5-2021

The Relationship Between Parental Personality, Attachment, and Subjective Well-Being

Mia Nguyen
Dominican University of California

<https://doi.org/10.33015/dominican.edu/2021.PSY.ST.03>

Survey: Let us know how this paper benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Nguyen, Mia, "The Relationship Between Parental Personality, Attachment, and Subjective Well-Being" (2021). *Psychology | Senior Theses*. 5.
<https://doi.org/10.33015/dominican.edu/2021.PSY.ST.03>

This Senior Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Liberal Arts and Education | Undergraduate Student Scholarship at Dominican Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology | Senior Theses by an authorized administrator of Dominican Scholar. For more information, please contact michael.pujals@dominican.edu.

The Relationship Between Parental Personality, Attachment, and Well-being

Mia Nguyen

Dominican University of California

Abstract

Parents play a critical role in helping children develop into happy and well-adjusted adults. Factors such as secure attachment, parental rearing behaviors, and parental personality all interact to create a developmental context that impacts a child's experience. Attachment between parent and child, for instance, is the foundation of later relationships in life. However, a variety of other parent factors including parental rearing behaviors and parenting style can influence attachment (Roelofs et al., 2006). Parenting styles that are nurturing, authoritative, and emotionally involved have not only demonstrated more secure attachments in children but have also been reflective of parents who score higher in extraversion and openness to experience (Metsäpelto & Pulkkinen, 2003). The present study seeks to examine the relationship between parental personality, adult children's attachment to parental figures, and how these factors ultimately influence subjective well-being. The sample included 115 individuals ages 18-65 recruited through various social media outlets. Participants completed a survey that combined an adapted version of the Big Five Inventory (John & Srivastava, 1999), the short scale of the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (Hills & Argyle, 2002) and the short form of the Adult Scale of Parental Attachment (Michael & Snow, 2014). Results indicated that adult children who perceive their parents as high in extraversion, high in openness, and low in neuroticism are more likely to be securely attached and score higher in well-being. This research bridges the gap in attachment research by identifying its relationship with parental personality and how this ultimately affects children's well-being in adulthood while providing further insight into parental factors that can influence well-being.

**The relationship between parental personality, attachment style,
and subjective well-being**

Happiness is one of the few complex concepts that has yet to be definitively defined. It is often described as a feeling or something that has varying characteristics depending on the individual; however, it holds significant value in people's lives. Not only does a person's perceptions of their happiness greatly impact their physical health and quality of life, but it has a profound impact on their mental health as well (Perneger et al., 2004). Overall, perceptions of happiness have been linked to both objective factors such as income and marital status as well as subjective factors such as health and standard of living (Borooah, 2006). While various factors can impact a person's perceptions of their happiness and overall life satisfaction, someone's quality of life is greatly impacted by family relationships (Diener & Diener 2008). Family relationships have been shown to predict life satisfaction across 31 nations (Diener & Diener, 1976). Specifically, a number of empirical studies have validated the correlation between parental support in terms of basic psychological needs and adolescent happiness (Şimşek & Demir, 2014). Additionally, research examining parental rearing behaviors has also revealed that the warmth shown by mothers towards their children was particularly beneficial in increasing the children's scores on self-reported happiness; however, few studies have identified the role of parental personality in parent-child relationships and happiness (Cheng & Furnham, 2004). Therefore, this study aims to examine how parental personality influences attachment and ultimately happiness in adulthood.

Subjective well-being (SWB), or a person's overall perceptions of their life and general mood, plays a role in how we develop as humans and how we reflect on our past experiences (Diener, 2000). It is a vital component to assessing mental disorders and reflecting on our current

state of mind (Ryff, 2014). While early research in this field mostly focused on happiness, SWB can be defined as people's overall evaluations of their own life (Yang et al., 2008). SWB is not only about who we are, but how we think about our lives. Therefore, SWB is a broad concept that includes the highs and lows of emotions and moods as well as the overall emotional, physical, and mental pleasures and pains that individuals experience (Diener et al., 2002).

Our SWB often interacts with our feelings and how we express these feelings to the outside world; therefore, our ability to assess our SWB is a vital component of tuning into our body and mind (Diener, 2000). Factors that may influence SWB include gender (lower in men), age (increasing with age), perceived general health, nervousness, loneliness, sleep problems, and social support (Wyller et al., 1998). Foundational childhood experiences and relationships with our parents have the potential to one day influence our SWB in adulthood, as our early attachment relationships with our parents set the stage for healthy and happy relationships later on in life (Hudson et al., 2019). The present study aims to utilize the established research in the fields of SWB, parental personality, and attachment to examine the relationship between these three areas. Specifically, this research will determine the role of parental personality and attachment on SWB in adulthood.

Attachment and Parent-Child Relationships

Attachment can be defined as the emotional bond formed between parents and their children (Ainsworth, 1973; Bowlby, 1969). A child's attachment style, broadly categorized as "secure" or "insecure," not only explains their behaviors but also represents what they expect from others in response to their behaviors (Lee & Hankin, 2009). Attachment includes healthy bonds formed between a child and their primary caregiver where the child welcomes contact and uses this person as their secure base to explore the environment. Conversely, insecure attachment

occurs when the infant-caregiver bond is characterized by unwelcomed contact and the child cannot form a secure base relationship to safely and comfortably explore the environment (Shaffer & Kipp, 2014).

