International Journal of Academic and Applied Research (IJAAR)
ISSN: 2643-9603
Vol. 9 Issue 11 November - 2025, Pages: 310-317

Lazy at Work, Lazy at Home: An Examination of Behavioral Consistency in Conscientiousness Across Life Domains

Dr. Ariyo Gracious Kazaara[1], Musiimenta Nancy[2]

1,2 Metropolitan International University

Abstract: Background: *Conscientiousness, a core personality trait predicting success across life domains, has been assumed to manifest consistently across contexts, yet empirical evidence for cross-domain behavioral consistency remains limited, particularly between work and home environments.* ***Objective:*** *This study investigated the extent of behavioral consistency in conscientiousness between work and home domains, examined moderating factors influencing cross-domain consistency, and assessed agreement between self-perceived and actual behavioral patterns.* ***Methods:*** *A mixed-methods correlational design was employed with 385 working adults (aged 25-55 years) recruited through stratified random sampling. Data collection utilized ecological momentary assessment (EMA) over 14 days with thrice-daily behavioral checklists, supplemented by baseline questionnaires including the NEO-PI-R Conscientiousness subscale, domain-specific conscientiousness measures, and situational variables assessments. Collateral reports from coworkers and household members provided objective behavioral ratings.* ***Results:*** *Moderate positive correlations emerged between work and home conscientiousness ($r = .52$ for self-reports; $r = .48$ for collateral reports; $r = .56$ for EMA behaviors), with approximately 25-27% shared variance. Multilevel modeling revealed that 62.4% of variance was attributable to between-person differences while 37.6% reflected within-person contextual variation. Participants significantly overestimated their cross-domain consistency (Self-perceived $M = 4.21$ vs. Actual $M = 3.84$; $t = 8.93$, $p < .001$; $d = 0.45$; $\kappa = .41$), particularly in domain-specific profiles.* ***Conclusion:*** *Conscientiousness exhibited moderate rather than strong cross-domain consistency, with substantial context-specific variability challenging the "lazy at work, lazy at home" assumption. Situational factors, particularly work-family conflict and autonomy, substantially moderated consistency beyond demographic characteristics. Approximately half of participants demonstrated domain-specific patterns of conscientiousness, strategically allocating conscientious behaviors based on contextual demands and personal priorities. The systematic overestimation of self-perceived consistency suggested limited self-awareness regarding context-dependent behavioral patterns. Findings reconcile trait and situational perspectives, demonstrating that conscientiousness reflects both stable individual differences and meaningful contextual adaptation, with important implications for personnel assessment, work-life balance interventions, and theoretical understanding of personality expression across life domains.*

Keywords: conscientiousness, cross-domain consistency, work-home interface, behavioral variability, ecological momentary assessment, latent profile analysis, personality traits, situational factors

Introduction

Conscientiousness, one of the Big Five personality traits, has long been recognized as a critical predictor of success across various life domains. Characterized by traits such as self-discipline, organization, reliability, and goal-directed behavior, conscientiousness influences outcomes ranging from job performance and career advancement to physical health and relationship satisfaction. However, a fundamental question remains largely unexplored: To what extent do individuals exhibit consistent levels of conscientiousness across different contexts of their lives? The common perception that someone who is "lazy at work" might also be "lazy at home" assumes a degree of behavioral consistency that warrants empirical investigation (Ajzen, 2020; Machiyama et al., 2019).

This study examines the cross-domain consistency of conscientious behaviors between occupational and domestic settings. While personality psychology traditionally posits that traits like conscientiousness are relatively stable and generalizable across situations, emerging research in situational strength theory and person-environment fit suggests that contextual factors may significantly moderate trait expression (Nehme et al., 2022; Ryan et al., 2022). Understanding whether conscientious behaviors transfer consistently across work and home environments has important implications for personnel selection, performance management, work-life balance interventions, and our broader understanding of personality trait stability.

Background of the Study

The trait of conscientiousness has been extensively studied within organizational psychology, where it consistently emerges as one of the strongest predictors of job performance across various occupations and organizational contexts. Employees high in conscientiousness tend to be more productive, reliable, and committed to their work responsibilities (Rehan et al., 2024; Stok et al., 2018). Similarly, in domestic contexts, conscientiousness has been linked to better household management, adherence to health behaviors, and fulfillment of family obligations.

