

# Assessing Parentification in South American College Students: A Factor Analytic Study of a Spanish Version of the Parentification Inventory

Lisa M. Hooper

The Parentification Inventory (PI; Hooper, 2009) was developed to retrospectively assess various levels of parentification (whereby children take on caregiving and parental roles, responsibilities, and relationships reserved for adults). This study examined the underlying factor structure of the first Spanish version of the PI with a sample of 231 South American Latina/o college students. The results showed sound internal consistency and supported an 18-item, 3-component solution. Implications for culturally tailored research and practice are discussed.

**Keywords:** Parentification Inventory, Latina/o culture, caregiving, international college students, psychometric properties

El Inventario de Parentificación (PI, por sus siglas en inglés; Hooper, 2009) fue desarrollado para evaluar retrospectivamente varios niveles de parentificación (el proceso mediante el cual los niños adoptan roles, responsabilidades y relaciones paternales y de cuidadores, normalmente reservadas para adultos). Este estudio examinó la estructura de factores subyacentes de la primera versión en español del PI con una muestra de 231 estudiantes universitarios sudamericanos/latinos de ambos sexos. Los resultados mostraron una firme consistencia interna y afirmaron una solución de 18 elementos en 3 componentes. Se discuten las implicaciones para investigaciones y prácticas culturalmente adaptadas.

**Palabras clave:** Inventario de Parentificación, cultura latina, servicios de cuidado, estudiantes universitarios internacionales, propiedades psicométricas

Parentification connotes a relational and generational process that is prevalent in many families (Boszormenyi-Nagy, 1965; Siskowski, 2009). This family systems process involves a type of role reversal—or role corruption, in severe cases (see Garber, 2011)—whereby children assume developmentally inappropriate caregiving roles, requiring them to assume parental and adult responsibilities in the family of origin (Boszormenyi-Nagy & Spark, 1973; Burton, 2008; Jurkovic, 1997, 1998). This ubiquitous relational process is an important clinical phenomenon that can—but does not always—lead to deleterious outcomes in children and in the adults they become (Byng-Hall, 2002, 2008a, 2008b; Chase, 2001; East, 2010; Hooper, DeCoster, White, & Voltz, 2011; Jankowski, Hooper, Sandage, & Hannah, 2013; Jurkovic, 1997, 1998).

---

*Lisa M. Hooper, Department of Educational Studies in Psychology, Research Methodology, and Counseling, University of Alabama. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lisa M. Hooper, Department of Educational Studies in Psychology, Research Methodology, and Counseling, University of Alabama, PO Box 870231, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487 (e-mail: lhooper@bamaed.ua.edu).*

© 2014 American Counseling Association. All rights reserved.

Parentification and its effects can be carried forward generation after generation (Kerig, 2005; Minuchin, 1974; Minuchin, Montalvo, Guerney, Rosman, & Schumer, 1967). This transmission of parentification across multiple generations has been discussed extensively in the literature (see Byng-Hall, 2008b; Garber, 2011; Howard, 2013). Byng-Hall (2008b) reported on the implicit encouragement and validation that parentification affords to family members, who often repeat compulsive family caregiving across generations. Clinical interviews with members of American families in which parentification exists have often uncovered descriptions of parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents who lived in a family system in which the adults had severe and chronic medical conditions, mental health disorders, or substance abuse or dependence, to such an extent that children were called upon to fill in for the adults in the family. This family ecology engenders, transmits, and thereby sustains the parentification process, roles, responsibilities, and relationships across multiple generations, both inside and outside the family system (e.g., excessive caregiving in relation to one's partner or professional colleagues). The transmission of parentification in a culturally and ethnically diverse 21st-century family system is less clear.

Because of the tendency for parentification and its later effects to extend from childhood into adulthood, counselors, physicians, psychologists, and other helping professionals working with individuals across the life span should have access to measures with reliable and valid scores that can evaluate the degree to which parentification is present in a patient's life. An additional consideration is the extent to which any such instrument is culturally, linguistically, and clinically sensitive (Anderson & Mayes, 2010; Manly, 2006). With the increasing focus on racial and cultural diversity in the human helping disciplines (Chao & Otsuki-Clutter, 2011; Hooper, 2013; McHorney & Fleischman, 2006), discussions and empirical research on the extent to which assessment methods are culturally responsive and relevant are important and timely (National Institutes of Health, 2002). Therefore, one important step in understanding parentification and its aftereffects is ensuring that individuals from racially and culturally diverse backgrounds are included in research studies that examine the factor structure and psychometric properties of instrument scores used in the assessment, diagnosis, and treatment process (Manly, 2006). The parentification literature has overwhelmingly focused on American populations. This study fills a gap in the family psychology, cultural psychology, and parentification literature with a focus on an international Latina/o college student population (East, 2010; Hooper, 2013).

