their natural tendencies. For example, assigning a highly conscientious, structure-loving user a complex project management system capitalizes on their ability to organize, allowing them to handle complexity that would overwhelm a less organized person.

The compensation model matches the system to the user's weaknesses, acting as a prosthetic or scaffold to support a deficit. For example, assigning a state-oriented, low-inhibition user a strict Pomodoro timer and website blocker compensates for their lack of internal inhibition by providing external inhibition. The user lacks initiation capacity; the timer provides an external signal to start.

The literature suggests that for personal productivity—which is often defined by the struggle to overcome deficits like procrastination and distraction—the compensation model is frequently more effective. Users often gravitate toward systems that feel like their personality (capitalization), but they often need systems that buttress their weak points (compensation).

This creates a paradox of preference: research on ATI in education found that learners often prefer the method that is least effective for them. Low-ability learners often prefer low-structure environments because they are less demanding, even though they learn best in high-structure

environments. Applied to productivity, a low-conscientiousness user might prefer a flexible, open-ended to-do list because it feels less restrictive, but their performance might improve substantially under a rigid time-blocking regime.

A sophisticated matching system must distinguish between what the user wants (preference) and what their profile requires (efficacy). This distinction is crucial for any personalization approach and represents one of the key challenges in implementation.

4.4 Quantifying the Personalization Advantage

Based on the available evidence, what magnitude of improvement might personalization provide? Direct evidence from large-scale trials comparing personalized to generic productivity recommendations is limited. However, several lines of evidence suggest the potential for meaningful improvements.

The differential susceptibility pattern suggests that intervention effects may vary substantially based on individual characteristics. If low-self-regulation individuals show effect sizes two to four times larger than high-self-regulation individuals for structured interventions, then matching low-self-regulation individuals to structured interventions would capture this larger effect.

Evidence from adjacent domains supports the personalization advantage. In educational settings, adaptive learning systems that tailor instruction to student characteristics show improvements over standardized instruction. In healthcare, personalized treatment matching based on patient characteristics improves outcomes compared to protocol-driven care. While productivity differs from these domains, the general principle—that individual differences moderate intervention effectiveness—appears robust.

We estimate that personalized productivity matching could improve outcomes meaningfully compared to random assignment to strategies or generic recommendations. However, we emphasize that this estimate is based on indirect evidence and theoretical extrapolation rather than direct experimental validation. Prospective trials directly testing personalized matching are needed to establish the actual magnitude of improvement.

5. A Framework for Personality-Productivity Matching

Based on the theoretical foundations and evidence reviewed, we propose a framework for matching individuals to evidence-based productivity strategies based on their psychological profiles. This framework is intended as a starting point for both practical application and empirical validation, not as a definitive algorithm.

5.1 Assessment Domains

Effective matching requires assessment across multiple domains. Primary assessment domains include: Big Five personality traits, particularly conscientiousness and neuroticism; action control orientation, distinguishing action-oriented from state-oriented individuals; executive function capacity, including working memory, inhibitory control, and task initiation; and screening for ADHD indicators, which fundamentally change the appropriate intervention approach.

Secondary assessment domains that may refine recommendations include: procrastination style, distinguishing arousal, avoidance, and decisional procrastination; cognitive processing style, including global versus local processing tendencies; personal need for structure; chronotype and energy patterns; and current context, including work environment, interruption frequency, and schedule flexibility.

5.2 Matching Logic

We propose the following matching rules, ordered by priority. Rules appearing earlier take precedence when multiple conditions apply.

Rule 1 addresses executive function deficit. If executive function scores indicate substantial difficulty, primary recommendations should emphasize external scaffolding: body doubling for task initiation and sustained attention, Pomodoro technique with visual timers for time blindness, external memory systems for working memory support, and environmental design that removes distractions rather than requiring resistance. Systems requiring strong executive function for maintenance, such as complex GTD implementations, should be avoided, as should advice assuming intact willpower.

