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**Abstract**

**Introduction**: There is wide variety of ways for individuals to regulate their emotion.The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between personality factors with emotion regulation strategies.

**Method**: Subjects of this research were 339 students from Faculty of Psychology, Gadjah Mada University. There were two scales used in this research, namely Big Five Personality Factors, and Emotion Regulation Scale, which have been modified from Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ). The data were analyzed with multiple regression analysis.

**Result:** There are correlation of personality factors with emotion regulation strategies. Personality’s effective contribution to the strategies is varied in scale, ranging from 8.66% to 26.74%. If observed per factor, the effective contribution from these factors of personality to the strategies is approximately from 4.11% to 22.69%.

**Conclusion:** The results of analysis indicated there is correlation between Big Five personality factors with emotion regulation strategies.
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Emotion is very important in our daily lives. Anger, fear, joy, happiness and sadness give distinctive colors to human life (Prawitasari, 2006). Experiences with strong emotions often need to be managed. Emotion regulation refers to the ability to control and change any emotional reaction in order to achieve desired goals (Matsumoto, Yoo, Seung Hee, Nakagawa, & Sanae, 2008). Emotion regulation is an aspect of self-regulation that includes behavior regulation such as emotional responses (Trommsdorf & Rothbaum, 2008). One’s success in regulating emotions is a requirement for him/her to make self-adjustment.

People regulate their emotions in different ways. An emotion regulation strategy can be healthier than others (John & Gross, 2004), or more effective than others (Lopez, Solovey, Beers & Cote, 2005; Salovey, Cote & Beers, 2005) for different condition. Previous studies have stated that there is a specific relationship between traits of personality and emotions, i.e. Shiota, Keltner and John (2006). Li, Zhanbiao and Wang (2009) studied about Neuroticism and Extraversion, emotion regulation, positive and negative affects in mediating the Reappraisal and Suppression strategies of emotion regulation. McCrae in Matsumoto (2006) studied on the correlation between Neuroticism and Extraversion with negative and positive emotions. The relationship between personality traits and emotion regulation was also examined in a study done by Costa and MacCrae, who also studied about the relationship between Neuroticism and negative expression, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness and positive emotion (in Matsumoto, 2006). Dynes (2010) studied about Neuroticism and success of emotion regulation. Matsumoto and Terracena (Matsumoto, 2008) found the relationship between openness and ability of recognizing emotion.. Based on the above explanation, there appears a question; how far does emotion regulation relate to an individual’s personality traits? Therefore, this research aims to find out whether there is a relationship between personality factors and strategies of emotion regulation.

Frijda (in Denollet, Nyklicek & Vingerboets, 2008) said that emotion has functions in interpersonal communication. Emotion is a specific manifestation of cognitive reaction, behavior and physiology that is important for an individual to do self-adjustment (Denollet, Nyklicek & Vingerhoets, 2008; Matsumoto, Hee, Yoo, & Nakagawa, 2008).

According to John and Gross (2004), emotion often is both helpful and destructive. There are two aspects that need to be explained, namely 1) one’s subjective experience and 2) emotion regulation (Aranda, Salguero & Berrocall, 2009; John & Gross in Denollet, Nyklicek & Vingerhoets, 2008). In the relationship between both aspects, it is found that an individual’s way of regulating emotion can help limit any aspects potential to be destructive. It occurs before response to emotion fully appears and determines certain physiological reaction and behavior.

Gross (in Evers, Stock and Ridder, 2010) stated that emotion regulation is an individual’s effort of making influence on emotions they own, how the emotions are experienced and expressed. The purpose of emotion regulation is not only to reduce negative emotions but also to increase positive emotions. However, it depends on situation. One perhaps expects to increase or express negative emotion and stop or reduce positive emotion (Gross; Tamir, Chiu & Gross, in Wadlinger & Isaacowitz, 2011). Accordingly, emotion regulation can be defined as keeping any desired emotion status and ending unwanted emotion status (Gross, Richard, & John, 2006; Wadlinger & Isaacowitz, 2011). Gross (in Bosse, Pontier, & Treur, 2007) identifies 5 factors of emotion that can be regulated in the process of emotion, namely 1) situation selection, 2) situation modification, 3) attentional deployment, 4) cognitive change, and 5) response modulation in terms of experiences, behavioral responses or physiological responses.