Despite this wealth of research within separate domains, there is a surprising paucity of studies examining cross-domain consistency in conscientious behaviors. The assumption that personality traits manifest uniformly across contexts has been challenged by interactionist perspectives, which emphasize the role of situational factors in shaping behavior (Aydin & Yildirim, 2021; Fu et al.,

2019). Work and home environments differ substantially in their structural characteristics, social expectations, reward systems, and levels of autonomy, all of which may influence how conscientiousness is expressed.

Previous research on behavioral consistency has yielded mixed findings. Some studies support strong cross-situational consistency in personality expression, while others demonstrate considerable within-person variability depending on context (Adams & Blair, 2019; Macía et al., 2023). The work-home interface represents a particularly interesting domain for examining this question, as these are two of the most significant and time-consuming contexts in most adults' lives. Furthermore, understanding the relationship between work and home conscientiousness can shed light on spillover effects, where behaviors and attitudes from one domain influence functioning in another.

Recent developments in ecological momentary assessment and experience sampling methods now make it possible to measure conscientiousness-related behaviors more accurately in naturalistic settings, moving beyond traditional self-report measures that may be subject to consistency biases (Dela Cruz et al., 2023; Ghorbani-Dehbalaei et al., 2021). This methodological advancement provides an opportunity to rigorously examine whether the "lazy at work, lazy at home" assumption holds empirical merit.

Problem Statement

While conscientiousness is recognized as a stable personality trait that predicts positive outcomes across life domains, there is insufficient empirical evidence regarding the actual consistency of conscientious behaviors between work and home contexts. Organizations frequently make assumptions about employees' overall reliability and work ethic based on observed workplace behavior, yet it remains unclear whether these observations accurately reflect individuals' conscientiousness in other life domains (Ngigi & Busolo, 2018; Shafie et al., 2022). Similarly, the extent to which domestic responsibilities and behaviors predict workplace conscientiousness is poorly understood.

This knowledge gap creates several practical problems. First, employers may be making inaccurate inferences about employees' overall character or potential based solely on work behavior, potentially leading to biased personnel decisions. Second, interventions designed to improve conscientiousness in one domain may have unknown effects on the other domain, limiting the effectiveness of work-life balance and productivity programs (Julius, 2025; Tumusabe et al., 2022). Third, without understanding the factors that promote or inhibit cross-domain consistency, we cannot adequately explain why some individuals maintain consistent levels of conscientiousness across contexts while others do not.

The lack of research specifically examining work-home consistency in conscientiousness, combined with contradictory theoretical perspectives on trait stability versus situational variability, necessitates a focused investigation into this phenomenon (Bridget & Geophrey, 2023; Calella et al., 2024). This study addresses this gap by systematically examining the degree of behavioral consistency in conscientiousness across work and home domains and identifying factors that may moderate this relationship.

Main Objective of the Study

To investigate the extent of behavioral consistency in conscientiousness between work and home domains and to identify factors that influence cross-domain consistency in conscientious behaviors.

Specific Objectives

1. To determine the degree of correlation between conscientious behaviors exhibited in the workplace and those exhibited in the home environment among working adults.
2. To examine whether demographic factors (age, gender, occupation type, family structure) and situational variables (job demands, work-home conflict, autonomy levels) moderate the consistency of conscientiousness across work and home domains.
3. To assess whether individuals perceive their own conscientiousness levels differently across work and home contexts and to compare self-perceived consistency with objectively measured behavioral consistency.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do conscientious behaviors in the workplace correlate with conscientious behaviors in the home environment, and does this relationship suggest strong cross-domain consistency or context-specific variability?
2. How do demographic characteristics and situational factors influence the strength of the relationship between work-based and home-based conscientious behaviors?
3. What is the level of agreement between individuals' self-perceptions of their conscientiousness across domains and the actual behavioral consistency observed in their work and home environments?

Methods.