---

## parentification in college students

---

The expansive literature on parentification in American college students has shown that this familial process and its associated roles, responsibilities, and relationships adversely affect many children and can later be linked to adult

psychopathology and poor intra- and interpersonal functioning and outcomes (Chase, 1999; Jones & Wells, 1996; Wells & Jones, 1998). For example, in the context of American college student samples, parentification has been shown to be linked with depressive symptoms and major depressive disorder (Hooper, Doehler, Jankowski, & Tomek, 2012; Martin, 1995), academic underachievement (Chase, Demming, & Wells, 1998), attachment style and trauma (Hooper, Marotta, & Lanthier, 2008; Howard, 2013), characterological and personality disturbances and disorders (Castro, Jones, & Mirsalimi, 2004; Jones & Wells, 1996; Wells & Jones, 1998), substance use and dependence (Hooper, Doehler, Wallace, & Hannah, 2011; Jankowski & Hooper, *in press*; Locke & Newcomb, 2004), and disordered eating behaviors (Rowa, Kerig, & Geller, 2001).

Although a few studies have examined parentification in the context of Latina/o families, specifically among Latino adolescents (East & Weisner, 2009; Jurkovic & Casey, 2000; Jurkovic et al., 2004; Kam, 2011; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009), few, if any, studies have explored parentification in Latina/o college students, and thus in emerging Latina/o adults. In addition, the heterogeneity of the international Latina/o culture and American Latina/o culture must be acknowledged and underscored. These variations in customs, idioms, and language make the study of parentification in Latina/o individuals and families complex and varied (East, 2010; Kam, 2011). Given these likely differences, researchers and scholars may glean knowledge about some Latina/o individuals who have experienced parentification from what has emerged in the literature from the study of Latina/o American adolescents. However, the understanding of a range of antecedents and outcomes among international and American Latina/o families is equally important.

Extrapolating from the results of empirical studies on parentification comprising Latina/o American adolescent participants, findings have suggested that levels of acculturation among family members and language and cultural brokering for family members may relate to levels of parentification and diverse outcomes (Jurkovic et al., 2004). In the context of this literature, the findings are mixed, revealing that parentification can be linked with (a) increased feelings of competence and well-being, as well as (b) decreased levels of emotional, social, and academic functioning. Thus, some researchers have concluded that parentification may be normative, culturally valued, and culturally sanctioned among some Latina/o families. Still, the less adaptive outcomes documented in the literature must be considered as well, such as issues regarding different levels of acculturation among family members, or adolescents' quest to differentiate from the family of origin, which, in conjunction with high levels of parentification, serve as potent risks for pathology and negative outcomes (Hooper, L'Abate, Sweeney, Ganesini, & Jankowski, 2013; Kam, 2011; Kuperminc, Jurkovic, & Casey, 2009).

Notwithstanding this body of literature on parentification in Latina/o adolescents and parentification in American college students, few, if any, studies have explored parentification in Latina/o college students. Furthermore, no studies have examined the factor structure of the measures that assess for

parentification—such as the Parentification Inventory (PI; Hooper, 2009), Parentification Questionnaire (Jurkovic & Thirkield, 1998), and Parentification Scale (Mika, Bergner, & Baum, 1987)—in the context of Latina/o college-age samples.

---

## need for the current study

---

Although considerable research has focused on parentification among American college students, racial and cultural factors and their possible impact on measuring parentification have received scant attention until recently (East, 2010; Hooper, 2013; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009). Because parentification is an important clinical construct, its precursors and outcomes need to be examined in the cultural and ecological contexts in which it takes place (e.g., Latino, Asian, Black, and Indian families, as well as international regions, college students, and underresourced family systems; see Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Cook, 2012; East, 2010; Hooper, 2013; Kam, 2011; Telzer & Fuligni, 2009). Most scholars would agree that research related to parentification should go beyond the borders of the United States. The benefits of exploring this process and construct from a global perspective, with international populations, can help develop and test culturally tailored and ecologically responsive assessment, prevention, intervention, and treatment efforts for parentification (Cook, 2012). As a first step, this study examines the factor structure and internal consistency of a Spanish version of the PI (Hooper, 2009) in a sample of Latina/o college students in South America.

---

## purpose

---

The study sought to determine the psychometric properties (factor structure, reliability) of the scores derived from the Parentification Inventory–Spanish Version (PI-SV). This purpose is divided into two specific aims:

*Aim 1:* Examine the factor structure of the PI-SV.