Rule 2 addresses high neuroticism. If neuroticism is elevated, recommendations should emphasize structured systems with flexibility: implementation intentions that reduce decision anxiety, time blocking with large buffers that provides structure without rigidity, and deep work periods with permission to reschedule without guilt. Emotional regulation components should be added, including self-compassion practices, anxiety processing protocols, and good enough framing to counteract perfectionism. All-or-nothing approaches and public streak tracking that increases shame should be avoided.

Rule 3 addresses low conscientiousness. If conscientiousness is below average, recommendations should emphasize external accountability: body doubling for social accountability, implementation intentions with public commitment, and reward-linked habit stacking. Motivation enhancement through variable rewards, social stakes, and progress tracking should be added. Long-term planning and delayed gratification approaches that assume internal drive should be avoided.

Rule 4 addresses high conscientiousness. If conscientiousness is above average, recommendations should emphasize simple systems with autonomy: time blocking that aligns with natural planning tendencies, energy management that optimizes existing capacity, and minimal external accountability given self-direction. However, warnings should be given about perfectionism and over-planning risks, including setting planning time limits, training the good enough mindset, and avoiding productivity porn—learning systems without implementing them.

Rule 5 addresses ADHD indicators. If the profile shows high executive dysfunction combined with elevated neuroticism and low conscientiousness, ADHD-specific adaptations become mandatory. All recommendations must account for executive dysfunction. External structure, immediate rewards, and environment design are essential. Professional evaluation for diagnosis should be considered, as medication may be appropriate though beyond the scope of productivity coaching.

Rule 6 addresses burnout or high stress. If the individual is experiencing burnout, this condition overrides other considerations. Intensity should be reduced regardless of profile. Primary focus should be on recovery and energy restoration: energy management with reduced work hours,

mandatory breaks and complete detachment, and professional support such as therapy. Only once recovered should profile-matched strategies be fully implemented.

5.3 Example Profiles and Recommended Approaches

To illustrate the matching framework, we present four example profiles drawn from a research-based productivity archetype system, each with their characteristic challenges, common mismatches, and recommended approaches.

The Anxious Perfectionist profile combines state orientation with high neuroticism and high structure preference. The individual is often intelligent and capable but paralyzed by the fear of starting. Tasks are perceived as monolithic threats, and a long to-do list triggers anxiety and rumination rather than action. The common mismatch for this profile is GTD, because the weekly review forces confrontation with everything not yet accomplished, triggering a spiral of negative affect. The lack of constraint in a simple list leads to analysis paralysis. The recommended approach combines WOOP (mental contrasting with implementation intentions) and the Pomodoro technique. WOOP pre-programs the response to anxiety—If I feel panic, I will work for just 5 minutes. The Pomodoro technique breaks monolithic tasks into non-threatening 25-minute units. The focus shifts from finishing the project (high stakes) to completing one Pomodoro (low stakes). Self-compassion practices and good enough framing are essential additions.

The Chaotic Creative profile combines low conscientiousness with global processing, intrinsic motivation, and burst energy patterns. The individual produces impressive output during energy bursts but struggles with consistency between bursts. They are disorganized, prone to starting projects they do not finish, and struggle with time estimation. The common mismatch is GTD or rigid daily scheduling, because ideas will be captured but never processed during low-energy periods. The individual will rebel against a rigid hour-by-hour schedule that ignores their natural energy rhythms. The recommended approach combines burst containers with environmental constraints. Rather than fighting the burst pattern, the system creates protected windows for intense work when energy is high, combined with low-demand tasks for recovery periods. Day theming—designating specific days for specific types of work—provides a container without

micromanagement. Environmental constraints such as website blockers compensate for low inhibition during productive periods.

The Strategic Planner profile combines high conscientiousness with high personal need for structure and a planning-oriented task relationship. The individual excels at developing comprehensive strategies and frameworks but struggles with execution. They love tools more than work, spend hours configuring systems, and are prone to productivity porn—learning about productivity without implementing it. The common mismatch is loose or flow-based systems, because the individual feels unsafe without a plan and will spend excessive time creating structure even when none is provided. The recommended approach combines strict GTD with OKRs (Objectives and Key Results) and planning time limits. GTD capitalizes on the natural organizing strength, while OKRs ensure that organizing is directed toward strategic goals rather than just shuffling deck chairs. Critically, time limits on planning and configuration must be enforced to shift the balance toward execution. The mantra strategy without execution is hallucination helps reframe perfectionist planning tendencies.