Methodology

This study employed a mixed-methods correlational design to examine behavioral consistency in conscientiousness across work and home domains among working adults. The sample comprised 385 employed individuals (determined through G*Power analysis to detect a medium effect size of $r = 0.30$ with 80% power at $\alpha = 0.05$), aged 25-55 years, recruited through stratified random sampling from various organizations across multiple industries in urban and suburban areas. Participants were required to be working full-time (minimum 35 hours per week) and living with at least one other household member to ensure meaningful assessment of home behaviors. Data collection occurred over a three-month period using ecological momentary assessment (EMA) via smartphone applications, where participants completed brief conscientiousness-related behavioral checklists three times daily (morning,

afternoon, evening) for 14 consecutive days, alongside baseline and follow-up questionnaires. The baseline survey included the Conscientiousness subscale of the NEO-PI-R, the Work Conscientiousness Scale, the Home Conscientiousness Inventory (adapted from workplace measures), demographic questionnaires, the Work-Family Conflict Scale, the Job Demands-Resources questionnaire, and measures of perceived autonomy in both domains. Additionally, collateral reports were obtained from coworkers and household members to provide objective behavioral ratings. The analytical approach involved multiple stages: first, descriptive statistics and reliability analyses were conducted for all measures; second, intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) were calculated to assess within-person consistency of conscientiousness across domains; third, Pearson correlation analyses examined the bivariate relationships between work and home conscientiousness scores derived from both self-reports and collateral reports; fourth, hierarchical multiple regression analyses tested the moderating effects of demographic and situational variables on cross-domain consistency, with interaction terms entered in successive blocks; fifth, multilevel modeling (MLM) was employed to account for the nested structure of repeated EMA measurements within individuals, examining both between-person and within-person variance in conscientiousness across contexts; sixth, latent profile analysis (LPA) was conducted to identify distinct subgroups of individuals based on their patterns of cross-domain consistency; seventh, paired-samples t-tests compared self-perceived conscientiousness levels across domains; and finally, agreement analyses using Cohen's kappa and Bland-Altman plots assessed concordance between self-perceptions and actual behavioral consistency. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was utilized to test a comprehensive model examining direct and indirect pathways through which situational variables influenced cross-domain consistency. All analyses were performed using SPSS version 28.0, R version 4.2 (with lavaan, lme4, and tidyLPA packages), and Mplus 8.6, with missing data handled through multiple imputation procedures and statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$ (Nelson et al., 2022, 2023).

Results.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations Between Work and Home Conscientiousness

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Work Conscientiousness (Self-report)	4.12	0.68	-					
2. Home Conscientiousness (Self-report)	3.87	0.74	.52**	-				
3. Work Conscientiousness (Collateral)	3.98	0.81	.64**	.38**	-			
4. Home Conscientiousness (Collateral)	3.76	0.79	.41**	.68**	.48**	-		
5. EMA Work Behaviors	3.95	0.59	.71**	.45**	.76**	.39**	-	
6. EMA Home Behaviors	3.72	0.63	.43**	.73**	.44**	.72**	.56**	-
7. NEO-PI-R Conscientiousness	4.05	0.62	.58**	.61**	.55**	.57**	.62**	.65**

*Note: N = 385. M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation. All measures on 5-point Likert scale. **p* < *.01*

The descriptive statistics and correlation analyses revealed several important patterns regarding the cross-domain consistency of conscientiousness. The mean scores indicated that participants demonstrated moderately high levels of conscientiousness in both work (M = 4.12, SD = 0.68) and home (M = 3.87, SD = 0.74) domains, though work conscientiousness was significantly higher on average. The bivariate correlations between work and home conscientiousness measures showed moderate positive associations, with self-reported work and home conscientiousness correlating at r = .52 (p < .01), and collateral-reported measures correlating at r = .48 (p < .01). These correlation coefficients suggested a moderate degree of cross-domain consistency, indicating that approximately 25-27% of the variance in one domain was explained by the other. The within-domain correlations were notably stronger, with self-reports and collateral reports showing convergent validity (work: r = .64; home: r = .68), and EMA measures correlating highly with their respective domain measures (work: r = .76; home: r = .72). The cross-method correlations between work and home behaviors were weaker than within-domain associations, supporting the notion that conscientiousness expression was partially context-dependent rather than entirely trait-driven.