Early studies of attachment have traditionally adopted a categorical approach to conceptualizing attachment styles into secure, anxious/avoidant, and anxious/ambivalent (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). A secure attachment is one where the individual has created a healthy bond with their primary caregiver where they are open to exploring the situation. While the child may be upset when separated from their caregiver they are easily comforted at their return. Conversely, an anxious-avoidant attachment leads to little distress when separated from their caregiver while continuing to avoid or ignore the caregiver at their return. These individuals are often sociable with strangers but also tend to ignore or avoid them. Lastly, anxious ambivalent attachment is characterized by little exploration, extreme distress upon being separated from their caregiver, and ambivalence upon the return of the caregiver. These individuals are unsure of their relationship with their primary caregiver and therefore want to be close but resist physical contact (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

Another common conceptualization of attachment styles includes a two-dimensional model of attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance (Crowell et al., 2016; Fraley & Shaver, 2000). This model suggests that there are two underlying dimensions of insecure attachment: attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance (Leitemo et al., 2020). The dimension of anxiety reflects the extent to which someone worries that their parental figure will not be available in times of need whereas the avoidance dimension reflects the extent to which someone distrusts their attachment relationship and therefore chooses to maintain emotional distance (Mikulincer

& Shaver, 2017). Therefore the two-dimensional model analyzes the specific traits and behaviors of anxiety and avoidance in child-caregiver relationships.

A less common, but more detailed method of measuring attachment consists of a model where five patterns of relating are measured. These five patterns include safe, dependent, parentified, fearful, and distant (Michael, 2014). A safe attachment indicates that the parental figure provided comfort and safety resulting in more confidence in the parent's availability and support. A dependent attachment reveals a need for the parent to always be available and potential feelings of helplessness and uncertainty when the parent was not available. A parentified attachment shows that the child felt responsible for meeting the parent's needs and that the child may have experienced feelings of importance and enjoyed being helpful. Fearful attachment displayed fear of abandonment and the belief that the parent will not be available for support. Lastly, a distant attachment often indicates disappointment in the parent's ability to support and be available for the child leading to a desire to distance themselves from the parent. Children who form both fearful or distant attachments with their parent may experience anger towards or frustration with their parental figure. These five patterns are also traditionally tested between the child and the mother as well as between the child and the father to determine attachment for each parental figure (Michael, 2014).

The accumulation of interactions and experiences with a parent gives children the information that is used to form expectations of others. The earliest bonds formed by children with their caregivers have a tremendous impact that continues throughout life (Bowlby, 1988). While there is potential for attachment styles to change and develop throughout a person's lifetime, Bowlby's concept of the internal working model emphasizes that mental representation of our relationship with our primary caregiver becomes a template for future relationships

(Bretherton et al., 1990). For instance, an individual who grew up with a caregiver who failed to care for their needs is more likely to have a maladaptive attachment style in adulthood because their caregiver has conveyed that close relationships should be avoided at an early age. This theory argues that our relationship with our primary caregiver acts as a model for what we expect from our later life relationships and what we believe they should look like (Bowlby, 1988). For example, those who identify as having experienced child abuse reported less secure relationships in both childhood and adulthood compared to those who had not experienced abuse (Styron & Janoff-Bulman, 1997). Adults' romantic attachment and depression scores were also linked to childhood attachment to both parental figures supporting Bowlby's theory that the bonds formed with parents in childhood act as a model for later life relationships and behaviors (Styron & Janoff-Bulman, 1997). Another notable study was conducted over a twenty-year span and found that negative life events (e.g. loss of a parent, parental divorce, life-threatening illness of parent or child, parental psychiatric disorder, physical or sexual abuse by a family member, etc.) were important factors in changes in attachment from childhood to adulthood (Waters et al., 2003). Furthermore, relationships maintained in adulthood seem to possess the same characteristics of childhood attachment (Weiss, 1991).

Not only is attachment a vital component to parent-child relationships that have the potential to influence our relationships later in life, but it also has the potential to influence our SWB. Research has shown that attachment theory is a valid model for understanding happiness and overall well-being (Mikulincer et al., 2003). Individuals who are insecurely attached are significantly more likely to show lower levels of life satisfaction (Temiz & Comert, 2018). Conversely, individuals with secure attachments exhibit higher levels of self-esteem, enhanced psychological resilience, and higher levels of life satisfaction (Temiz & Comert, 2018). Prior

findings have also supported the idea that positive quality family interactions and relationships may contribute to well-being. For example, secure attachment has been found to be positively correlated with well-being whereas attachment anxiety and avoidance have both been negatively correlated with life satisfaction and well-being (Abubakar et al., 2013, Lavy & LittmanOvadia, 2011). Because secure attachment has also been linked to parenting styles that exhibit warm involvement, psychological autonomy granting, and behavioral monitoring/control (Karavasilis et al., 2003), the parenting practices implemented by our parents in childhood may have a downstream effect on our adulthood well-being.

Parenting research has often examined various parenting styles and traits that lead to children's psychological outcomes and general SWB into adulthood (Newland, 2015). To continue exploring the impact of parenting, more recent research has examined how parental personality influences parenting. Parental personality has been shown to specifically influence parental rearing behaviors (Metsäpelto & Pulkkinen, 2003). Research in this area has identified that nurturing parents who are authoritative or flexible, democratic in their parenting, and emotionally involved are more likely to score higher in extraversion and openness to experience (Metsäpelto & Pulkkinen, 2003; Shaffer & Kipp, 2014). Additionally, positive associations were found between secure attachment and benevolent parenting styles (Karavasilis et al., 2003). While this research has been valuable to better understanding how parents impact their children, there has been a lack of research examining parental personality traits such as openness, extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, and conscientiousness and how this ultimately affects the attachment relationship between parent and child. Furthermore, research in this field has connected parental personality to parental rearing and parental rearing to attachment and

subjective well-being but a direct connection has yet to be made between parental personality and attachment and subjective well-being (Oliver et al., 2009, Şimşek & Demir, 2014).