The Novelty Seeker profile combines medium-low structure preference with intrinsic curiosity-driven motivation and a tendency toward multi-project engagement. The individual learns quickly but gets bored faster, constantly drawn to new projects while existing ones languish incomplete. They need variety and stimulation to maintain engagement. The common mismatch is any system requiring sustained focus on a single project for extended periods—which feels like torture for this profile. The recommended approach centers on project rotation and novelty injection. A two-project rotation system allows the individual to switch between projects when boredom strikes, rather than abandoning work entirely. Gamification elements, progress tracking with variable rewards, and connecting routine tasks to larger meaningful outcomes provide the stimulation needed to maintain engagement through completion.

5.4 Multiple Strategy Integration

Rather than prescribing a single best strategy, optimal approaches typically combine multiple complementary frameworks addressing different aspects of the productivity challenge.

For an individual with an ADHD profile, an integrated approach might include: morning body doubling sessions for task initiation and accountability; Pomodoro technique within sessions for time structure and breaks; external memory system throughout the day for working memory support; and weekly energy audits to identify peak performance windows and schedule demanding tasks accordingly.

For an individual with high neuroticism combined with moderate conscientiousness, an integrated approach might include: daily implementation intentions to reduce decision anxiety by pre-programming responses; morning deep work blocks of protected time with permission to reschedule without guilt; habit stacking throughout the day to create automatic behaviors that reduce decisions; and an evening shutdown ritual for psychological closure and work-life boundary protection.

For an individual with high conscientiousness who is experiencing burnout, an integrated approach might include: temporarily implementing energy management with reduced hours to override the natural planning tendency; recovery focus with mandatory breaks and complete weekend detachment; a simplified system of inbox plus top three tasks only to prevent over-planning; and monthly reassessment to gradually add complexity as energy restores.

6. Limitations and Future Directions

6.1 Evidence Gaps

Despite substantial research on personality and productivity separately, direct evidence for personality-matched productivity interventions remains limited. We identify several critical gaps in the current evidence base.

First, there are limited intervention trials testing moderation effects. Most research is correlational, establishing that personality predicts productivity outcomes, but few randomized controlled trials have tested whether matching strategies to personality improves outcomes compared to mismatched assignment. The differential susceptibility evidence is suggestive but indirect.

Second, there is a lack of long-term studies. Most productivity research measures short-term effects over weeks to months. Whether personalized strategies show better long-term maintenance remains unknown, as does whether they affect distal career outcomes such as promotions and income over years.

Third, mechanisms remain unclear. Why does neuroticism moderate intervention effectiveness? Is it through anxiety reduction, increased structure, or something else? Understanding mechanisms would enable better prediction and refinement of matching algorithms.

Fourth, there is insufficient attention to neurodivergence. ADHD productivity research has been largely clinical and pharmaceutical in focus. Limited research exists on behavioral and cognitive strategies specifically for ADHD adults in workplace contexts. Autism workplace accommodations remain understudied.

Fifth, cultural generalizability is uncertain. Most research uses Western, educated, industrialized, rich, democratic samples. Whether the same personality-productivity relationships hold across cultures is unknown, and collectivist versus individualist cultural differences may moderate strategy effectiveness.

Sixth, work environment as a contextual moderator remains underexplored. The present framework focuses primarily on Person × Treatment interactions, but emerging research suggests

that Environment constitutes a critical third variable. The rapid expansion of remote and hybrid work arrangements has revealed that personality-productivity relationships may differ substantially across work contexts. Longitudinal research demonstrates that remote work can moderate and reduce the beneficial effects that extraversion and conscientiousness typically have on performance, with fully remote arrangements potentially dampening trait-performance linkages that hold in traditional office settings (Evans et al., 2022; Olsen et al., 2024). Conscientiousness and openness to experience show positive associations with remote work productivity, while extraversion shows negative associations with remote work preference (Gavoille & Hazans, 2025). These findings suggest that optimal productivity matching may require considering not only trait-strategy alignment but also trait-environment fit. A high-structure office environment may compensate for low conscientiousness through external accountability, while remote work may expose self-regulation deficits that necessitate different digital interventions. Future research should explicitly model three-way Person × Treatment × Environment interactions.