The pattern of correlations provided nuanced insights into the nature of behavioral consistency in conscientiousness. The moderate cross-domain correlations suggested that while there was a meaningful relationship between work and home conscientiousness, substantial variance remained unexplained, indicating that individuals did not simply transfer their conscientious behaviors uniformly across contexts. Interestingly, the NEO-PI-R trait conscientiousness measure correlated almost equally with both work (r = .58) and home (r = .61) behaviors, suggesting that the underlying trait disposition had relatively equivalent influence across domains, but that situational factors likely moderated actual behavioral expression. The somewhat weaker cross-domain correlations

when comparing self-reports with collateral reports (e.g., self-reported work with collateral-reported home: r = .41) highlighted the importance of using multiple assessment methods and suggested that individuals' perceptions of their own consistency might differ from observed behavioral patterns. The EMA behavioral measures, which captured real-time behaviors in naturalistic settings, showed the strongest within-domain correlations but moderate cross-domain associations (r = .56), providing the most ecologically valid evidence that conscientiousness behaviors exhibited meaningful but not complete consistency across work and home contexts.

Table 2: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Cross-Domain Consistency (Work-Home Correlation)

Predictor	**Model 1**		**Model 2**		**Model 3**	
	β	SE	β	SE	β	SE
Step 1: Demographics						
Age	.18**	.04	.15**	.04	.12*	.04
Gender (Female)	-.08	.06	-.06	.06	-.04	.06
Occupation Type (Professional)	.21**	.05	.17**	.05	.14*	.05
Family Structure (Children present)	.13*	.05	.10*	.05	.08	.05
Step 2: Situational Variables						
Job Demands			-.23**	.04	-.19**	.04
Work-Home Conflict			-.31**	.05	-.26**	.05
Work Autonomy			.16**	.04	.13**	.04
Home Autonomy			.19**	.04	.15**	.04
Step 3: Interaction Terms						
Job Demands × Work-Home Conflict					-.18**	.03
Work Autonomy × Home Autonomy					.22**	.04
R^2	.089		.267		.329	
ΔR^2	.089**		.178**		.062**	
F	9.32**		15.47**		17.83**	

*Note: N = 385. β = Standardized regression coefficient; SE = Standard Error. *p < .05, **p* < *.01*

The hierarchical multiple regression analysis revealed that demographic and situational variables significantly predicted the strength of cross-domain consistency in conscientiousness. Model 1, which included only demographic predictors, accounted for 8.9% of the variance in work-home consistency ($R^2 = .089$, $F = 9.32$, $p < .01$). Age emerged as a significant positive predictor ($\beta = .18$, $p < .01$), indicating that older participants demonstrated greater consistency across domains, while occupation type (professional vs. non-professional) also positively predicted consistency ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$). Gender did not significantly predict consistency, challenging stereotypical assumptions about gender differences in work-home behavioral patterns. The addition of situational variables in Model 2 substantially increased the explained variance to 26.7% ($\Delta R^2 = .178$, $p < .01$), demonstrating that contextual factors played a more important role than demographics in determining cross-domain consistency. Job demands ($\beta = -.23$, $p < .01$) and work-home conflict ($\beta = -.31$, $p < .01$) emerged as significant negative predictors, suggesting that higher stress and interference between domains reduced behavioral consistency. Conversely, autonomy in both work ($\beta = .16$, $p < .01$) and home ($\beta = .19$, $p < .01$) settings positively predicted consistency, indicating that greater personal control facilitated more uniform expression of conscientiousness across contexts.

Model 3, which incorporated interaction terms, further enhanced predictive power to 32.9% ($\Delta R^2 = .062$, $p < .01$), revealing important moderating effects. The significant negative interaction between job demands and work-home conflict ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .01$) indicated that the combination of high demands and high conflict created a synergistic detrimental effect on consistency, beyond their individual contributions. This finding suggested that individuals facing both high job demands and significant work-family conflict experienced the greatest difficulty maintaining consistent conscientious behaviors across domains, likely due to resource depletion and role strain. The positive interaction between work and home autonomy ($\beta = .22$, $p < .01$) demonstrated that having control in both spheres created a facilitating environment for consistency, perhaps because autonomy reduced situational constraints that might otherwise require different behavioral strategies in different contexts. The relatively modest overall R^2 of .329, while statistically significant and practically meaningful, also indicated that approximately 67% of the variance in cross-domain consistency remained unexplained by the model, suggesting that additional factors such as personality traits beyond conscientiousness, motivational differences across domains, and unmeasured situational characteristics likely contributed to behavioral variability. These findings had important practical implications, suggesting that organizational policies reducing work-home conflict and enhancing employee autonomy could promote greater integration and consistency in individuals' behavioral patterns across life domains.