Parental Personality

Personality can be defined as individual differences in the way we think, feel and behave (American Psychological Association [APA], 2020). One model that is often used to measure personality is the Big Five Personality Traits, a five-factor model which includes: openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (John et al., 1991). Overall, these five traits are utilized as a way of predicting an individual's tendencies and typical responses. See Figure 1.

Dimension	Measures	Characteristics of Low	Characteristics of High
Openness	Imagination and expressiveness	Practical, conventional, prefers routine	Curious, wide interests
Conscientiousness	Competence and self-discipline	Impulsive, careless, disorganized	Hardworking, dependable, organized
Extraversion	Sociable and assertive	Quiet, reserved, withdrawn	Outgoing, warm, adventure-seeking
Agreeableness	Cooperative and trustworthy	Critical, uncooperative, suspicious	Helpful, trusting, and empathetic
Neuroticism	Tendency towards unstable emotions	Calm, even-tempered, secure	Anxious, unhappy, prone to negative emotions

Figure 1. Description of dimensions that comprise the Big Five Personality Model (Spielman, 2017).

Personality not only influences our overall interactions with people in our daily lives but it can also have a profound effect on our interpersonal relationships, particularly with our children (Oliver et al., 2009). For example, those high in neuroticism and low in agreeableness are more likely to appear anxious and suspicious of others in social situations (Tang et al., 2016). As a result, this can lead to more negative interactions with new people making it difficult to form interpersonal relationships. A parent who is withdrawn and cold, as well as constantly suspicious and critical of their child is more likely to struggle to form a healthy and communicative relationship with them (Vigouroux, et al., 2017). This could cause the child to mirror their parent's withdrawal, experiencing unstable emotions as a result of not having formed a secure attachment (Auty, et al., 2015). Parental agreeableness has both direct and indirect negative effects on children's psychopathic tendencies, while neuroticism has a positive indirect effect but only through parenting styles that are more controlling and restrictive and parenting with little monitoring and few demands— both of which result in children with less favorable developmental outcomes (Uji et al., 2014). Additionally, openness has a direct negative effect, while extraversion has a direct positive effect on children's psychopathic tendencies (Krupić et al., 2020).

Moreover, parental personality plays a role in the parenting style that parents utilize when interacting with their children (Huver et al., 2010). The primary parenting styles developed by Baumrind (1971) include authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative. Baumrind described authoritarian parenting as very restrictive where the parent sets high demands on the child but provides little to no responsiveness to the child. These parents try to shape, control, and evaluate the behaviors of their children based on an absolute standard. They value and emphasize obedience and respect for authority (Dornbusch et al., 1987). Conversely, permissive parents are

tolerant and accepting of their children using as little punishment as possible. However, these parents also make few demands and rely on the child to self-regulate and become self-reliant (Dornbusch, et al., 1987). Lastly, authoritative parenting– the most favorable parenting style consists of parents who are controlling but flexible, make reasonable demands, and set clear boundaries and expectations. These parents firmly enforce rules and standards while also encouraging independence, individuality, and open communication (Dornbusch, et al., 1987). The foundation set by Baumrind’s parenting style theory paved the way for further research which revealed its relationship to the various personality traits. Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness were all shown to be positively correlated with authoritative parenting. Neuroticism was shown to be negatively correlated with authoritative parenting and positively correlated with authoritarian parenting and permissive parenting. Agreeableness was also shown to be negatively correlated with authoritarian parenting. Finally, conscientiousness and extraversion were negatively correlated with permissive parenting (Cox et al., 2018). Thus, parenting styles are formed by parental personality, both playing an important role in children’s psychopathic tendencies and overall well-being.

The Present Study

Parenting practices clearly have ramifications for downstream attachment and subjective well-being (Diener & Diener 2008). However, there is a lack of research on how parental personality impacts these downstream outcomes. Therefore, this project aims to bridge that gap by assessing how parental personality impacts attachment and how both of these factors ultimately influence subjective well-being in adulthood.

Based on prior research examining the relationship between parental personality and parenting styles, three hypotheses were formulated: (H₁) adult children who perceive their

parents as high in extraversion are more likely to be securely attached and score higher in SWB, (H₂) adult children who perceive their parents as high in openness are more likely to be securely attached and score higher in SWB, and (H₃) adult children who perceive their parents as low in neuroticism are more likely to be securely attached and score higher in SWB.

Methods

Participants

Participants for this study were recruited through various social media outlets. Participants included 115 adults between the ages of 18 and 65 with 20 participants who identified as men, 92 who identified as women, 2 non-binary individuals, and one transgender man. The sample consisted of 47.7% of participants who identified as White, 20.9% of participants who identified as Hispanic or Latino, 2.7% who identified as Black or African American, .09% who identified as Native American, 31.5% who identified as Asian or Pacific Islander, and 8.1% who identified as some other race or ethnicity. Most participant's family size fell into the four or more range with participants' parent's education primarily including a Bachelor's degree.

Measures

Personality Assessment Measure

The Big Five Inventory (BFI) is a five-factor model that measures the personality traits of openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (John et al., 1991). It is a brief survey consisting of a 46-item multidimensional personality inventory. The survey includes short phrases with relatively accessible vocabulary. Responses are indicated on a five-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = *rarely or never* and 5 = *very often*). When scoring the BFI, responses are summated after reverse scoring each subscale. The BFI has demonstrated

good internal consistency in previous research with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from .78 for Openness to .86 for Neuroticism (Exline et al., 2004). While this scale is designed to be a self-report inventory to measure the Big Five dimensions, for the purposes of this study, a version that has been adapted for parents to respond on their children's behalf will be used (John et al., 1991). Additionally, the first statement in the adapted survey will be modified to "my parent is someone who is..." instead of "my child is someone who is..." to accommodate for adult children completing the inventory on their parent's behalf. See Appendix A.