*Aim 2:* Examine the reliability of the scores/coefficients derived from the PI-SV.

---

## method

---

### PARTICIPANTS

Participants were 231 college students recruited from a university in South America. Participants were primarily never-married ( $n = 217$ ; 94%) young adult students, of whom 67.5% were women ( $n = 156$ ) and 33.5% were men ( $n = 75$ ). Participants ranged in age from 18 to 35 years old, with a mean age of 19.63 ( $SD = 2.28$ ), and represented a range of disciplines (e.g., business, language, education). The self-reported ethnicity of the study sample was 100% Hispanic or Latina/o ( $N = 231$ ). Many participants identified their race

as being the same as their ethnicity. Specifically, 94% identified their race as Hispanic or Latina/o ( $n = 218$ ), 4% as Hispanic-White ( $n = 9$ ), and 0.4% as Hispanic-Black ( $n = 1$ ); 1% did not report their racial background ( $n = 3$ ).

## PROCEDURE

Approval for the study was obtained from the university's institutional review board and permission was granted at the data collection site in South America. Study recruitment took place during visits following classes. The faculty course instructor introduced the researcher to each class. Because the students were bilingual (i.e., English and Spanish speaking), the researcher and university professors described the study in English and Spanish and distributed a packet containing an informed consent form, a demographic information sheet, and the study instrument to the participants. All study materials were provided in Spanish. No incentive was provided for participating in the study.

## MEASURES

*Demographic information sheet.* This questionnaire was created for the study and asked for information about gender, current age, and marital status. Participants were also asked to report race and ethnicity.

*Parentification.* The PI (Hooper, 2009) is a 22-item retrospective self-report measure that assesses caregiving and parental roles, responsibilities, and relationships usually reserved for adults but carried out by children. The PI also measures the perceived benefits of performing family caregiving and parental roles in one's family of origin. Participants respond to the 22 items using a 5-point, Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*never true*) to 5 (*always true*). The PI consists of three subscales: Parent-Focused Parentification (PFP; 12 items), Sibling-Focused Parentification (SFP; seven items), and Perceived Benefits of Parentification (PBP; three items). Items associated with PFP include "I was expected to comfort my parents when they were sad or having emotional difficulties" and "My parent(s) often shared secrets with me about other family members." Items associated with SFP include "I was responsible for making sure that my siblings went to bed every night" and "I was the primary person who disciplined my siblings." Items associated with PBP include "I really enjoyed my role in the family." Each PI subscale score is computed by adding the subscale item scores and then dividing by the number of items in the subscale. The PI overall score is based on the average score of all items. Therefore, scores can range from 1 to 5, with higher total and subscale scores reflecting greater perceived levels or perceived benefits of parentification.

In the original validation study (Hooper, Doehler, et al., 2011), factor analysis resulted in a three-factor solution for the PI items. The study demonstrated the validity of the parentification construct, as measured by the PI scores; internal consistency coefficients ranged from .79 to .84. In two related studies, Hooper and colleagues also found that in their American college student sample, the PI scores were associated with other measures to assess young caregiving (see

Hooper & Doehler, 2012) and psychological distress (measured by scores on the Beck Depression Inventory and the Brief Symptom Inventory; Hooper, Doehler, et al., 2011) in theoretically expected ways. However, a comprehensive review of the literature indicates that no subsequent studies have been conducted using a translation of the PI.

For this study, the PI was translated independently by three individuals. The translation process for the resulting PI-SV involved double (i.e., forward and backward) translation, as recommended by Sireci and Berberoglu (2000). Two Spanish-speaking health care providers completed the first two translations. One college student who is a native Spanish speaker familiar with South American culture completed the third translation. Once the translators established consensus among the three translations, the study commenced.

## DATA ANALYSIS

All analyses were completed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 15.0. The data analysis plan was informed by recommendations put forward by Dimitrov (2012). First, an exploratory approach was used. Second, the plan used principal component analysis to identify coherent constructs that best reflect the various aspects of parentification. With regard to the extraction of components, consistent with Dimitrov's recommendations, several methods were considered, including scree plot, eigenvalue of 1, and an a priori hypothesized number of factors (PFP, SFP, and PBP; based on Hooper, Doehler, et al., 2011). With regard to rotation, the study employed principal component analysis followed by varimax rotation. First, oblimin rotation was considered, expecting that the factors would be correlated based on Hooper, Doehler, et al.'s (2011) earlier findings. Second, given the similarities in findings (i.e., oblimin and varimax), and for ease of interpretation, the results derived from the varimax rotation are reported. Third and finally, the results of the Bartlett's (1954) test of sphericity were reviewed to clarify the factorability of the data and Kaiser-Meyer-Okin to determine sampling adequacy, that is, the ratio of the number of participants to the PI items (Kaiser, 1970, 1974).