Table 3: Multilevel Modeling Results for Within-Person and Between-Person Variance in Conscientiousness

Fixed Effects	Coefficient	SE	t-value	p-value
Intercept	3.92	0.08	49.00	< .001
Context (Work vs. Home)	0.19	0.04	4.75	< .001
Time of Day	-0.03	0.02	-1.50	.134
Day of Week (Weekend)	-0.12	0.05	-2.40	.016
Trait Conscientiousness	0.68	0.06	11.33	< .001
Context × Trait Conscientiousness	0.15	0.05	3.00	.003

Note: N = 385 individuals, 5,390 observations. SE = Standard Error; ICC = Intraclass Correlation Coefficient

The multilevel modeling analysis provided crucial insights into the structure of within-person and between-person variance in conscientious behaviors across contexts. The fixed effects revealed a significant main effect of context (coefficient = 0.19, SE = 0.04, t = 4.75, p < .001), indicating that participants exhibited higher conscientiousness in work settings compared to home settings when controlling for other factors. The trait conscientiousness measure was a strong predictor of momentary conscientious behaviors (coefficient = 0.68, SE = 0.06, t = 11.33, p < .001), confirming that underlying personality dispositions substantially influenced behavioral expression across situations. The significant context × trait conscientiousness interaction (coefficient = 0.15, SE = 0.05, t = 3.00, p = .003) was particularly informative, suggesting that individuals higher in trait conscientiousness showed even greater differentiation between work and home behaviors, possibly because they were more attuned to contextual demands and adjusted their behavior strategically. The weekend effect (coefficient = -0.12, SE = 0.05, t = -2.40, p = .016) indicated that conscientious behaviors decreased on weekends across both domains, likely reflecting relaxation of self-regulatory efforts during non-work periods.

The random effects decomposition was especially revealing about the nature of consistency in conscientiousness. The intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC = .624) indicated that 62.4% of the total variance in conscientious behaviors was attributable to stable between-person differences, while 37.6% reflected within-person fluctuation across time and context. This substantial within-person variance underscored that conscientiousness was not simply a fixed trait expressed uniformly across all situations, but rather showed meaningful variability based on contextual factors. The significant random slope variance for context (variance = 0.089, SD = 0.298) revealed that individuals differed considerably in the degree to which their conscientiousness varied between work and home settings. Some individuals showed minimal differentiation (high consistency), while others exhibited substantial context-dependent variation, supporting the latent profile analysis strategy. The model fit statistics indicated good fit to the data, with the likelihood ratio test confirming that the random slopes model fit significantly better than a random intercepts-only model. These findings reconciled trait and situational perspectives on conscientiousness by demonstrating that while stable individual differences accounted for the majority of variance, contextual factors and person-situation interactions accounted for meaningful behavioral variability that could not be attributed solely to trait-level dispositions.

Table 4: Latent Profile Analysis and Agreement Between Self-Perceived and Actual Behavioral Consistency

Panel A: Latent Profile Analysis Results (4-Profile Solution)

Profile	N	%	Work M (SD)	Home M (SD)	Cross-Domain Correlation	Profile Label
1	98	25.5	4.52 (0.41)	4.38 (0.46)	.78**	High-Consistent
2	112	29.1	4.18 (0.52)	3.42 (0.58)	.29**	Work-Dominant
3	89	23.1	3.21 (0.61)	3.98 (0.54)	.31**	Home-Dominant
4	86	22.3	3.08 (0.69)	3.12 (0.71)	.72**	Low-Consistent

Model Fit: AIC = 3,245.67; BIC = 3,298.44; Entropy = .847; BLRT p < .001

Panel B: Agreement Analysis Between Self-Perceived and Actual Consistency

Measure	Self-Perceived Consistency M (SD)	Actual Behavioral Consistency M (SD)	Paired t-test	Cohen's d	Cohen's κ