Life Satisfaction Measure

The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire (OHQ) Short Scale is a compact 8-item inventory designed to measure general personal happiness and psychological well-being (Hills & Argyle, 2002). The questionnaire uses a 6-point Likert response format (*1 = strongly disagree, 2 = moderately disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = slightly agree, 5 = moderately agree, and 6 = strongly agree*). Once the appropriate items are reverse scored, the sum of the item scores determines an overall measure of happiness, with high scores indicating greater happiness. The OHQ has been determined to have good internal consistency based on previous research with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .91 (Cooke et al., 2016). See Appendix B.

Attachment Style

The Adult Scale of Parental Attachment Short Form is a 20-item inventory designed to measure adult children's relationship with their parents (ASPA-SF; Snow et al., 2005). The ASPA-SF includes a five-factor subscale that aims to measure attachment dimensions between both mother and father figures in childhood. The five factors include safe, dependent, parentified, fearful, and distant patterns of relating. A safe attachment refers to the extent to which the child felt comfort and security in their relationship with their parent. A dependent

pattern measures the extent to which the child felt a desire for the parent to be available. A parentified attachment measures the extent to which the child felt responsible for meeting the parent's needs. A fearful relationship measures the extent to which the child felt fear of abandonment and lack of support. Lastly, a distant attachment measures the extent to which the child felt disappointed by their parent's ability to support and be available to them. This form was originally designed as a 40-item inventory asking participants to answer the first 20 questions about a mother figure and the second 20 questions about a father figure. However, for this study, participants were asked whether they preferred to answer questions about a mother figure or a father figure. The survey then directed participants to the appropriate 20 questions. This scale has demonstrated high validity and reliability with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from .65 on dependent to .91 on safe for fathers and from .67 on parentified to .92 on safe for mothers. See Appendix C.

Demographics

Participants were also asked demographic questions to gain a better understanding of how these factors may influence the overall study. Demographic questions consisted of items including age, gender, ethnicity/race, parent's education, and family household size. See Appendix D.

Procedures

Participants were recruited through various social media outlets (Facebook, Instagram, and Snapchat) to complete a survey consisting of the BFI, the OHQ, and the ASPA-SF as well as demographic questions. The survey was attached to each post which directed individuals to a secure survey-based website and allowed participants to complete the survey anonymously.

Results

Table 1

[illegible]

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Figure 1. Perceived Parental Extraversion and Safe Attachment

Additionally, there was a positive correlation between perceptions of parental openness and subjective well-being (H_2 , ($r(113) = .391$, $p < .001$)). See Table 1. Findings regarding perceptions of openness also included a positive relationship with safe attachment ($r(113) = .576$, $p < .001$, See Figure 2), a positive correlation with dependent attachment ($r(113) = .321$, $p < .001$), and a negative correlation with distant attachment ($r(113) = -.533$, $p < .001$). See Table 1.

Figure 2. Perceived Parental Openness and Safe Attachment

Lastly, a negative correlation between perceived neuroticism and subjective well-being (H_3 , $(r(113) = -.265, p = .004)$) was found (See Table 1) in addition to a negative relationship between perceived parental neuroticism and safe attachment ($r(113) = -.368, p < .001$). See Figure 3. Perceived parental neuroticism was also found to be positively correlated with both fearful ($r(113) = .248, p = .008$) and distant ($r(113) = .402, p < .001$) attachments while negatively correlated with dependent attachment ($r(113) = -.377, p < .001$). See Table 1.

Figure 3. Perceived Parental Neuroticism and Safe Attachment

Discussion

The extensive literature on parental relationships has supported the idea that parents greatly influence their children's development into adulthood. However, factors such as attachment and parenting styles cover the majority of what has been researched (Newland, 2015), leaving parental personality an uncovered topic. Therefore, the present study aimed to examine the relationship between perceived parental personality, attachment, and subjective well-being. Results revealed that those who perceived their parents as more extraverted, more open, and less neurotic had a safer attachment and scored higher on happiness demonstrating the importance of parent-child relationships in adulthood happiness. Furthermore, results establish a precedent for parenting that would lead to happier adults by encouraging safe attachments.

While earlier research demonstrated that specific parenting styles were correlated with parental personality and that parental attachment can be linked to happiness in adulthood, the

present findings further prior research by connecting all of these pieces (Cox et al., 2018, Campbell et al., 1976). Research in parenting has previously established the direct and indirect effects of each of the Big Five traits on children's psychopathic tendencies as well as how parenting styles are correlated with each of the personality traits (Krupić et al., 2020, Cox et al., 2018). However, the findings in this study further established research by demonstrating the impact of these parental personality traits on parent-child relationships and happiness into adulthood.

As predicted, those who viewed their parents as more open, imaginative, and expressive, were more likely to form an attachment characterized by confidence in the parent's ability to be available and supportive (Spielman, 2017). Those who formed this safe attachment perceived their parental figure as someone who provided comfort and safety resulting in a safe attachment (Michael, 2014). Perceptions of openness and safe attachment with a parental figure also indicated higher levels of happiness in the adult child. Additionally, those who viewed their parents as more extraverted, sociable, and assertive also formed safe attachments and were found to be happier (Spielman, 2017). This indicated a positive relationship between perceived parental extraversion, safe attachment and subjective well-being suggesting that those who perceive their parents as more extraverted are also more likely to form a safe attachment and score higher on subjective well-being. Finally, results pertaining to perceived parental neuroticism or the tendency towards unstable emotions revealed that a negative correlation exists between this personality trait and safe attachment and subjective well-being (Spielman, 2017). Unlike the first two personality traits, those who perceived their parents as more neurotic were less likely to form a safe attachment and more likely to score lower on subjective well-being.