First, in emotion regulation strategy through *situation selection,* one opts to be in a situation that suits their emotional response level. Second, emotion regulation strategy through *situation modification* is done to obtain different levels of emotion. Third, emotion regulation strategy through *attentional deployment* aims to alternate attention to certain other aspect. Fourth, emotion regulation strategy through *cognitive change* is a way of deciding a cognitive meaning of an incident. A special kind of cognitive change, which aims to reduce emotion, is a *reappraisal* of a situation that is potential to generate certain emotion so that any emotional impact can be reduced. Fifth, emotion regulation strategy through *response modulation* is a strategy focusing on response. It is applied after any liable emotion response has been created. People try to influence the process of response tendency to be behavior response. One specific of response modulation is *suppression*, in which an individual impedes any on-going expression of behavior. John & Srivastata (in John & Gross, 2004) stated that there is differences in emotion regulation of adults caused by the variation of their personality dimensions.

Feist and Feist (2006) defined personality as a pattern that relatively settles, consisting of unique traits, dispositions or characteristics within an individual that show some consistent measures about his/her behavior. Traits are constant patterns of an individual’s behavior, feeling and thinking. Most researchers with this approach use procedure of factor analysis statistics to determine basic traits existing in an individual’s personality (Pervin & John, 2001).

In 1963, Norman (in Pervin & John, 2001) did a research using factor analysis, and found five basic factors of personality. According to *Five Factor Model* (FFM) *of traits*, personality is described in the form of five major dimensions (McCrae & Costa Jr., in Pervin & John, 2001). These five basic dimensions are *Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness.*  According to Howard (in Pervin, 2001), neuroticism is different from emotion stability in identifying negative emotion, including anxiety, sadness and tension. Extraversion and agreeableness summarize interpersonal trait, which represents an individual’s relationship with others. An extravert individual has tendency to be active, both physically and verbally, while an introvert one tends to be dependent and aloof. Agreeableness refers to tendency of prioritizing social interest. A person with trait is caring, supportive, sympathetic and warm. They are not self-centered persons who are easily to be envious. Conscientiousness refers to an individual with personality that tends to focus their attention to goals and hardworking to achieve the goals. They are career-oriented. In addition, they are flexible, more impulsive, convincing in doing their jobs. Openness to experience is characterized by discretion, profoundness and mental complexity.

John and Srivastava (Gross, 2007) explained about the relationship between each personality trait and strategy of emotion regulation. Conscientiousness socially determines control of impulse that mediates goal-accomplishing behaviors such as thinking before doing, cancelling happiness, following the norms, planning, and managing and prioritizing jobs. These behaviors make it easy to do situation selection. And individual with high conscientiousness also often modifies situation; they prefer modifying something over situation that generates negative emotions, making interaction with friends or behaving to reduce negative emotion. In addition, they also do attentional deployment to accomplish their goals. Focusing on job and deploying attention to relevant goal is one of the characteristics of conscientiousness.

According to John and Srivastava (Gross, 2007), *extraversion* obviously shows persons with high enthusiasm for social life; they are assertive, gregarious and energetic. They tend to always have positive emotions, yet having freedom to express negative ones. They are very careful in selecting situation, opting more to approach situations that are potentially beneficial for them or those potentially generating positive emotions. In contrast, introvert individuals tend to avoid or withdraw from many situations.

*Neuroticism* is opposite to stability of emotion. It involves emotions like anxiety, worry, sadness and tension. In general it has negative relationship with the strategy of emotion regulation. Neurotic individuals hardly believe that others can change their emotions and their emotions are hard to be controlled (Gross, 1998). They tend to be pessimistic in making any strategy for regulating their emotions because they are afraid of going through failure. *Openness to experience* is a personality trait belonging to the *Big Five*. Individuals with this trait have wide-ranging, deep cognitive contents and authentic and complex life experiences. Their openness to others’ emotional situations in general enables them to be optimistic individuals and to make strategy of cognitive change. In addition, they also are good in using the strategies of situation selection and situation modification, depending on any situation they face.

*Agreeableness* refers to interpersonal relationship in the future. It is opposed to traits like disbelief in others, egoism, antagonism. In general it cannot be predicted what emotion regulation strategy will be used because the effect of agreeableness depends on specific relationship in the future. Individuals with high score of agreeableness tend to pay attention to others’ interest more that their own interests. Consequently, they do not try hard to change situation while regulating emotion.