## results

---

Table 1 illustrates means, standard deviations, and other descriptive information for the PI-SV factors. Scores on the PI-SV were consistent with other studies composed of American college samples (e.g., Hooper, Doehler, et al., 2011).

### AIM 1 RESULTS: FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE PI-SV

Principal component analysis with varimax orthogonal rotation was performed on the study participants' responses to the 22 items on the PI-SV. Kaiser's (1970, 1974) measure of sampling adequacy was acceptable at a level of .77, suggesting that the items were appropriate for principal component analysis. Additionally, the Bartlett (1954) test of sphericity was significant, also suggesting sampling adequacy for the planned analyses.

**TABLE 1**

**Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the Parentification Inventory–Spanish Version**

Factor	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Item <i>n</i>	$\alpha$
Sibling-Focused Parentification–Spanish Version	1.87	0.63	9	.79
Parent-Focused Parentification–Spanish Version	2.23	0.71	6	.77
Perceived Benefits of Parentification–Spanish Version	4.23	0.82	3	.70
Parentification Inventory–Spanish Version (total score)	2.21	0.47	18	.78

*Note.* *N* = 231.

The analysis used three criteria to evaluate and retain the most meaningful and parsimonious components: (a) assess the percentage of total variance explained by the factors; (b) review Cattell's (1966) scree plot of the factor variances; and (c) retain items loading .30 or higher on only one factor (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001; Worthington & Whitaker, 2006).

In the initial analysis, this study led to the extraction and loading of six components. The six-factor solution was problematic in that several components had overly complex factors—that is, the same items loaded on several components. Additionally, a review of the scree plot demonstrated a clear bend at three factors, suggesting that the Kaiser (1958; Dimitrov, 2012) method produced an overextraction of components. Therefore, the initial interpretation based on the scree plot was that the PI-SV was measuring approximately three components with this international adult population.

To test this observation, and to attempt to increase the clarity among the components, the data were reanalyzed, specifying a three-factor solution. Twenty-one item loadings were estimated above .30, demonstrating good factor saturation. Once again, a review of the scree plot demonstrated a clear bend at three factors. Based on the scree plot and other criteria, the interpretation was that the PI-SV measures approximately three components with this international college student population. A review of the results from the second factor analysis pointed to three complex items (PI-SV02: “My parents shared secrets with me about other members of my family”; PI-SV05: “I helped my parents make important decisions”; and PI-SV22: “I served in the role of translator in my family”). Also, one item did not adequately load on any factor (PI-SV03: “Most children living in my community contributed to their family finances”). Notwithstanding the three complex items and one item that did not load on any factor, interpretation of this second analysis as a three-factor solution is the most parsimonious description and is supported by the visual presentation of the data. In addition, the three salient components or factors represent distinct constructs of parentification.

Together, these three interpretable components (comprising 18 items) explained 42% of the total variance, and the original labels put forward by Hooper, Doehler, et al. (2011) seemed appropriate for the structure in this sample. Factor 1, SFP, explained 22% of the variance and contained nine items;

Factor 2, PFP, explained 13% of the variance and contained six items; and Factor 3, PBP, explained 7% of the variance and contained three items. Additional details about the final rotated component loadings appear in Table 2.

### AIM 2 RESULTS: SCORE RELIABILITY OF THE PI-SV

A review of Table 1 reveals acceptable—that is, for an exploratory study—but low reliability among the study factors that emerged (i.e., the 18 items that produced the three factors). Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were .78 for the overall PI-SV score; the subscale scores were .79 for SFP, .77 for PFP, and .70 for PBP. Correlations among the three factors were all moderate to high (.47 to .71) as measured by Cohen’s conventions (see Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

**TABLE 2**

**Final Rotated Component Factor Analysis and Factor Loadings for the 18-Item Parentification Inventory–Spanish Version (PI-SV)**

