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The present study examined relationship between personality dimensions, locus of control and coping styles in sample of Iranian and Armenian students. Through random sampling, 425 students (Males and Females) were selected from universities of Tehran in Iran and university of Yerevan state in Armenia. Participants completed the NEO-Five-Factor Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992), The CISS (Endler & Parker, 1990), Rotter Internal-External Scale (Rotter, 1966) and Satisfaction With life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin, 1985).

Results showed that there is significant relationship between personality dimensions, locus of control and coping styles and life satisfaction and low levels of neuroticism were accompanied by high levels of life satisfaction. High level of extroversion were accompanied by high levels of life satisfaction. It was also revealed that there are a partial national difference between Iranian and Armenian in personality dimensions, locus of control and coping styles and life satisfaction.
Introduction

Personality psychology has been no exception in the struggle over broad versus specific factors. Although researchers in personality psychology have invested immense effort in seeking to identify thousands of specific traits (e.g., Allport & Odbert, 1936), others have argued that these labors have produced independent literatures that evolved from related traits with little consideration of their possible common core. As D. Watson and Clark (1984) commented, “distinct and segregated literatures have developed around a number of personality traits that, despite dissimilar names, nevertheless intercorrelate so highly that they must be considered measures of the same construct” (p. 465). Much earlier, Kelley (1927) cited the jangle fallacy in reference to the tendency of psychologists to discover new traits without consideration of similar personality constructs already in existence. Clearly, not all specific traits are indicators of a broader construct, but, by the same token, new and existing measures must be evaluated on the basis of a possible common core when there is reason (on empirical and/or theoretical grounds) to believe that such a commonality may exist. In a narrow sense, the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality is an empirical generalization about the co-variation of personality traits. As Digman and Inouye (1986) put it, “If a large number of rating scales is used and if the scope of the scales is very broad, the domain of personality descriptors is almost completely accounted for by five robust factors” (p. 116). The five factors, frequently labeled Neuroticism (N), Extraversion (E), Openness (O), Agreeableness (A), and Conscientiousness (C), have been found not only in the peer rating scales in which they were originally discovered (Tupes & Cristal, 1961/1992), but also in self-reports on trait descriptive adjectives (Saucier, 1997), in questionnaire measures of needs and motives (Costa & McCrae, 1988), in expert ratings on the California Q-Set (Lanning, 1994), and in personality disorder symptom clusters (Clark & Livesley, 2002). Much of what psychologists mean by the term personality is summarized by the FFM, and the model has been of great utility to the field by integrating and systematizing diverse conceptions and measures.
In a broader sense, the FFM refers to the entire body of research that it has inspired, amounting to a reinvigoration of trait psychology itself. Research associated with the FFM has included studies of diverse populations (McCrae, Terracciano, & 78 Members of the Personality Profiles of Cultures Project, 2005a), often followed over decades of the lifespan (Terracciano, Costa, & McCrae, 2006); employed multiple methods of assessment (Funder, Kolar, & Blackman, 1995); and even featured case studies (Costa & McCrae, 1998a; McCrae, 1993-94). As Carlson (1984) might have predicted, these research strategies have paid off handsomely in substantive findings: The FFM "is the Christmas tree on which findings of stability, heritability, consensual validation, cross-cultural invariance, and predictive utility are hung like ornaments" (Costa & McCrae, 1993, p. 302). After decades of floundering, personality psychology has begun to make steady progress, accumulating a store of replicable findings about the origins, development, and functioning of personality traits (McCrae, 2002a).

The purpose of this review is threefold: (1) to survey the history of the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality relative to its theoretical framework, diverse applicability, and empirical evidence for and (arguments) against the model; and (2) to examine and evaluate the five Domains of Costa and McCrae's Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO FFI, 1992) with respect to their predictive relationship to coping styles, locus of control and subjective well-being.

Methodology
The goal of this research study is an attempt to investigate the correlation between Big Five personality dimensions, coping styles, locus of control and subjective well-being in Iranian and Armenian students, with the intention of establishing a particular trait profile. In the article we discussed the relevant literature with respect to the four abovementioned constructs.