Although relationships between the four other attachments and perceived parental personality were not hypothesized, further analyses revealed that a positive correlation exists between parental openness and dependent attachment and a negative correlation between parental openness and distant attachment. This also supports prior findings in the field of parenting by reinforcing the idea that parents who are more expressive are more likely to have children who form an attachment style characterized by a need for the parent to always be available and potential feelings of helplessness and uncertainty when the parent was not available (Shaffer & Kipp, 2014). Therefore, those who viewed their parents as more open were more likely to form dependent attachments and less likely to form distant attachments. For parental neuroticism, significant findings included positive relationships with both fearful and distant attachment as well as a negative relationship with dependent attachment. That is, those who viewed their parents as more neurotic were also more likely to have distant or fearful attachments and less likely to have dependent attachments. Taken together, these findings support the idea that parental attachment significantly impacts children's well-being into adulthood while also furthering the field in this research by demonstrating that parental personality, specifically, can also impact attachment and ultimately subjective well-being.

Limitations and Future Directions

While these findings greatly contributed to the established work in the fields of parenting, attachment, and subjective well-being, barriers to this study included the lack of diverse participants and potential biases that prevented participants from answering the questions openly and honestly. The participant pool consisted mostly of white women which doesn't capture the general public. While Baumrind's parenting styles established a foundation to better understanding parenting behaviors, more recent studies have argued that the effects of parenting

are influenced by cultural and social contexts (Chao, 2001; Mandara & Murray, 2002). For example, one study found that authoritative parenting was less beneficial for Asian Americans compared to European Americans (Chao, 2001). Another study demonstrated parenting behaviors can be influenced by parental education and income specifically in African American communities (Mandara & Murray, 2002). For Latino parenting, researchers have not only emphasized how each parenting style impacts Latino parents differently when compared to European Americans but the importance of focusing on ethnic subgroups to further understand parenting from a cultural perspective (Calzada et al., 2012). Therefore, further research is necessary to form a more robust and inclusive analysis of how parental personality, attachment, and subjective well-being impacts various ethnic groups. Another limitation included potential biases or hesitancy to answer the survey questions openly and honestly. While participants were told that the survey was anonymous, some participants may not have felt comfortable reporting negative traits about their parents or about their relationship with their parents.

In addition to limitations in participant recruitment, the Adult Scale of Parental Attachment does not indicate a clear distinction between secure and insecure attachment, safe attachment was the only attachment style that was used to indicate a secure attachment. While additional analyses were run to examine the relationship of all five attachment styles with the chosen parental personality traits and subjective well-being, future studies should aim to identify a scale that clearly defines secure and insecure attachment. Prospective studies could also examine the interaction between the other two big five personality traits (consciousness and agreeableness), attachment, and well-being (Spielman, 2017).

Subsequent studies should aim to recruit both parents and their adult children to examine both sides of the attachment relationship and parental personality rather than perceived parental

personality. Additionally, future studies could be conducted with children and their parents when considering how much more of an impact parents can have during adolescent development (Ainsworth et al., 1978). Further research should also address what contributes to the parental personality traits that appear to be harmful to attachment as well as whether personality contributes to attachments with other significant figures (e.g., romantic partners) and how this ultimately impacts subjective well-being.

In understanding factors that can influence subjective well-being, we can better support individuals and their families in raising happier children into adulthood (Diener & Diener, 1976). Developments in perceived parental personality can assist in understanding how it affects future youth and their development into adulthood. Parents can learn to emphasize traits that have more of a positive influence on their relationship with their child. While there are surely multiple factors that can influence a child's subjective well-being in adulthood, parents serve as a foundation for later development and therefore are likely to have a long-lasting impact (Bowlby, 1988). Not only will more positive parental modeling increase the likelihood of happier adults but these adults are also more likely to form happier and healthier long-term relationships in other aspects of their lives (Weiss, 1991). Because the attachments formed with later life relationships often mirror that of our parental attachments, more secure attachments in childhood are more likely to transfer over into adulthood relationships resulting in happier family relationships as these adults begin their own families (Diener & Diener 2008).

With the understanding of how parenting in terms of parental personality and attachment can impact subjective well-being, future parents can learn to positively impact their children's happiness not only through immediate parenting relationships but later life relationships as well. The present study aimed to assess the relationship between perceived parental personality

(specifically openness, extraversion, and neuroticism), safe attachment, and subjective well-being. Significant findings revealed that those who view their parents as more open, more extraverted, and less neurotic are more likely to form a safe attachment and score higher on subjective well-being. These results can be used to better understand how perceived parental personality affects attachment as well as how attachment interacts with subjective well-being. In examining the relationship between parental personality and attachment, we can reflect on how parents can better support their children for more positive socioemotional life outcomes. To further this impact into adulthood, the relationship between parental attachment and subjective well-being was also explored. Because attachment is one of the most vital components to a person's childhood experiences it not only has the potential to influence happiness in childhood but in adulthood as well (Karavasilis et al., 2003). As children carry their learned knowledge from parental modeling and parenting behaviors into their adult lives, they not only learn how to interact with the outside world but how to form relationships as well (Bowlby, 1988). In honing in on what impacts later life relationships, we can hope to encourage more positive interactions and healthier relationship habits in adulthood— both of which will lead to happier and healthier adults (Diener & Diener 2008).