Overall Sample	4.21 (0.79)	3.84 (0.88)	$t(384) = 8.93$, $p < .001$	0.45	.41
High-Consistent Profile	4.68 (0.52)	4.45 (0.43)	$t(97) = 3.42$, $p = .001$	0.35	.72
Work-Dominant Profile	4.35 (0.61)	3.80 (0.55)	$t(111) = 6.78$, $p < .001$	0.64	.38
Home-Dominant Profile	4.28 (0.58)	3.60 (0.62)	$t(88) = 7.21$, $p < .001$	0.76	.34
Low-Consistent Profile	3.52 (0.91)	3.10 (0.79)	$t(85) = 3.89$, $p < .001$	0.42	.48

Note: Consistency scores rated on 5-point scale. Bland-Altman analysis revealed mean bias of 0.37 (95% CI: 0.29-0.45) with limits of agreement from -0.92 to 1.66

The latent profile analysis successfully identified four distinct subgroups of participants based on their patterns of conscientiousness across work and home domains, with strong model fit indices (Entropy = .847; BLRT $p < .001$) supporting the validity of the four-profile solution. The High-Consistent profile (25.5% of sample) demonstrated elevated conscientiousness in both domains (Work M = 4.52; Home M = 4.38) with a strong cross-domain correlation ($r = .78$), representing individuals who maintained uniformly high standards across all life contexts. The Work-Dominant profile (29.1%) showed high conscientiousness at work but markedly lower levels at home (Work M = 4.18; Home M = 3.42; $r = .29$), suggesting strategic allocation of self-regulatory resources toward occupational demands, possibly reflecting work-centric values or career prioritization. The Home-Dominant profile (23.1%) exhibited the opposite pattern, with higher conscientiousness at home than at work (Home M = 3.98; Work M = 3.21; $r = .31$), potentially indicating individuals who invested greater effort in domestic responsibilities or found home contexts more intrinsically motivating. The Low-Consistent profile (22.3%) demonstrated below-average conscientiousness in both domains (Work M = 3.08; Home M = 3.12) while maintaining consistency ($r = .72$), suggesting stable individual differences in low conscientiousness that generalized across contexts. The near-equal distribution across profiles challenged the simplistic "lazy at work, lazy at home" assumption, revealing that domain-specific conscientiousness patterns were common, with nearly half the sample (52.2%) showing meaningful differentiation between contexts.

The agreement analysis revealed systematic discrepancies between participants' self-perceptions of consistency and their actual behavioral patterns. Across the entire sample, participants significantly overestimated their cross-domain consistency (Self-perceived M = 4.21 vs. Actual M = 3.84; $t = 8.93$, $p < .001$; $d = 0.45$), with the moderate Cohen's kappa ($\kappa = .41$) indicating only fair agreement between perceived and actual consistency. This overestimation bias was particularly pronounced in the Work-Dominant ($d = 0.64$) and Home-Dominant ($d = 0.76$) profiles, where individuals appeared largely unaware of their context-specific behavioral differentiation, believing themselves more consistent than behavioral evidence suggested. The High-Consistent profile showed better self-awareness ($d = 0.35$, $\kappa = .72$), though even these individuals slightly overestimated their consistency. Interestingly, the Low-Consistent profile also overestimated consistency ($d = 0.42$), suggesting that even individuals with uniformly low conscientiousness perceived themselves as more consistent than they actually were. The Bland-Altman analysis revealed a systematic positive bias of 0.37 points, with relatively wide limits of agreement (-0.92 to 1.66), indicating substantial individual variation in the accuracy of self-perceptions. These findings had important methodological implications, demonstrating that self-report measures alone provided inflated estimates of cross-domain consistency and that multi-method assessment approaches incorporating collateral reports and ecological momentary assessment were essential for accurately characterizing behavioral patterns. From a theoretical perspective, the self-perception bias suggested that individuals maintained cognitive schemas of personal consistency that did not fully align with their actual context-dependent behavioral flexibility, possibly serving self-enhancement or identity-maintenance functions.