Factor, Item Number, and Text	Factor Loading		
	1	2	3
Factor 1: Sibling-Focused Parentification (22% of variance)			
PI-SV06 I was responsible for making sure that my siblings went to bed every night.	.72		
PI-SV11 I was responsible for helping my siblings complete their homework.	.69		
PI-SV13 I was the primary person who disciplined my siblings.	.67		
PI-SV04 I had time to be happy or sad even though I had to care for family members.	.59		
PI-SV08 Most children my age had the same roles and responsibilities that I did.	.51		
PI-SV21 I was asked to complete the grocery shopping more than any other family member.	.50		
PI-SV17 I was in charge of doing the laundry for the family most days of the week.	.44		
PI-SV16 I was expected to comfort my siblings when they were sad or having emotional difficulties.	.42		
PI-SV09 I had time for play or schoolwork even though I had family responsibilities.	.31		
Factor 2: Parent-Focused Parentification (13% of variance)			
PI-SV14 I often helped solve problems between my parents.		.81	
PI-SV12 I was the first person my family members turned to when there was a family disagreement.		.76	
PI-SV01 I was expected to comfort my parents when they were sad or having emotional difficulties.		.69	
PI-SV18 I served in the role of referee for my family.		.67	
PI-SV19 I was the person with whom family members shared their secrets.		.59	
PI-SV10 I worked and contributed to the family finances.		.39	
Factor 3: Perceived Benefits of Parentification (7% of variance)			
PI-SV15 I really enjoyed my role in the family.			.80
PI-SV07 I felt appreciated by my family.			.74
PI-SV20 I felt like our family worked well together.			.50
Eigenvalue	4.61	2.93	1.59

Note. *N* = 231.



## discussion

---

This study examined the psychometric properties of scores derived from a Spanish version of the PI (Hooper, 2009) using a convenience sample of South American Latina/o college students. More specifically, exploratory factor analysis and reliability analysis were used to evaluate the psychometric properties of the PI-SV. The study provides preliminary results indicating that the Spanish version of the PI has a factor structure similar to that reported in the original validation study of the English version.

The findings suggest that the factors (scores) derived from the PI-SV are valid and reliable for this Latina/o college student population. Although this study had fewer items (18 vs. 22) than those found by Hooper, Doehler, et al. (2011) and also produced some items that loaded on factors other than those reported in the original validation study, the findings among South American college student participants showed a factor structure comparable to Hooper, Doehler, et al.'s (2011) study. The findings indicate that the PI-SV may have some utility with South American Latina/o college students. Future research to evaluate the meaningfulness of the current results for other Latino populations is warranted.

With regard to the United States, Latina/o American individuals and families represent one of the fastest growing ethnic minority groups (Humes, Jones, & Ramirez, 2011). Recent findings showed that among recent high school graduate students, more Latino Americans (49%) proceeded to enroll in college than White Americans (47%; Pew Research Center, 2013). Thus, given the substantial growth in Latino Americans attending colleges and universities, it is critical that factors that may enhance or impede academic success be explored. Researchers and practitioners are encouraged to be aware of how Latina/o values, beliefs, and culture interact with psychological distress, psychopathology, and wellness. As evidenced in adolescent-focused studies (e.g., Jurkovic & Casey, 2000; Jurkovic et al., 2004), parentification in college students may engender both competence and hardship in personal and academic domains. Specifically, college counselors, educators, and mentors can help Latina/o college students use the skills garnered from their parentification experience during their college and academic experiences. In addition, knowledge about how the family system and its members may be both a source of encouragement and a burden for many Latina/o college students is important information for counselors to have. Finally, the heterogeneity of the international Latina/o culture and American Latina/o culture makes the implications of parentification in Latina/o college students and families complex and very likely disparate (East, 2010). There could be unique factors that are relevant for some Latina/o students but not for others (e.g., level of acculturation, gender roles, immigration status).

This study is a first step in exploring the psychometric properties of the PI-SV scores. This preliminary study points to the criticality of empirical studies to examine the underlying structure of important family systems constructs,

such as parentification. Future studies would benefit from exploring the construct validity of the PI-SV scores. Researchers are encouraged to examine the psychometric properties of the PI-SV using other analytic procedures, such as confirmatory factor analysis. In addition, researchers should examine the extent to which the PI-SV scores demonstrate test-retest reliability and relate to other constructs in theoretically expected ways (e.g., concurrent and discriminant validity). As previously mentioned, given the heterogeneity evinced among individuals who identify as Latina/o, it will be important to examine the psychometric properties of the PI-SV scores in other samples.

This study also represents an essential step in measuring parentification using the PI-SV in a Latina/o emerging-adult sample. The importance of understanding the cultural context of international Latina/o and Latina/o American families and family members cannot be overstated. These preliminary findings provide some initial evidence that the PI-SV scores are reliable and valid in assessing caretaking roles, responsibilities, and relationships usually reserved for adults in the current South American Latina/o college student sample.