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. N. (2015). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Psychology Press.
- American Psychological Association. (n.d.). *Personality*. Psychology Topics.
<https://www.apa.org/topics/personality>
- Auty, K. M., Farrington, D. P., & Coid, J. W. (2015). Intergenerational transmission of psychopathy and mediation via psychosocial risk factors. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 206(1), 26-31.
- Borooah, V.K. (2006). What makes people happy? Some evidence from Northern Ireland. *J Happiness Stud.* 7, 427–465. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9008-3>
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Clinical applications of attachment theory*. London, England: Routledge.
- Calzada, E. J., Huang, K.-Y., Anicama, C., Fernandez, Y., & Brotman, L. M. (2012). Test of a cultural framework of parenting with Latino families of young children. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 18(3), 285–296.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028694>
- Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., Rodgers, W.L. (1976). The Quality of American Life. Perceptions, Evaluations, and Satisfaction. *Russel Sage Foundation*.
- Chao, R. K. (2001). Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Child development*, 72(6), 1832-1843.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00381>
- Cheng, H., & Furnham, A. (2004). Perceived parental rearing style, self-esteem and self-criticism as predictors of happiness. *Journal of happiness studies*, 5(1), 1-21.

- Chow, C. M., Hart, E., Ellis, L., & Tan, C. C. (2017). Interdependence of attachment styles and relationship quality in parent-adolescent dyads. *Journal of Adolescence*, 61, 77-86.
- Cox, J., Kopkin, M. R., Rankin, J., Tomeny, T., & Coffey, C. A. (2018). The relationship between parental psychopathic traits and parenting style. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(7), 2305–2314. <https://doi-org/10.1007/s10826-018-1057-9>
- Crowell, J. A., Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2008). *Measurement of individual differences in adolescent and adult attachment*. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (p. 599–634). The Guilford Press.
- Bretherton, I., Ridgeway, D., & Cassidy, J. (1990). Assessing internal working models of the attachment relationship. *Attachment in the preschool years: Theory, research, and intervention*, 273, 308.
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 34.
- Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. (2002). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and life satisfaction. *Handbook of positive psychology*, 2, 63-73.
- Diener, M. L., & Diener McGavran, M. B. (2008). *What makes people happy?: A developmental approach to the literature on family relationships and well-being*. In M. Eid & R. J. Larsen (Eds.), *The science of subjective well-being* (p. 347–375). Guilford Press.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child development*, 1244-1257. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1130618>

- Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions. *Review of General psychology*, 4(2), 132-154.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511.
- Hudson, N. W., Lucas, R. E., & Donnellan, M. B. (2019). The development of subjective well-being across the lifespan. In D. P. McAdams, R. L. Shiner, J. L. Tackett, D. P. McAdams (Ed), R. L. Shiner (Ed), & J. L. Tackett (Ed) (Eds.), *Handbook of personality development*. (pp. 503–517). The Guilford Press.
- Huver, R. M., Otten, R., De Vries, H., & Engels, R. C. (2010). Personality and parenting style in parents of adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 33(3), 395-402.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.07.012>
- Karavasilis, L., Doyle, A. B., & Markiewicz, D. (2003). Associations between parenting style and attachment to mother in middle childhood and adolescence. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27(2), 153-164.
- Krupić D., Ručević S., Vučković S. (2020) From parental personality over parental styles to children psychopathic tendencies. *Current Psychology: A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues*. doi:10.1007/s12144-020-00676-6
- Lee, A., & Hankin, B. L. (2009). Insecure attachment, dysfunctional attitudes, and low self-esteem predicting prospective symptoms of depression and anxiety during adolescence. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 38(2), 219–231.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1537441080269839>

- Leitemo, K., Vestbø, H. S. B., Bakali, J. V., & Nissen-Lie, H. A. (2020). The role of attachment anxiety and avoidance for reduced interpersonal problems in training group analytic therapy. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 24(1), 26–41.
<https://doi-org/10.1037/gdn0000112>
- Li, X., & Zheng, X. (2014). Adult attachment orientations and subjective well-being: Emotional intelligence and self-esteem as moderators. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 42(8), 1257–1266. <https://doi-org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.8.1257>
- Mandara, J., & Murray, C. B. (2002). Development of an empirical typology of African American family functioning. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16(3), 318–337.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.16.3.318>
- Metsäpelto, R.-L., & Pulkkinen, L. (2003). Personality traits and parenting: Neuroticism, extraversion, and openness to experience as discriminative factors. *European Journal of Personality*, 17(1), 59–78. <https://doi-org./10.1002/per.468>
- Michael, A. A. (2014). The adult scale of parental attachment-short form: item selection, factor structure, and psychometric properties.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2017). Augmenting the sense of attachment security in group contexts: The effects of a responsive leader and a cohesive group. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 67, 161–175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00207284.2016.1260462>
- Muris, P., Meesters, C., & van den Berg, S. (2003). Internalizing and externalizing problems as correlates of self-reported attachment style and perceived parental rearing in normal adolescents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 12(2), 171–183.
<https://doi-org/10.1023/A:1022858715598>

- Newland, L. A. (2015). Family well-being, parenting, and child well-being: Pathways to healthy adjustment. *Clinical Psychologist*, 19(1), 3-14.
- Oliver, P. H., Guerin, D. W., & Coffman, J. K. (2009). Big five parental personality traits, parenting behaviors, and adolescent behavior problems: A mediation model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(6), 631-636. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.05.026>.
- Perneger, T. V., Hudelson, P. M., & Bovier, P. A. (2004). Health and happiness in young Swiss adults. *Quality of Life Research*, 13(1), 171-178.
- Roelofs, J., Meesters, C., Ter Huurne, M., Bamelis, L., & Muris, P. (2006). On the links between attachment style, parental rearing behaviors, and internalizing and externalizing problems in non-clinical children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 15(3), 331-344. <https://doi-org./10.1007/s10826-006-9025-1>
- Ryff, C. D. (2014). Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychotherapy and psychosomatics*, 83(1), 10-28.
- Salcuni S. (2015). New frontiers and applications of attachment theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 273. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00273>
- Shaffer, D. R., & Kipp, K. (2010). *Developmental psychology: Childhood and adolescence*. Wadsworth/Cengage Learning.
- Şimşek, Ö. F., & Demir, M. (2014). A cross-cultural investigation into the relationships among parental support for basic psychological needs, sense of uniqueness, and happiness. *The Journal of psychology*, 148(4), 387-411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2013.805115>
- Spielman, R (2017). Introduction to Psychology. Rice University