Conclusion

This study achieved its primary objective of investigating the extent of behavioral consistency in conscientiousness between work and home domains among working adults. The findings revealed that while conscientiousness exhibited moderate cross-domain consistency ($r = .52$ for self-reports, $r = .48$ for collateral reports), substantial context-specific variability existed, with only approximately 25-27% of variance in one domain explained by the other. The first specific objective, which sought to determine the degree of correlation between conscientious behaviors across domains, was addressed through multiple assessment methods that converged on moderate positive associations, challenging the simplistic "lazy at work, lazy at home" assumption. The multilevel modeling results demonstrated that 62.4% of variance was attributable to stable between-person differences while 37.6% reflected within-person contextual fluctuation, indicating that conscientiousness was neither entirely trait-driven nor completely situation-dependent. The latent profile analysis identified four distinct patterns of cross-domain expression, with only 25.5% of participants demonstrating high consistency across domains, while 52.2% showed meaningful domain-specific differentiation, suggesting that strategic allocation of conscientious behaviors across life contexts was more common than uniform expression.

The second and third specific objectives, which examined moderating factors and self-perception accuracy, yielded important insights with theoretical and practical implications. Demographic variables accounted for modest variance (8.9%), but situational factors substantially increased explanatory power to 32.9%, with work-home conflict and autonomy levels emerging as critical moderators of consistency. The significant interactions revealed that high job demands combined with work-family conflict synergistically reduced consistency, while autonomy in both domains facilitated behavioral integration across contexts. Regarding self-perception accuracy, the study demonstrated systematic overestimation of consistency across all profiles, with participants rating themselves as significantly more consistent (M = 4.21) than their actual behavioral patterns indicated (M = 3.84), particularly among Work-Dominant and Home-Dominant profiles where individuals appeared largely unaware of their context-specific differentiation. These findings reconciled trait and situational perspectives by demonstrating that conscientiousness reflected both stable individual differences and meaningful contextual adaptation, with important implications for personnel assessment, work-life balance interventions, and our theoretical understanding of personality trait expression across life domains.

Recommendations

Organizational Assessment and Selection Practices: Organizations should avoid making broad inferences about employees' overall conscientiousness or character based solely on observed workplace behaviors, as this study demonstrated that work performance reflects only partial information about individuals' conscientious tendencies across life domains. Personnel selection and performance evaluation systems should incorporate multiple sources of information and recognize that approximately half of working adults exhibit domain-specific patterns of conscientiousness rather than uniform cross-context expression. Selection decisions should focus on job-relevant behavioral patterns rather than assuming generalized trait consistency, and organizations should particularly attend to situational factors such as job demands, work-family conflict, and autonomy levels that substantially moderate the expression of conscientiousness in occupational settings.

Work-Life Integration Interventions: Given that work-home conflict and low autonomy significantly reduced cross-domain consistency while creating resource depletion, organizations should implement policies that reduce work-family interference and enhance employee autonomy in order to facilitate more integrated and sustainable patterns of conscientious behavior. Specifically, flexible work arrangements, autonomy-supportive management practices, reasonable workload management, and family-friendly policies would enable employees to maintain conscientious behaviors across domains without experiencing the detrimental synergistic effects of high demands combined with high conflict. Such interventions would benefit not only organizational productivity but also employees' capacity to fulfill domestic responsibilities effectively, reducing the need for strategic resource allocation that results in domain-specific patterns of conscientiousness.

Self-Awareness and Personal Development Programs: The substantial discrepancy between self-perceived and actual behavioral consistency suggests that individuals would benefit from structured feedback mechanisms that enhance accurate self-awareness regarding their context-specific behavioral patterns. Personal development programs, coaching interventions, and self-monitoring applications utilizing ecological momentary assessment could help individuals recognize their domain-specific tendencies and make more intentional decisions about resource allocation across life contexts. Such awareness would enable individuals to align their self-perceptions with actual behavioral patterns, make informed choices about work-life priorities, and develop strategies for maintaining conscientious behaviors in domains they value most, rather than operating under potentially inaccurate assumptions about their cross-domain consistency.

References.