Participants
A multistage sampling procedure was used to select the sample for this study. Students were selected by multistage sampling from universities of Tehran in Iran and university of Yerevan state In Armenia. All participants completed a questionnaire packet during a single assessment period. 425 students were recruited from the universities of Tehran, Iran (301 students) and universities of Armenian (124 students).

Measuring Instruments
The NEO-Five-Factor Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992) the Coping Inventory for Stressful Situations (CISS, Endler & Parker, 1990), the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966), The Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS, Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin, 1985) and Demographic Questionnaire are used as measuring instruments for this study. All instruments translated to Armenian language. A more detailed description of each instrument is provided as follows.

Figure 1 presents the means for scores on the NEO – FFI in the Iranian and Armenian samples. All mean values for the personality traits, were significantly different with neuroticism, extraversion, openness, Conscientiousness and agreeableness higher in the Armenia. EC dimension of Coping Styles significantly higher in too (Fig. 2.). The relationship between the trait of neuroticism and the life Satisfaction, in both the Iran and Armenia, show any replicated pattern of strong associations. In the Iran and Armenia showed a significant correlation ($r = -.305$, and $r= -.217$, $p < .05$) with neuroticism. Furthermore, neuroticism and life satisfaction indicates that the patterns of relationships found in Iran and the Armenia were not significantly similar to each other.

The relationship between the trait of Extroversion and the Life Satisfaction, in both the Iran and Armenia,
show any replicated pattern of strong associations. In the Iran and Armenia showed a significant correlation \((r = 0.242)\) and \((r = 0.206, p < .05)\) with neuroticism. Furthermore, neuroticism and life satisfaction indicates that the patterns of relationships found in Iran and the Armenia were not significantly similar to each other.

The trait of Openness to Experience and Agreeableness presented do not significant relationships with life satisfaction. In Iran, conscientiousness strongly correlated with life satisfaction \((r = 0.339, p < .05)\). For the Armenian students found little relation between conscientiousness and life satisfaction.

In Iran, Ec strongly correlated with life satisfaction \((r = 0.326, p < .01)\). Furthermore Pc and Ac no significant relationships with life satisfaction in Iranian sample. In Armenia, Pc and Ac showed a moderate positive relationships with life satisfaction \((r = 0.236, p < .05)\), \((r = 0.190, p < .05)\). Furthermore Ec no significant relationships with life satisfaction in Armenian sample.

These results show that there is not a significant relationship between Locus of control and satisfaction levels of students\((r = -0.110, p < .05)\), \((r = -0.026, p < .05)\) in Iran and Armenia.

The Five-Factor Model of Personality (FFM) or the “Big 5” has been a very influential theory in the field of personality. Personality may be considered as a “configuration of cognitions, emotions and habits activated when situations stimulate their expression” (Triandis & Suh, 2002). It appears that personality is universal and works the same way across cultures, with similar interlude agreement when rating self or significant other’s personality traits across cultures (McCrae et al., 2004). A broad range of studies on personality in adulthood has identified individual differences in the five domains of the Five Factor Model (FFM): Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Neuroticism is defined as a tendency to worry versus a tendency to be more relaxed and easygoing. Extraversion is defined as a trait of outgoingness and sociability versus a preference to work alone and be less sociable. Openness to experience is a trait that describes people who are creative and adaptable versus people who are more down-to-earth and uncomfortable with change. Agreeableness leads to wanting to satisfy others and comply with the status quo versus wanting to challenge rules and being more argumentative. Conscientiousness focuses on how organized and structured one’s life is versus a more flexible and yet less productive way of life.

The Big 5 personality trait levels appear to be relatively stable over a lifetime even when people experience major life events. This is probably due to the fact that personality traits are genetically influenced rather than only a result of environment or child rearing (McCrae et al., 2000). Furthermore, even though culture may influence the expression or restraint of certain traits, there is evidence that these personality traits are universal (McCrae, 2001).