6.2 Measurement Challenges

Several measurement challenges complicate research in this domain. Productivity is multidimensional, encompassing quantity versus quality of output, short-term productivity versus sustainable performance, task completion versus creative innovation, and individual contribution versus team coordination. How to weight and aggregate these dimensions is not obvious, and different weighting schemes may favor different interventions.

Self-report limitations are pervasive. Self-reported productivity correlates only modestly with objective metrics, and social desirability bias may inflate reports of system adherence and effectiveness. Research increasingly requires objective measures including peer ratings, supervisor ratings, and actual output quality assessments.

Causality questions remain. Does personality cause productivity differences? Or do productivity experiences shape personality? Success may increase conscientiousness while failure increases neuroticism, creating reverse causality. Longitudinal studies with multiple measurement waves are needed to disentangle these effects.

6.3 Research Priorities

We propose six priorities for future research.

Priority one is a large-scale randomized controlled trial of personalized versus generic recommendations. A study with 1,000 or more participants randomized to personalized (algorithm-matched) versus generic (random assignment) versus control conditions, tracked for 6-12 months, would provide definitive evidence for or against the personalization hypothesis. Primary outcomes should include task completion and work quality measured both objectively and through ratings. Secondary outcomes should include adherence, satisfaction, stress, and burnout.

Priority two is mechanism studies. Why do certain personality-strategy matches work? Mediation analysis could test whether, for example, neuroticism leads to anxiety reduction, which leads to better adherence, which leads to better outcomes. Understanding the causal chain from trait to outcome would enable theoretical advancement and better prediction.

Priority three is ADHD-specific productivity research. Controlled trials of body doubling, external scaffolding, and environmental design for ADHD adults are needed. Comparisons of behavioral strategies to medication, and combined approaches, would inform clinical practice. Identification of subtypes within ADHD that respond differently to different interventions would refine matching.

Priority four is cultural validation studies. Replication of personality-productivity relationships in non-Western samples would establish boundary conditions. Testing whether the same matching algorithm works across cultures, and adapting strategies to cultural contexts such as individual versus group accountability, would enable global application.

Priority five is long-term cohort studies. Tracking 1,000 or more users over 2-5 years would enable measurement of career outcomes including promotions and income, health outcomes, and wellbeing, and would identify which interventions produce lasting behavior change versus temporary effects.

Priority six is AI-powered just-in-time adaptive systems. The framework proposed here represents static matching—assessing personality once and recommending strategies

accordingly. However, the fullest realization of personalized productivity would involve dynamic adaptation that responds to momentary states, not just stable traits. Research on Just-in-Time Adaptive Interventions (JITAIs) in health psychology provides empirical precedent for this approach. Nahum-Shani and colleagues (2018) define JITAIs as interventions that provide the right type and amount of support, at the right time, by adapting to an individual's changing internal and contextual state. Meta-analytic evidence shows substantial effect sizes for JITAIs compared to both waitlist controls ($g = 1.65$) and non-adaptive interventions ($g = 0.89$), with effects persisting across different target behaviors and participant characteristics (Wang et al., 2019). More recent meta-analyses of JITAIs for mental health outcomes found small but significant effects ($g = 0.15$) with benefits sustained up to six months beyond intervention (Kraiss et al., 2025). Critically, JITAI research indicates that tailoring to both stable characteristics and momentary states produces additive benefits. Applied to productivity, this suggests systems that combine baseline personality matching with real-time adaptation to energy levels, stress, and context could substantially outperform static recommendations. Micro-randomized trials comparing static personality matching to dynamic JITAI-style adaptation would quantify this additional benefit and represent a priority for translational research.