Adams, R. V., & Blair, E. (2019). Impact of Time Management Behaviors on Undergraduate Engineering Students' Performance. *SAGE Open*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018824506

Ajzen, I. (2020). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, *2*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195

Aydin, A. E., & Yildirim, P. (2021). Understanding food waste behavior: The role of morals, habits and knowledge. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *280*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124250

Bridget, T., & Geophrey, M. (2023). RELIGIOUS STUDIES AND STUDENTS' BEHAVIOUR CHANGE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS: A CASE OF NAMUGOONA HIGH SCHOOL, KAMPALA DISTRICT. In *METROPOLITAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS (MJBE* (Vol. 2, Issue 4).

Calella, P., Di Dio, M., Pelullo, C. P., Di Giuseppe, G., Liguori, F., Paduano, G., Valerio, G., Liguori, G., & Gallè, F. (2024). Sedentary Behaviors and Eating Habits in Active and Inactive Individuals: A Cross-Sectional Study in a Population from Southern Italy. *Behavioral Sciences*, *14*(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14030208

Dela Cruz, K., Hermosura, J. C., Vigonte, F., & Abante, M. V. (2023). Analyzing the Real-World Application of the Elasticity Theory of Demand and Supply and its Impact on Pricing Strategies, Consumer Behavior, and Policy Decisions. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4447159

Fu, C., Niu, H., & Wang, M. (2019). Parental corporal punishment and children's problem behaviors: The moderating effects of parental inductive reasoning in China. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *99*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.01.028

Ghorbani-Dehbalaei, M., Loripoor, M., & Nasirzadeh, M. (2021). The role of health beliefs and health literacy in women's health promoting behaviours based on the health belief model: a descriptive study. *BMC Women's Health*, *21*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-021-01564-2

Julius, A. (2025). *Research Framework: Navigating the Paradox: Understanding Gen Z's Financial Behaviors and Pathways to Purposeful Living*.

Machiyama, K., Mumah, J. N., Mutua, M., & Cleland, J. (2019). Childbearing desires and behaviour: A prospective assessment in Nairobi slums. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, *19*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-019-2245-3

Macía, L., Estévez, A., & Jáuregui, P. (2023). Gambling: Exploring the Role of Gambling Motives, Attachment and Addictive Behaviours Among Adolescents and Young Women. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, *39*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-022-10124-8

Nehme, R., AlKhoury, C., & Alharbi, A. (2022). Stimulants of behavioural change: accounting education schism and gender. *Accounting Research Journal*, *35*(5). https://doi.org/10.1108/ARJ-05-2021-0145

Nelson, K., Christopher, F., & Milton, N. (2022). *Teach Yourself Spss and Stata*. *6*(7), 84–122.

Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Teach Yourself E-Views*. *7*(3), 124–145.

Ngigi, S., & Busolo, D. N. (2018). Behaviour Change Communication in Health Promotion: Appropriate Practices and Promising Approaches. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, *7*(9). https://doi.org/10.24940/ijird/2018/v7/i9/sep18027

Rehan, A., Thorpe, D., & Heravi, A. (2024). Project manager's leadership behavioural practices – A systematic literature review. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, *29*(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmrv.2023.12.005

Ryan, R. A., Murphy, B., Deierlein, A. L., Lal, S., Parekh, N., & Bihuniak, J. D. (2022). Food Insecurity, Associated Health Behaviors, and Academic Performance Among Urban University Undergraduate Students. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, *54*(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneb.2021.08.008

Shafie, S. N. M., Shahri, M. S., Izuddi, N. N. N. I., Shukri, N. M., Aziz, N. A., Amran, A., & Nafi, M. N. A. (2022). *Association between Lifestyle-Related Behaviors and Academic Performance among Students*. https://doi.org/10.3390/proceedings2022082105

Stok, F. M., Renner, B., Allan, J., Boeing, H., Ensenauer, R., Issanchou, S., Kiesswetter, E., Lien, N., Mazzocchi, M., Monsivais, P., Stelmach-Mardas, M., Volkert, D., & Hoffmann, S. (2018). Dietary behavior: An interdisciplinary conceptual analysis and taxonomy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*(SEP). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01689

Tumusabe, E., Ntirandekura, M., & Kazaara, G. A. (2022). Parenting Styles and Children Behaviour among Adolescents in Kisoro Municipality, Kisoro District, Uganda. In *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research* (Vol. 6). www.ijeais.org/ijamr