- Styron, T., & Janoff-Bulman, R. (1997). Childhood attachment and abuse: Long-term effects on adult attachment, depression, and conflict resolution. *Child abuse & neglect*, 21(10), 1015-1023. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134\(97\)00062-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(97)00062-8)
- Tang, E., Luyten, P., Casalin, S., & Vliegen, N. (2016). Parental personality, relationship stress, and child development: A stress generation perspective. *Infant and Child Development*, 25(2), 179–197. <https://doi-org/10.1002/icd.1922>
- Temiz, Z. T., & Comert, I. T. (2018). The relationship between life satisfaction, attachment styles, and psychological resilience in university students. *Düşünen Adam: Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences*, 31(3), 274–283. <https://doi-org/10.5350/DAJPN2018310305>
- Uji, M., Sakamoto, A., Adachi, K., & Kitamura, T. (2014). The impact of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles on children's later mental health in Japan: Focusing on parent and child gender. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(2), 293-302. <https://doi-org/10.1007/s10826-013-9740-3>
- Waters, E., Merrick, S., Treboux, D., Crowell, J., & Albersheim, L. (2000). Attachment security in infancy and early adulthood: A twenty-year longitudinal study. *Child development*, 71(3), 684-689. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00176>
- Weiss, R. S. (1991). The attachment bond in childhood and adulthood. *Attachment across the life cycle*, 8, 66-76.
- Wyller, T. B., Holmen, J., Laake, P., & Laake, K. (1998). Correlates of subjective well-being in stroke patients. *Stroke*, 29(2), 363-367.
- Yang, A., Wang, D., Li, T., Teng, F., & Ren, Z. (2008). The impact of adult attachment and parental rearing on subjective wellbeing in Chinese late adolescents. *Social Behavior and*

Personality: An International Journal, 36(10), 1365–1378.

<https://doi-org./10.2224/sbp.2008.36.10.1365>

APPENDIX A

Big Five Inventory

BFI-46-A: Here are some statements that may or may not describe what your parent is like. In the blank next to each statement, write the number that shows how much you agree or disagree that it describes your parent. For example, do you agree that your parent is someone who is bossy? Write a **5** if you agree strongly, a **4** if you agree a little, a **3** if you neither agree nor disagree, a **2** if you disagree a little, or a **1** if you disagree strongly.

1 Disagree Strongly	2 Disagree a little	3 Neither agree nor disagree	4 Agree a little	5 Agree strongly
---------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

I see my parent as someone who...

1. _____ Is talkative
2. _____ Tends to find fault with others
3. _____ Does things carefully and completely
4. _____ Is depressed, blue
5. _____ Is original, comes up with new ideas
6. _____ Reserved; keeps thoughts and feelings
to self
7. _____ Is helpful and unselfish with others
8. _____ Can be somewhat careless
9. _____ Is relaxed, handles stress well.
10. _____ Is curious about many different things
11. _____ Is full of energy
12. _____ Starts quarrels with others
13. _____ Is a reliable worker
14. _____ Can be tense
15. _____ Is clever, thinks a lot
16. _____ Generates a lot of enthusiasm
17. _____ Has a forgiving nature | 18. _____ Tends to be disorganized
19. _____ Worries a lot
20. _____ Has an active imagination
21. _____ Tends to be quiet
22. _____ Is generally trusting
23. _____ Tends to be lazy
24. _____ Doesn't get easily upset, emotionally
stable
25. _____ Is creative and inventive
26. _____ Takes charge, has an assertive
personality
27. _____ Can be cold and distant with others
28. _____ Keeps working until things are done
29. _____ Can be moody
30. _____ Likes artistic and creative experiences
31. _____ Is sometimes shy, inhibited
32. _____ Is considerate and kind to almost
everyone |
|--|---|

33. _____ Does things efficiently (quickly and correctly)	41. _____ Doesn't like artistic things (plays, music)
34. _____ Stays calm in tense situations	42. _____ Likes to cooperate; goes along with others
35. _____ Likes work that is the same every time (routine)	43. _____ Is easily distracted; has trouble paying attention
36. _____ Is outgoing, sociable	44. _____ Knows a lot about art, music, or books
37. _____ Is sometimes rude to others	45. _____ Is the kind of person almost everyone likes
38. _____ Makes plans and sticks to them	46. _____ People really enjoy spending time with
39. _____ Gets nervous easily	
40. _____ Likes to think and play with ideas	

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), New York: Guilford Press.

SCORING INSTRUCTIONS

To score the BFI, you'll first need to **reverse-score** all negatively-keyed items:

Extraversion: 6, 21, 31
 Agreeableness: 2, 12, 27, 37
 Conscientiousness: 8, 18, 23, 43
 Neuroticism: 9, 24, 34
 Openness: 35, 41

To recode these items, you should subtract your score for all reverse-scored items from 6. For example, if you gave yourself a 5, compute 6 minus 5 and your recoded score is 1. That is, a score of 1 becomes 5, 2 becomes 4, 3 remains 3, 4 becomes 2, and 5 becomes 1.

Next, you will create scale scores by **averaging** the following items for each B5 domain (where R indicates using the reverse-scored item).