7. Conclusion

The search for a universal productivity system is an intellectual dead end. As action control theory, personality psychology, and executive function research demonstrate, the mechanisms that drive human volition are deeply heterogeneous. The failure of a user to adhere to a system like GTD is not necessarily a moral failure of discipline; it is frequently a structural failure of aptitude-treatment fit.

The universality assumption that underpins the current productivity market is not merely scientifically unfounded; it is economically inefficient and psychologically damaging. It leads to a cycle of adoption and abandonment that wastes resources and erodes self-efficacy. Each failed system becomes evidence to the user that they are broken, lazy, or lacking in discipline—when the actual problem was a mismatch between their psychological architecture and the demands of the system.

By adopting an aptitude-treatment interaction framework, we can move towards a science of precision productivity. This approach respects individual differences in action orientation, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and executive function, treating them not as defects to be cured but as parameters to be matched. The highly conscientious user does not need the same scaffolding as the state-oriented procrastinator; the ADHD adult cannot succeed with neurotypical advice; the anxious perfectionist requires different support than the chaotic creative.

The implications extend beyond individual productivity to organizational performance, public health, and economic efficiency. Organizations that continue to mandate one-size-fits-all productivity training likely fail a majority of employees whose profiles do not match the recommended approach. Personalized productivity coaching may justify premium pricing through superior outcomes. Protecting deep work time, accommodating chronotype differences, and supporting neurodivergent employees could provide competitive advantage as cognitive work becomes increasingly valuable.

The path forward requires rigorous research—particularly large-scale trials testing personalized versus generic approaches—combined with ethical implementation that protects privacy, avoids limiting stereotypes, and maintains appropriate referrals to professional support when needed.

The technology for adaptive, personalized productivity systems exists; what remains is to ground these systems in psychological science rather than marketing intuition.

The future of high performance lies not in the mass production of a single workflow, but in the intelligent pairing of the unique human mind with its specific scaffolding requirements. We do not need better lists; we need better matches.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author is the founder of Prolific Personalities, a commercial platform that applies the personalized productivity matching framework described in this paper. The author has a financial interest in the platform's success. This relationship has been disclosed to ensure transparency. The theoretical framework and literature review presented here were developed independently and represent the author's genuine scholarly conclusions. No external funding was received for this work.

References

Ariga, A., & Lleras, A. (2011). Brief and rare mental breaks keep you focused: Deactivation and reactivation of task goals preempt vigilance decrements. Cognition, 118(3), 439-443.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44(1), 1-26.

Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2007). Self-regulation, ego depletion, and motivation. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 1(1), 115-128.

Bayer, U. C., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (2007). Boosting scholastic test scores by willpower: The role of implementation intentions. Self and Identity, 6(1), 1-19.

Beilock, S. L., & DeCaro, M. S. (2007). From poor performance to success under stress: Working memory, strategy selection, and mathematical problem solving under pressure. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 33(6), 983-998.

Belsky, J., & Pluess, M. (2009). Beyond diathesis stress: Differential susceptibility to environmental influences. Psychological Bulletin, 135(6), 885-908.

Bond, C. F., Jr., & Titus, L. J. (1983). Social facilitation: A meta-analysis of 241 studies. Psychological Bulletin, 94(2), 265-292.

Claessens, B. J., van Eerde, W., Rutte, C. G., & Roe, R. A. (2007). A review of the time management literature. Personnel Review, 36(2), 255-276.

Cowan, N. (2001). The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 24(1), 87-114.

Cronbach, L. J. (1957). The two disciplines of scientific psychology. American Psychologist, 12(11), 671-684.

Diamond, A. (2013). Executive functions. Annual Review of Psychology, 64, 135-168.

Engle, R. W. (2002). Working memory capacity as executive attention. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 11(1), 19-23.

Evans, A. M., Meyers, M. C., Van De Calseyde, P. P. F. M., & Stavrova, O. (2022). Extroversion and conscientiousness predict deteriorating job outcomes during the COVID-19 transition to enforced remote work. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 13(3), 781-791.