### LIMITATIONS

In conjunction with the study results, it is important to note the preliminary nature of the study findings, as well as several limitations. One limitation was that the results of the principal component analysis were derived from a small sample. The study sample comprised 231 participants, raising the possibility that the obtained factor structure may not be stable. With regard to the number of items in this study, some researchers (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) have argued in favor of having 10 to 15 participants per item to yield a stable factor solution, whereas others have contended that only five participants per item are needed (e.g., Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Thus, given that this study had 18 items and a student sample of 231, a larger sample should be considered in future studies.

In addition, the data in this study were derived from a retrospective information design. The study assumes that the participants accurately reported childhood experiences related to parentification. However, it remains unclear whether childhood roles, responsibilities, and relationships experienced in the family of origin were underreported, overreported, minimized, or denied; thus, the use of retrospective self-report is a limitation of this study (Baker, 2009).

As another limitation, one item related to parentification in general loaded on the SFP factor. It could be that participants in this study associated the described activities (PI-SV09, "I had time for play or school work even though I had family responsibilities") with caring for their siblings, specifically, to a greater extent than they cared for the adults in the family, or the family as a whole (see Hafford, 2010). Future studies should continue to clarify how this item functions in other Latina/o samples and to what extent it may even need to be removed from the PI-SV. Given the exploratory nature of this study, this item was retained.

Finally, other aspects of the study sample limit the results. Specifically, the sample was primarily comprised of women, so the results could be biased by

gender. Additionally, this ethnically homogeneous Latina/o college student sample may not be representative of the general population or the heterogeneous South American or international Latina/o population in particular. All these considerations restrict the generalizability of the study's findings.

### IMPLICATIONS FOR CULTURALLY TAILORED PRACTICE

Incorporating culture into the understanding of parentification and its later effects is paramount. Childhood behaviors that are considered age inappropriate in American family systems may not be relevant to or culturally similar in South American Latina/o family systems. Counselors have indicated that the manner in which some Latina/o children are socialized in their family of origin may differ from how White American children are socialized. Therefore, counselors must assess for diverse experiences related to parentification so that adaptive and culturally sanctioned practices may be identified and explored. For example, counselors can examine to what extent parentification is related to unique antecedents or outcomes for some individuals who self-identify as Latina/o. Asking about and understanding the cultural meaning of family obligations and family caregiving—even excessive caregiving—may produce clinical information unique to South American families. More specifically, parentification might engender feelings of pride and well-being (i.e., a positive sense of familism) in some Latina/o families (see East, Weisner, & Slonim, 2009). Moreover, the sense of and obligation to the family could engender a buffer that protects against the negative effects often associated with parentification, as often seen in American college students, adults, and families (Hooper et al., 2012). It is likely that South American families and individual family members experience a range of outcomes, both beneficial and deleterious, and counselors can therefore use the PI-SV to assess for the differences that may coexist. Counselors can also use the PI-SV to assess whether students have experienced high levels of parentification and to determine how their experiences may affect college persistence, academic success, and intra- and interpersonal functioning.

Parent and child roles, responsibilities, and relationships likely vary based on the cultural and family ecology in which individuals are embedded. Because most of our existing knowledge on the later effects of parentification is with American college, adult, and family populations, the current investigation provides new information and support for an instrument that may be used by counselors and researchers to better understand parentification in culturally diverse, Spanish-speaking populations. Specifically, the PI-SV is an instrument that may be used to assess for parentification in international Latina/o communities. Counselors, physicians, psychologists, and other helping professionals working with individuals across the life span can use the PI-SV with South American Spanish-speaking patients to better understand what aspects of parentification engender competence and high functioning and what aspects may be deleterious and therefore require culturally responsive intervention or treatment. Exploring the cultural relevance of parentification for Latina/o South American families is likely to be beneficial

to college counselors, researchers, mental health providers, and policy makers. It is also important to note that asking questions about parentification during the clinical interview process in college counseling centers or other therapeutic contexts will help providers form culturally tailored assessment, intervention, and treatments for college students, emerging adults, and families when parentification has been experienced.