According to Matsumoto (2006), there is possible relationship between other personality traits and emotion regulation as found by Costa and MacCrae; for instance, between neuroticism and negative expression, between agreeableness and positive emotion, between conscientiousness and positive emotion. In addition, Matsumoto and Terracena (Matsumoto, 2008) found a relationship between openness and ability to recognize emotion. John and Srivastata (John & Gross, 2004) stated that there is differences in neuroticism and extraversion within the development of the use of reappraisal and suppression strategies. It is supported by the research done by Li, Shi and Wang (2009). They found that there is relationship between extraversion, neuroticism and positive and negative emotions, with mediation by the contribution of reappraisal and suppression.

Based on the existing theories and previous research, the hypothesis of this research was:

1. There is correlation between personality and *situation selection* strategy
2. There is correlation between personality and *situation modification*
3. There is correlation between personality and *attentional deployment*
4. There is correlation between personality and *cognitive change/Reappraisal*
5. There is correlation between personality and *response modulation/suppression*

**Method**

**Subjects**. The subjects of this research were students of the Faculty of Psychology of Gadjah Mada University from the classes of 2010 and 2012. There were 339 students participating in this study as subjects.

**Variables of the Research.** It used *free variables* in the form of personality traits of the *Big Five*, namely *Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness to experience.* Its’ *dependent Variable* were two strategies of emotion regulation, namely the *Antecedent focused emotion regulation* consisting of *Situation Selection* (SS), *Situation modification* (SM), *Attentional Deployment* (AD) and *Cognitive Change* (CC)/*Reappraisal,* and the *Response focused emotion regulation* consisting of *Suppression* only.

***Scale used*.** a) *Big Five Personality Factor* (adapted by Ramdhani et al., 2008 from John & Srivasta). The scale of personality consists of 5 traits, namely *Extraversion, Agreeableness, Openness to experience, conscientiousness and neuroticism*. The number of item was 44. The item scores moved from not very suitable’ (1), ‘not suitable’ (2), ‘rather suitable’ (3), suitable’ (4) and ‘very suitable’ (5) for both favorable and unfavorable items. The score of each factor showed the high or low degree of each factor of the related individual. b) Emotion Regulation Scale is a modification of *Emotion Regulation Questionnaire* (ERQ) made by Gross and John (1998), consisting of 10 items, 6 of which expose reappraisal strategy and 4 others exposing *suppression* strategy. In this research the scales arranged by the researcher were 38 items, which contained all types of emotion regulation strategy, as suggested by Gross (2007) for the next research of measuring the antecedent focused strategies, not only cognitive change or reappraisal but also *situation* *selection, situation modification, attentional deployment* and *suppression.* The item scores moved from ‘not very suitable’ (1), ‘not suitable’ (2), ‘rather suitable’ (3), suitable’ (4) and ‘very suitable’ (5), applicable otherwise for unfavorable items. The high or low scale of the emotion regulation strategy used was shown from the scores obtained by each strategy.

***Procedure of the Research*.** Data collecting was done at the Faculty of Psychology, Gadjah Mada University using two scales, namely Personality Scale and Emotion Regulation Scale. Out of 346 copies of the scales having been filled, 339 could be analyzed because the other 7 were not complete. The data were analyzed using multiple regression analysis statistics with *stepwise* method. In this case, regression analysis was conducted for 5 times; 5 traits of personality were correlated with every type of emotion regulation strategy. The next step was to find out how effective contribution of each personality trait to each emotion regulation strategy was.

**Results**

In short, the co-efficiency of the correlation of moment product resulted by multiple-regression analysis on the contribution of personality in emotion regulation strategy can be seen on Table 1.

Table 1

Based on the Table 1 it can be known that:

1. There was positive correlation between *Extraversion* and *Situation modification* (SM)*, Attentional deployment* (AD), and *Cognitive Change* ( CC); negative correlation between *extraversion* and *selection situation* (SS) and *suppression* (sup).
2. There was positive correlation between *Agreeableness* and *Situation modification* (SM), *Attentional Deployment* (AD)and *Cognitive Change* (CC); no correlation between *Agreeableness* and *Selection Situation* (SS) *and Suppression* (Sup)
3. There was positive correlation between *Conscientiousness* and *situation modification* (SM) and Cognitive change (CC); negative correlation between *Conscientiousness* and *Selection Situation* (SS) and *Suppression* (Sup);

no correlation between *Conscientiousness* and *Attentional Deployment* (AD)