Gavoille, N., & Hazans, M. (2025). Personality traits, remote work and productivity. International Labour Review, 164(3). https://doi.org/10.16995/ilr.18853

Gollwitzer, P. M., & Sheeran, P. (2006). Implementation intentions and goal achievement: A meta-analysis of effects and processes. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 38, 69-119.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (2nd ed., pp. 102-138). Guilford Press.

Kuhl, J. (1984). Volitional aspects of achievement motivation and learned helplessness: Toward a comprehensive theory of action control. In B. A. Maher & W. B. Maher (Eds.), Progress in experimental personality research (Vol. 13, pp. 99-171). Academic Press.

Kuhl, J. (1994). A theory of action and state orientations. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), Volition and personality: Action versus state orientation (pp. 9-46). Hogrefe & Huber.

Kraiss, J. T., et al. (2025). Effectiveness of just-in-time adaptive interventions for improving mental health and psychological well-being: A systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Mental Health, 28(1), e301392.

Lerner, J. S., & Tetlock, P. E. (1999). Accounting for the effects of accountability. Psychological Bulletin, 125(2), 255-275.

Mark, G. (2023). Attention span: A groundbreaking way to restore balance, happiness and productivity. Hanover Square Press.

Masicampo, E. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2011). Consider it done! Plan making can eliminate the cognitive effects of unfulfilled goals. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101(4), 667-683.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. American Psychologist, 52(5), 509-516.

Nahum-Shani, I., Smith, S. N., Spring, B. J., Collins, L. M., Witkiewitz, K., Tewari, A., & Murphy, S. A. (2018). Just-in-time adaptive interventions (JITAIs) in mobile health: Key components and design principles for ongoing health behavior support. Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 52(6), 446-462.

Olsen, O. K., Hetland, J., Matthiesen, S. B., Hoprekstad, Ø. L., Espevik, R., & Bakker, A. B. (2024). The influence of remote work on personality trait-performance linkages: A two-wave longitudinal study. Administrative Sciences, 14(7), 144.

Poon, K. (2018). Hot and cool executive functions in adolescence: Development and contributions to important developmental outcomes. Frontiers in Psychology, 8, 2311.

Roberts, B. W., Kuncel, N. R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A., & Goldberg, L. R. (2007). The power of personality: The comparative validity of personality traits, socioeconomic status, and cognitive ability for predicting important life outcomes. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2(4), 313-345.

Roenneberg, T., Kuehnle, T., Juda, M., Kantermann, T., Allebrandt, K., Gordijn, M., & Merrow, M. (2007). Epidemiology of the human circadian clock. Sleep Medicine Reviews, 11(6), 429-438.

Schmidt, C., Collette, F., Cajochen, C., & Peigneux, P. (2007). A time to think: Circadian rhythms in human cognition. Cognitive Neuropsychology, 24(7), 755-789.

Snow, R. E. (1989). Aptitude-treatment interaction as a framework for research on individual differences in learning. In P. L. Ackerman, R. J. Sternberg, & R. Glaser (Eds.), Learning and individual differences: Advances in theory and research (pp. 13-59). W. H. Freeman.

Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. Psychological Bulletin, 133(1), 65-94.

Webb, T. L., & Sheeran, P. (2007). How do implementation intentions promote goal attainment? A test of component processes. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 43(2), 295-302.

Willcutt, E. G., Doyle, A. E., Nigg, J. T., Faraone, S. V., & Pennington, B. F. (2005). Validity of the executive function theory of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: A meta-analytic review. Biological Psychiatry, 57(11), 1336-1346.

Wilmot, M. P., & Ones, D. S. (2019). A century of research on conscientiousness at work. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116(46), 23004-23010.

Wang, L., & Miller, L. C. (2019). Just-in-the-moment adaptive interventions (JITAI): A meta-analytical review. Health Communication, 35(12), 1531-1544.

Wood, W. (2019). Good habits, bad habits: The science of making positive changes that stick. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Zajonc, R. B. (1965). Social facilitation. Science, 149(3681), 269-274.