## references

---

- Anderson, E. R., & Mayes, L. C. (2010). Race/ethnicity and internalizing disorders in youth: A review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 30*, 338–348. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2009.12.008
- Baker, A. J. L. (2009). Adult recall of childhood psychosocial maltreatment: Definitional strategies and challenges. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*, 703–714.
- Bartlett, M. S. (1954). A further note on the multiplying factors for various  $\chi^2$  approximations in factor analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 16*, 296–298.
- Boszormenyi-Nagy, I. (1965). A theory of relationships: Experience and transaction. In I. Boszormenyi-Nagy & J. L. Framo (Eds.), *Intensive family therapy* (pp. 33–86). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Boszormenyi-Nagy, I., & Spark, G. (1973). *Invisible loyalties: Reciprocity in intergenerational family therapy*. Hagerstown, MD: Harper & Row.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burton, L. (2008). Childhood adultification in economically disadvantaged families: A conceptual model. *Family Relations, 56*, 329–345.
- Byng-Hall, J. (2002). Relieving parentified children's burden in families with insecure attachment patterns. *Family Process, 41*, 375–388.
- Byng-Hall, J. (2008a). The crucial roles of attachment in family therapy. *Journal of Family Therapy, 30*, 129–146. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6427.2008.00422.x
- Byng-Hall, J. (2008b). The significance of children fulfilling parental roles: Implications for family therapy. *Journal of Family Therapy, 30*, 147–162. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6427.2008.00423.x
- Castro, D. M., Jones, R. A., & Mirsalimi, H. (2004). Parentification and the imposter phenomenon: An empirical investigation. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 32*, 205–216.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1*, 245–276.
- Chao, R. K., & Otsuki-Clutter, M. (2011). Racial and ethnic differences: Sociocultural and contextual explanations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*, 47–60.
- Chase, N. (1999). An overview of theory, research, and societal issues. In N. Chase (Ed.), *Burdened children* (pp. 3–33). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Chase, N. D. (2001). Parentified children grow up: Dual patterns of high and low functioning. In B. E. Robinson & N. D. Chase (Eds.), *High-performing families: Causes, consequences and clinical solutions* (pp. 157–189). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Chase, N., Demming, M., & Wells, M. (1998). Parentification, parental alcoholism, and academic status among young adults. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 25*, 105–114.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cook, E. P. (2012). *Understanding people in context: The ecological perspective in counseling*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, & Evaluation, 10*, 1–9.
- Dimitrov, D. M. (2012). *Statistical methods for validation of assessment scale data in counseling and related fields*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- East, P. L. (2010). Children's provision of family caregiving: Benefit or burden? *Child Development Perspectives, 4*, 55–61. doi:10.1111/j.1750-8606.2009.00118.x
- East, P. L., & Weisner, T. S. (2009). Mexican American adolescents' family caregiving: Selection effects and longitudinal associations with adjustment. *Family Relations, 58*, 562–577. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2009.00575.x

- East, P. L., Weisner, T. S., & Slonim, A. (2009). Youths' caretaking of their adolescent sisters' children. *Journal of Family Issues, 30*, 1671-1697.
- Garber, B. D. (2011). Parental alienation and the dynamics of the enmeshed parent-child dyad: Adultification, parentification, and infantilization. *Family Court Review, 49*, 322-335. doi:10.1111/j.1744-1617.2011.01374.x
- Hafford, C. (2010). Sibling caretaking in immigrant families: Understanding cultural practices to inform child welfare practice and evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 33*, 294-302.
- Hooper, L. M. (2009). *Parentification Inventory*. (Available from L. M. Hooper, Department of Educational Studies in Psychology, Research Methodology, and Counseling, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487)
- Hooper, L. M. (2013). Parentification. In K. D. Keith (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of cross-cultural psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell
- Hooper, L. M., DeCoster, J., White, N., & Voltz, M. L. (2011). Characterizing the magnitude of the relation between self-reported childhood parentification and adult psychopathology: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 67*, 1028-1043. doi:10.1002/jclp.20807
- Hooper, L. M., & Doehler, K. (2012). Assessing family caregiving: A comparison of three retrospective parentification measures. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 38*, 653-666. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.2011.00258.x
- Hooper, L. M., Doehler, K., Jankowski, P. J., & Tomek, S. E. (2012). Patterns of self-reported alcohol use, depressive symptoms, and body mass index in a family sample: The buffering effects of parentification. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 20*, 164-178. doi:10.1177/1066480711435320
- Hooper, L. M., Doehler, K., Wallace, S. A., & Hannah, N. J. (2011). The Parentification Inventory: Development, validation, and cross-validation. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 39*, 226-241. doi:10.1080/01926187.2010.531652
- Hooper, L. M., L'Abate, L., Sweeney, L. G., Giancesini, G., & Jankowski, P. J. (2013). *Models of psychopathology: Generational processes and relational roles*. New York, NY: Springer-Science.
- Hooper, L. M., Marotta, S. A., & Lanthier, R. P. (2008). Predictors of growth and distress following parentification among college students. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 17*, 693-705.
- Howard, S. (2013). Recognizing the humanity of the victimizer: Clinical and social implications. *International Journal of Psychoanalytic Self Psychology, 8*, 179-194.
- Humes, K. R., Jones, N. A., & Ramirez, R. R. (2011). *Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-02.pdf>
- Jankowski, P. J., & Hooper, L. M. (in press). Parentification and alcohol misuse: Religiosity as a moderator in a proposed conditional effects model. *Counseling and Values*.
- Jankowski, P. J., Hooper, L. M., Sandage, S. J., & Hannah, N. J. (2013). Parentification and mental health symptoms: Mediator effects of perceived unfairness and differentiation of self. *Journal of Family Therapy, 35*, 43-65. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6427.2011.00574.x
- Jones, R., & Wells, M. (1996). An empirical study of parentification and personality. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 24*, 145-152.
- Jurkovic, G. J. (1997). *The plight of the parentified child*. New York, NY: Brunner Mazel.
- Jurkovic, G. J. (1998). Destructive parentification in families: Causes and consequences. In L. L'Abate (Ed.), *Family psychopathology* (pp. 237-255). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Jurkovic, G. J., & Casey, S. (2000, March). Parentification in immigrant Latino adolescents. In G. P. Kuperminc (Chair), *Projecto Juventud: A multidisciplinary study of immigrant Latino adolescents*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology, San Francisco, CA.
- Jurkovic, G. J., Kuperminc, G., Perilla, J., Murphy, A., Ibanez, G., & Casey, S. (2004). Ecological and ethical perspectives on filial responsibility: Implications for primary prevention with immigrant Latino adolescents. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 25*, 81-104.
- Jurkovic, G. J., & Thirkield, A. (1998). *Parentification Questionnaire-Adult*. (Available from G. J. Jurkovic, Department of Psychology, Georgia State University, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303)
- Kaiser, H. F. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 23*, 187-200.
- Kaiser, H. (1970). A second generation Little Jiffy. *Psychometrika, 35*, 401-415.
- Kaiser, H. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika, 39*, 31-36.
- Kam, J. A. (2011). The effects of language brokering frequency and feelings on Mexican-heritage youth's mental health and risky behaviors. *Journal of Communication, 61*, 455-475. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01552.x