1. There was positive correlation between *Neuroticism* and *Selection situation (SS) Attentional Deployment* (AD); negative correlation between *Neuroticism* and *Cognitive Change* (CC); no correlation between *Neuroticism* and *Situation modification* (SM)and *Suppression* (Sup)
2. There was positive correlation between *Openness* and *Situation Modification* (SM*)* and *Cognitive Change* (CC); no correlation between Openness and *Selection situation* (SS) *Attentional Deployment* (AD)and *Suppression* (Sup)

The effective contribution of personality to emotion regulation strategy can be seen on Table 2

Table 2

From the Table 2 can be found out that

1. The *Situation Selection* strategy was supported by *extraversion, conscientiousness* and *neuroticism.* The biggest effective contribution obtained from the personality factor of Neuroticism amounted to 9.76% of the total contribution of personality as many as 10.45%.
2. The *situation Modification* strategy was supported by *Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness* and *Openness to experience.* The biggesteffective contribution obtained from the personality factor *Extraversion* amounted to 10.94% of the total contribution of personality as many as 21.29%.
3. The *Attentional Deployment* strategy was supported by *Extraversion, Agreeableness* and *Neuroticism.* The biggest effective contribution obtained from the personality factor of Neuroticism amounted 4.11% of the total contribution of personality as many as 8.66%
4. *Cognitive Change*/*Reappraisal* was supported by all big five personality factors. The biggest effective contribution obtained from the personality factor of *Agreeableness,* amounted to 15.88% of the total contribution of personality as many as 20.74%.
5. *Response Modulation/Suppression* was supported by *Extraversion* and *Conscientiousness* (both negatively correlating with *Suppression*). The biggest effective contribution obtained from the personality factor of *Extraversion* amounted to 22.69% of the total contribution of personality as many as 26.22%

**Discussion**

As described on Table 1, *neuroticism* had the biggest correlation with the *situation selection* strategy (*r=.312)* and had the biggest effective contribution (9.76%) of the total contribution of personality (10.45%) in conducting this strategy. Gross and John said that the higher score of neuroticism an individual has, the higher level is their anxiety, worry, sadness and tension they feel, so that in facing a situation of negative emotion there is a tendency of opting other situation to get rid of or reduce these emotions. It is an act of avoidance. It is strengthened by the judgment of Schimmack et al (Matsumoto, 2006) that neuroticism correlates with experience of negative emotion,

*Conscientiousness*, even a little, contributed to *Situation Selection* strategy (.87%). Gross (1998) stated that conscientiousness has positive correlation with situation selection. However, in this study, negative correlative was found between them, meaning the bigger conscientiousness was, the smaller the use of situation selection strategy was. It was possible because an individual with conscientiousness tends to focus their attention to goal and to work very hard to accomplish the goal (Pervin, 2001). It is supported by an example given by Gross (2007), stating that students who get high score of conscientiousness will feel uncomfortable if they have not completed their papers until the due time. Cate (Gross, 2007) also found that individuals with conscientiousness are predicted to have a little regret because of being so careful in selecting situation and consistent to their plans and goal-achieving efforts. *Extraversion*’s contribution to situation selection strategy was small (.034%). It was in accordance with Gross’ statement (2007) that extravert persons are careful in selecting situation.

*Agreeableness* did not correlate with the situation selection strategy. It suited Gross’ finding that the effects of agreeableness depend on specific relationship in the future. An individual with high score of agreeableness is more attentive to other people’s interests than that their own interest so that they do not strive to select or change any situation while regulation their emotion. *Openness to experience* does not correlated to the strategy of situation selection too because it is open to any feeling, receiving any emotion as it is (Gross, 2007).

From the Table 2 and its explanation, it can be seen that extraversion had the highest correlation and the biggest effective contribution to the strategy of situation selection (10.94%). It was in line with the theory formulated by Gross (2007) that extraversion belongs to individuals who are full of enthusiasm in social activities; they are assertive, sociable, active and inclined to positive emotions. They have freedom in expressing both positive and negative emotions. Therefore, they have courage to do situation modification if necessary. The contribution of agreeableness to situation modification was 5.64%. According to Gross (2007), individuals with high agreeableness will consider others’ attitudes and emotions in certain situations. For example, if they see others sad and obviously in need of help, they will help to make situation modification in order to reduce negative emotion. According to Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz (Gross, 2007), it is believed that individuals with high score of agreeableness will strive to modify situation while regulating their emotions.