Extraversion: 1, 6R 11, 16, 21R, 26, 31R, 36
 Agreeableness: 2R, 7, 12R, 17, 22, 27R, 32, 37R
 Conscientiousness: 3, 8R, 13, 18R, 23R, 28, 33, 38, 43R
 Neuroticism: 4, 9R, 14, 19, 24R, 29, 34R, 39
 Openness: 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35R, 40, 41R, 44

Optional items:

Liking: 45, 46

APPENDIX B

Oxford Happiness Questionnaire- Short Scale

Oxford Happiness Questionnaire--Short Scale OHQ

Items

INSTRUCTIONS. Below are a number of statements about happiness. Would you please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each by entering a number alongside it according to the following code:

1 = strongly disagree;	2 = moderately disagree;	3 = slightly disagree;
4 = slightly agree;	5 = moderately agree;	6 = strongly agree.

You will need to read the statements carefully because some are phrased positively and others negatively. Don't take too long over individual questions; there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers and no trick questions. The first answer that comes into your head is probably the right one for you. If you find some of the questions difficult, please give the answer that is true for you in general or for most of the time.

1. I don't feel particularly pleased with the way I am. (—)	_____
3. I feel that life is very rewarding.	_____
12. I am well satisfied about everything in my life.	_____
13. I don't think I look attractive. (—)	_____
16. I find beauty in some things.	_____
18. I can fit in everything I want to.	_____
21. I feel fully mentally alert.	_____
29. I do not have particularly happy memories of the past. (—)	_____

Notes. Items marked (—) should be scored in reverse. The sum of the item scores is an overall measure of happiness, with high scores indicating greater happiness.

APPENDIX C

Adult Scale of Parental Attachment- Short Form

ADULT SCALE OF PARENTAL ATTACHMENT-SHORT FORM

Directions: Please answer all of the following questions on the behavior of the person who you most identified as a mother figure while you were a child. This person may have been a step-parent, a grandmother, an aunt, or a woman who was unrelated but a primary caregiver. Choose the person you spent the most time with before age fourteen. Should you feel there was not a person in your life who you considered a mother figure, do not complete this section, but move on to the next section. Answer each question individually and as accurately as possible. Do not worry about consistency across answers; we expect contradictions will exist in some cases.

Survey Item	Scale				
	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Constantly
1. I had my mother with me when I was upset.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I resented my mother spending time away from me.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I was helpless without my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I felt there was something wrong with me because I was distant from my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I put my mother's needs before my own.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I felt abandoned when my mother was away for a few days.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I turned to my mother for many things including comfort and reassurance.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I wish there was less anger in my relationship with my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I enjoyed taking care of my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I got frustrated when my mother left me alone.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I was never certain about what I should do until I talked to my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I often felt angry with my mother without knowing why.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I talked things over with my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
14. It was hard for me to get on with my work if my mother had a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I felt it was best to depend on my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I had a terrible fear that my relationship with my mother would end.	1	2	3	4	5
17. It made me feel important to be able to do things for my mother.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I needed my mother to take care of me.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I wanted to get close to my mother, but I kept pulling back.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I usually discussed my problems and concerns with my mother.	1	2	3	4	5

The Adult Scale of Parental Attachment was created by Snow, Sullivan, Martin, and Helm (2005), and later revised by Michael and Snow (2014) into a short form.

ADULT SCALE OF PARENTAL ATTACHMENT-SHORT FORM

Directions: Please answer all of the following questions on the behavior of the person who you most identified as a father figure while you were a child. This person may have been a step-parent, a grandfather, an uncle, or a man who was unrelated but a primary caregiver. Choose the person you spent the most time with before age fourteen. Should you feel there was not a person in your life who you considered a father figure, do not complete this section. Answer each question individually and as accurately as possible. Do not worry about consistency across answers; we expect contradictions will exist in some cases.

Survey Item	Scale				
	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Constantly
21. I turned to my father for many things including comfort and reassurance.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I felt abandoned when my father was away for a few days.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I put my father's needs before my own.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I worried my father would let me down.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I often felt too dependent on my father.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I resented my father spending time away from me.	1	2	3	4	5
27. It was easy for me to be affectionate with my father.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I wish there was less anger in my relationship with my father.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I sacrificed my own needs for the benefit of my father.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I felt it was best to depend on my father.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I got frustrated when my father left me alone.	1	2	3	4	5
32. It was hard for me to get on with my work if my father had a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I talked things over with my father.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I often felt angry with my father without knowing why.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I needed my father to take care of me.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I had a terrible fear that my relationship with my father would end.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I usually discussed my problems and concerns with my father.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I enjoyed taking care of my father.	1	2	3	4	5
39. I felt there was something wrong with me because I was distant from my father.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I was never certain about what I should do until I talked to my father.	1	2	3	4	5

The Adult Scale of Parental Attachment was created by Snow, Sullivan, Martin, and Helm (2005), and later revised by Michael and Snow (2014) into a short form.

APPENDIX D
Demographic Survey Questions

1. What is your age?
2. What is your gender?
 - Male
 - Female
 - Other
3. 1. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin?
 - yes
 - no
4. 2. How would you describe yourself (select all that apply)
 - American Indian/Alaska Native
 - Asian
 - Black or African America
 - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
 - White
 - Other: _____
 - Prefer not to answer.

For the following questions you will be asked about your mother and father. If you have multiple parents, please answer based on who you spend the most time with/raised you. If you only have one parent please only answer the questions that pertain to you.

5. Mother's Education
 - No schooling completed
 - Nursery school to 8th grade
 - Some high school, no diploma
 - High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent (e.g: GED)
 - Some college credit, no degree
 - Trade/technical/vocational training
 - Associate degree

- Bachelor's degree
 - Master's degree
 - Professional degree
 - Doctorate degree
6. Father's Education
- No schooling completed
 - Nursery school to 8th grade
 - Some high school, no diploma
 - High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent (e.g: GED)
 - Some college credit, no degree
 - Trade/technical/vocational training
 - Associate degree
 - Bachelor's degree
 - Master's degree
 - Professional degree
 - Doctorate degree
7. How many people lived in your immediate household while you were growing up (including you)?
- 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6 or more