- Kerig, P. K. (2005). Revisiting the construct of boundary dissolution: A multidimensional perspective. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 5*, 5–42. doi:10.1300/J135v05n02\_02
- Kuperminc, G. P., Jurkovic, G. J., & Casey, S. (2009). Relation of filial responsibility to the personal and social adjustment of Latino adolescents from immigrant families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 23*, 14–22.
- Locke, T. F., & Newcomb, M. D. (2004). Child maltreatment, parent alcohol- and drug-related problems, polydrug problems, and parenting practices: A test of gender differences and four theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*, 120–134. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.18.1.120
- Manly, J. J. (2006). Deconstructing race and ethnicity: Implications for measurement of health outcomes [Supplemental material]. *Medical Care, 44*, s10–s16.
- Martin, M. T. (1995). *Mother-daughter relations in divorced families: Parentification and internalizing and relationship problems* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.
- McHorney, C. A., & Fleischman, J. A. (2006). Assessing and understanding measurement equivalence in health outcomes measures: Issues for further quantitative and qualitative inquiry [Supplemental material]. *Medical Care, 44*, s205–s210.
- Mika, P., Bergner, R. M., & Baum, M. C. (1987). The development of a scale for the assessment of parentification. *Family Therapy, 14*, 229–235.
- Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families and family therapy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Minuchin, S., Montalvo, B., Guerney, B., Rosman, B., & Schumer, F. (1967). *Families of the slums*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- National Institutes of Health. (2002). *Outreach notebook for the inclusion, recruitment and retention of women and minority subjects in clinical research*. Bethesda, MD: Author.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Pew Research Center. (2013). *CPS historical time series tables on school enrollment*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/school/data/cps/historical>
- Rowa, K., Kerig, P. K., & Geller, J. (2001). The family and anorexia nervosa: Examining parent-child boundary problems. *European Eating Disorders Review, 9*, 97–114. doi:10.1002/erv.383
- Sireci, S. G., & Berberoglu, G. (2000). Using bilingual respondents to evaluate translated-adapted items. *Applied Measurement in Education, 13*, 229–248.
- Siskowski, C. (2009). Adolescent caregivers. In K. Shifren (Ed.), *How caregiving affects development: Psychological implications for child, adolescent, and adult caregivers* (pp. 65–91). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Telzer, E. H., & Fuligni, A. J. (2009). Daily family assistance and the psychological well-being of adolescents from Latin American, Asian, and European backgrounds. *Developmental Psychology, 45*, 1177–1189. doi:10.1037/a0014728
- Wells, M., & Jones, R. (1998). Relationship among childhood parentification, splitting, and dissociation: Preliminary findings. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 26*, 331–340.
- Worthington, R. L., & Whitaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*, 806–838.