*Openness to experience* contributed as many as 3.52% to *situation modification* strategy. The openness and acceptance to emotions as they are in general enable individuals with high openness to experience to be more optimistic in doing situation modification, depending on situation needed. Although it was not so big (1.97%), conscientiousness also contributed to situation modification. According to Gross (2007), the use of situation modification strategy can be seen in individuals who love to change any situation that generates negative emotions, to interact with friends or to behave in certain way to reduce negative emotion.

The score of *Neuroticism’s* contribution to situation modification strategy was negative (-.97%). According to Gross and John (1998), neurotic individuals less believe that other people can change their emotion and they are pessimistic in doing any strategy because they are afraid of failure. It becomes an obstacle for them to be brave to change situation.

*Neuroticism* gave the biggest contribution to *Attentional Deployment* strategy (4.11%). Gross and John (1998) stated that the bigger score of neuroticism an individual have, the higher degree of anxiety, worry, sadness and tension they have, so that in facing negative emotion there is inclination in them to eliminate or reduce the anxiety, such as by avoiding it or focusing attention to other object that makes them more calm.

*Agreeableness* became a predictor of the need of doing *attentional deployment* (its effective contribution was 2.4%). To get out of or to avoid certain situation, it is necessary to know how the individual’s attitude and feeling is related to other individuals in the situation because essentially an individual with high agreeableness is more dependent on other individuals. Meanwhile, the extraversion personality also had contribution to *Attentional Deployment* strategy (SE=1.89%). According to Gross and John (1008), it is possible because an individual with high score of extraversion love to express their emotions, both the positive and negative ones. An extravert individual will use physical activity or try to do other activity to reduce negative emotion if they are not able to change situation.

Table 2 shows that cognitive change was predicted by the *Big Five Personality Factors*. The biggest effective contribution was obtained from *agreeableness* (SE=15.88% out of 26.74% of total personality contribution). Individuals with high agreeableness prioritize others’ interest that that of their own. Therefore, they can make necessary cognitive change in order to create harmony. It does not oppose Gross’ view (2007) that the relationship between agreeableness and any strategy of emotion regulation is indecisive, depending on many considerations.

Regarding the contribution of conscientiousness to cognitive change, individuals with conscientiousness socially determine the control of impulse that mediates them to behave in a way of achieving goal. They focus their attention to goal and hard work to achieve the goal such as by thinking before acting, following the existing norms, planning and managing tasks (Gross, 2007). Therefore, it is possible for individuals with high conscientious will make cognitive change in order to achieve their goals. *Extraversion* shows traits of openness, liking of situations that potentially generate positive emotions, and optimism. Consequently, it is possible for them to implement cognitive change strategy in order to reduce negative emotions and to increase positive emotions.

*Openness to experience* is one of the big five personality that has many wide-ranging, deep cognitive contents and has authentic and complex life experiences. The openness and acceptance to any emotion in general make individuals optimistic and easy to use strategy of cognitive change. Meanwhile, negative relationship between neuroticism and cognitive change strategy that was found supports the theory proposed by Gross (2007), that neurotic individuals hardly believe that other people can change their emotion and that their emotions are difficult to be controlled (Gross & John, 1998). Therefore, they are pessimistic in doing any strategy for regulating their emotions. They have no enough confidence and ability needed to make effective planning and preparation to avoid negative situations or emotions. They are afraid of experiencing failure, including in doing cognitive change and at last they even do not try to use any potentially effective strategy.

On Table 2 it can be seen that the suppression strategy of emotion regulation in this study obtained effective contribution from personality as many as 26.22%, especially from the extraversion as many as 22.69% and from conscientiousness as many as 2.05%. However, if seen their correlations, both had negative correlation with suppression. Such result suits the theory formulated by Gross and John (1998) that extravert individuals like more to express their emotions, both positive and negative. Meanwhile, introvert individuals tend to withdraw and hide their feelings so that no one can notice. It is strengthened by the results of Gross and John’s research (2003), that there is negative correlation between extraversion and suppression. Whereas, the characteristics of conscientiousness is seen in individuals who tend to focus attention on goals and hard work and express their emotion to achieve the goals. In addition, according to MacCrae & Costa (Matsumoto, 2006), conscientiousness has correlation with positive emotion, while according to Li, Zhanbiao, Wang et al (2009), positive affect and negative affect play a role in mediate reappraisal and suppression strategies of emotion regulation.