Coping is a process that we as individuals employ every day. We engage in coping when we feel under stress or want to manage a taxing situation. The process of coping involves two components, appraisal and coping (Lazarus, 1966). Appraisal is the act of perceiving a stressor and analyzing one’s own ability to deal with the stressor. Appraisal can be made in three different conditions: when we have experienced a stressor, when we anticipate a stressor and when we experience a chance for mastery or gain (Lazarus, 1966). There appear to be three main coping styles that people employ when attempting to resolve or remove a stressor: problem-focused coping, emotion-focused coping and avoidant coping. Problem-focused coping involves altering or managing the problem that is causing the stress and is highly action focused. Individuals engaging in problem-focused coping focus their attention on gathering the required resources (i.e. skills, tools and knowledge) necessary to deal with the stressor. This
involve a number of strategies such as gathering information, resolving conflict, planning and making decisions (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Emotion-focused coping can take a range of forms such as seeking social support, acceptance and venting of emotions etc (Carver et al., 1989). Although emotion-focused coping styles are quite varied they all seek to lessen the negative emotions associated with the stressor, thus emotion-focused coping is action-oriented (Admiraal, Korthagen, & Wubbels, 2000; Folkman & Lazarus, 1980). The third main coping style is avoidant coping. Avoidant coping can be described as cognitive and behavioral efforts directed towards minimizing, denying or ignoring dealing with a stressful situation (Holahan, Holahan, Moos, Brennan, & Schutte, 2005). Although some researchers group avoidant coping with emotion-focused coping the styles are conceptually distinct. Avoidant coping is focused on ignoring a stressor and is therefore passive, whereas emotion-focused coping is active (Admiraal et al., 2000, Holahan et al., 2005).

Since the domain of life satisfaction is of immense importance to the quality of life of an individual, psychologists have made numerous attempts to find the correlates and predictors of people's life satisfaction. Research has consistently shown that personality traits tend to be among the foremost predictors of life satisfaction (Diener et al., 2003 and Steel et al., 2008). For example, neuroticism, as a risk factor for quality of life, has been found to have a detrimental effect on life satisfaction. In contrast, resilience, as a protective factor for quality of life, has been found to be important in increasing life satisfaction. An alternative line of research has confirmed the role of positive and negative affect (PA and NA) in influencing life satisfaction (Kuppens et al., 2008, Lucas et al., 1996 and Suh et al., 1998). The purpose of the current study is to incorporate these two lines of research to investigate the processes underlying the associations between Big 5, coping styles, locus of control and life satisfaction. This study is unique in that it is the first to examine the relation between the personality traits, coping styles, locus of control, and life satisfaction in Iran and Armenia, which is an understudied countries of the world in the well-being literature. Findings of this study regarding the relation between personality traits and life satisfaction are also consistent with those of previous studies (e.g., DeNeve and Cooper 1998). Results of bivariate correlation analysis showed that four of the Big Five traits (extra-version, neuroticism, agreeableness and conscientiousness) were significantly correlated with life satisfaction. As expected, openness to new experiences was not correlated with life satisfaction. Correlational analysis results showed that when all five personality traits were entered as potential predictors of life satisfaction, only extraversion and neuroticism could significantly predict life satisfaction.

In conclusion, this study has provided some insights into the relationships between Big five personality, coping styles, locus of control and life satisfaction. In particular, neuroticism acts as a risk factor by decreasing feelings of PA, which in turn has a detrimental effect on life satisfaction. In contrast, E acts as a protective factor by increasing feelings of PA, which in turn has a beneficial effect on life satisfaction. Thus, to improve individuals' life satisfaction, we should adopt interventions primarily focusing on increasing their positive affective experiences.

Overall, the findings from the current study converge with the findings from past studies to suggest that the patterns of relationships between LS and coping styles, locus of control and the big 5 personality traits are universal. Future research can extend the findings of the current study by focusing on differences within countries, such as regional differences (Van de Vijver & Leung, 2000). Future work could also consider commitment alongside relationship satisfaction; such work should consider other possible determinants of commitment, such as quality of alternatives and investment size (Rusbult et al., 1998), as well as the cultural constraints that may prevent relationship breakdown in some cultures (Goodwin, 2008).

Admittedly, the conclusions in this study need to be considered cautiously because of some limitations. First, this study was the cross-sectional design in nature, with correlation and mediation analyses on data collected concurrently. Thus the findings reported here reflect associations and predictions, but not causal relationships between the variables in question. Therefore, prospective and longitudinal studies are warranted. Further research could adopt a longitudinal design to test the possible reciprocal causality.

Finally, it is necessary to replicate this study using a more diverse sample from the general populations of the countries examined. Clearly, there is a need for more studies in this field.
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