From the Table 1 and Table 2 it can be seen that all types of emotion regulation strategy obtained support from personality, each strategy was supported by certain personality factor of the Big Five. Personality’s effective contribution to emotion regulation strategy was varied, ranging from 8.66% to 26.74%. Observed per factor, the effective contribution of personality factors obtained by emotion regulation strategy were from 4.11% to 22.69%. As stated by Gross (2007), there is certain personality factor whose correlation with personality is indecisive. It can be positive or negative, depending on other factors and certain subject’s considerations. For example, the factor of agreeableness had positive correlation with cognitive change (*r*=.450; *p*<.05). It can occur because the individuals consider others’ interest so that they need to make cognitive change. Similarly it is in the correlation between agreeableness and situation modification. Gross (2007) stated that individuals with high score of agreeableness tend not to make situation modification because they want to keep the harmony or others’ interests and not to prioritize their own interest. However, in this study its correlation with situation modification was positive and significant (*r* = .309; *p*<.05).

**Conclusion**

Based on the data analysis and explanation, it can be concluded that all types of emotion regulation strategy obtained support from personality, each strategy was supported by certain personality factor of the Big Five.

1. There are three factors of personality together (*neuroticism*, *conscientiousness* and *extraversion*) make 10.45% contribution to the *situation selection* (SS) strategy. The biggest contribution is given by *neuroticism*, while the rest by *conscientiousness* and *extraversion.*
2. There are four personality factors together (*extraversion*, *agreeableness*, conscientiousness and openness) make contribution as many as 21.29% to the *situation modification* (SM) strategy. The biggest contribution from *extraversion*, followed by *Agreeableness*, *Openness* , and *Conscientiousness.*
3. There are three personality factors together (*Neuroticism, Agreeableness* and *Extraversion*) make contribution as many as 8.66% to the *Attentional Deployment* (AD) strategy. The biggest contribution is from *neuroticism* ,followed by *Agreeableness and extraversion*.
4. There are five factors of personality (*Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism* and O*penness* *Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism* and O*penness*) together make contribution as many as 26.74% to the *Cognitive Change* (CC)/ *Reappraisal* strategy. The biggest contribution is from *Agreeableness*, followed by conscientiousness*, extraversion, neuroticism, and Openness to experience.*
5. There are two factors of personality (*extraversion* and conscientiousness.) together make contribution to *response suppression* strategy as many as 26.22%. The biggest contribution is from extraversion, followed by conscientiousness.

Based on this conclusion, it can be suggested that in a research of emotion regulation strategies, it need to calculate the scale of the contribution of personality factors.
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Table 1

Summary of the results of multiple regression analysis with *stepwise* method on the contribution of personality to emotion regulation strategy

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Personality** | **SS** | **SM** | **AD** | **CC/**  ***Reappraisal*** | **RM/**  ***Suppression*** |
| **Extraversion** | -.098\* | .384\*\* | .111\* | .337\*\* | -.412\*\* |
| **Agreeableness** | -.065 | .309\*\* | .163\*\* | .450\*\* | -.048 |
| **Conscientiousness** | -.125\* | .257\*\* | .004 | .319\*\* | -.177\*\* |
| **Neuroticism**  **Openness** | .312\*\*  .011 | -.087  .241\*\* | .169\*\*  .046 | -.224\*\*  .173\*\* | -.084  -.038 |
| Information: \*=p<0.05 \*\*=p<0.01; SS = *Situation selection*; SM=*Situation modification*; AD=*Attentional Deployment*; CC=*Cognitive Change*; RM= *response modulation*. | | | | | |

Table 2

Summary of the contribution of personality to emotion regulation strategy

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Personality SS SM AD CC/Reap. RM/Supp**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Extraversion 0.34% 10.94%\* 1.89% 3.63% 22.69%\*

Agreeableness 0.09% 5.64% 2.40% 15.88%\* 0.67%

Conscientiousness 0.87% 1.97% 0.01% 4.21% 2.05%

Neuroticism 9.76%\* 0.79% 4.11%\* 1.87% 2.46%

Openness 0.07% 3.52% 0.27% 1.15% 0.31%

Total effective contribution: 10.45% 21.29% 8.66% 26.74% 26.22%

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Information: \* = the highest contribution obtained from personality factor to emotion regulation strategy SS = *Situation selection*; SM=*Situation modification*; AD=*Attentional Deployment*; CC=*Cognitive Change*; RM= *Response modulation*.