The Influence of Family Capital on Children’s Working Memory in New Immigrant Families in the United States

This study investigated how family capital was associated with the working memory of young school-aged children from immigrant families in the United States using the New Immigrant Survey. Family capital was identified as economic, human, cultural, and social capital, and children’s working memory was measured by the Digit Span scores. Poisson regression analysis was used for examining the sample of 428 children from the New Immigrant Survey. Results indicated that cultural capital within the home was positively associated with the working memory of young school-aged children whereas economic, human, and social capital was not. Implications and limitations of the study are also discussed.

The number of children from immigrant families across the United States has been continuously growing. With the current rate of increase, one in three children will be from immigrant families in the United States by 2015 (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2007). Young children under age eight show more diversity in racial/ethnic, linguistic, and family backgrounds than other age groups (Hernandez, 2004; Hernandez, Takanishi, & Marotz, 2009). This diversity offers enrichment of educational and cultural experiences for young children, and it requires the special attention of educators, researchers, and policy makers on the developmental outcomes of this group (Palacios, Guttmanova, & Chase-Lansdale, 2008). In particular, the cognitive development of early school-aged children (i.e., first to third graders) is worthy of attention because the experiences of the first three years at school provide the foundation for their future academic achievement (Moon, Kang, & An, 2009).

The development of children from immigrant families may be at risk because their parents generally have limited cultural knowledge and resources to navigate the educational system of the host society (Turney & Kao, 2009; White & Kauffman, 1997). However, numerous empirical studies show a complicated picture of cognitive development and academic performance of children from immigrant families. Many children of immigrants do as well as their peers from non-immigrant families in the United States at school (Fuligni, 1997), and some of them outperform their counterparts (Pong, Hao, & Gardner, 2005). A significant number of children, however, still struggle with studying and drop out of school (Warren, 1996; White & Kauffman, 1997).

Capital theory has often been employed to explain the performance differences among children from immigrant families because capital refers to resources that facilitate productive activities such as cognitive development (Agger & Anne, 2007). According to the theory, children of parents with
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more capital show more positive development than peers from families with less capital. Many studies have largely supported the roles of family capital in children’s development. Those studies usually examined academic performance among adolescents (e.g., Fulgini 1997; Greenman, 2013; Perreira, Harris, & Lee 2006; Sun, 1998). Studies on the cognitive competencies of young-aged children from immigrant families, however, are relatively limited (Crosby & Dunbar, 2012).

Acknowledging the sociocultural location of immigrants and their children, we explored the association of family capital with the working memory of young school-aged children from immigrant families in the United States. The present study focuses on working memory and attention because these competencies play an important role in reasoning and academic performance (Mandakini & Kaur, 2009).

TRANSMISSION OF FAMILY CAPITAL TO CHILDREN IN IMMIGRANT FAMILIES

The cognitive development of children in immigrant families is multifaceted, similar to the development of their counterparts from non-immigrant families. Some children thrive and succeed in school while others struggle. The different outcomes can be explained by gaps in capital and/or assets invested for optimal development and successful adaption of children in the society (Agger & Anne, 2007; Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman, 1988; Lareau, 2011; Parcel, Defur, & Zito, 2010). Several forms of capital are proposed, including economic, human, cultural, and social capital. These types of capital are generally associated with one another and directly and/or indirectly related to an individual’s development (Parcel et al., 2010). These types of capital are understood as being transmitted from one generation to the next generation through purposeful and effortful child rearing strategies that parents choose (Lareau, 2011).

Economic Capital

Economic capital is defined as resources immediately and directly convertible into money (Bourdieu 1986; Coleman 1988). Parental income can be one of the indicators of economic capital. This type of capital is reported as one of the influential factors on children’s socio-emotional and cognitive development including academic achievement (Mistry, Biesanz, Chien, Howes, & Benner, 2009). Considering the importance of economic capital on individuals, children in immigrant families are disadvantaged because more immigrant families live in impoverished or near-impoverished conditions compared to non-immigrant families (Hernandez, 2004). According to Mistry and others (2009), the overall socioeconomic status of immigrant families indirectly influences the development of young children through differentiating a level of investment on children and a quality of home environment. For instance, high quality childcare is a form of investment that parents make in their children as well as extracurricular activities. outings to the library or museum could be valuable informal experience that enhances the cognitive and literacy development of young children.

Human Capital

Human capital refers to the practical knowledge and acquired skills that enable individuals to make positive contributions to society (Perreira, Harris, & Lee 2006; Sun, 1998). Scholars have consistently found that parental education, an indicator of human capital, is positively associated with educational attainment and cognitive development of children in both non-immigrant and immigrant families (Fulgini 1997; Mistry, et al., 2009; Palacios, Guttmannova, & Chase-Lansdale, 2008; Plunkett & Bámaca-Gómez 2003; Pong & Landale, 2012). Upon examining the New Immigrant Survey, Pong and Landale (2012) concluded that the educational level of immigrant parents prior to immigration had the strongest association with the academic achievements of their children. Moreover, the educational attainment of mothers differentiated the trajectories of reading achievements among kindergarten aged children in immigrant families (Palacios et al., 2008). In addition to general knowledge and practical skills, knowledge about early childhood development can be seen as human capital as it is supportive of
parents with the provision of developmentally appropriate care for their young children (Bornstein & Cote, 2007; Glick, Bates, & Yakibu, 2009). Informed parents may find more effective ways to stimulate their children’s learning. In fact, when mothers are more knowledgeable about child development, their young children show higher cognitive competencies (Glick et al., 2009). Furthermore, parents with higher education are likely to have higher expectations for their children’s academic performance than their counterparts without higher education, which, in turn, leads to a better performance in children (Davis-Kean, 2005). Parents with higher education also showed more warmth to their children and provided more stimulating home environments which foster young children’s cognitive development (Klebanov, Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1994; Smith, Brooks-Gunn, & Klebanov, 1997).

Cultural Capital
Cultural capital is defined as one’s general cultural background and dispositions (Agger & Anne, 2007). According to Bourdieu (1986), an individual benefits when the person’s culture fits the culture of the larger society or the societal institutions. Cultural capital includes one’s familiarity with language and various societal systems in the dominant culture. Parents’ overall understanding of a culture is considered as cultural capital that a child inherits and translates into the values and norms of a given society (Lareau, 2011). This form of capital is particularly important for immigrants and their families. When immigrants are well-versed about the cultural standards and norms of a host society, for example, their own acculturation as well as transmission of their cultural resources to their children could be more effective (De Feyter & Winsler, 2009). Acculturated immigrants are more likely than their less acculturated counterparts to provide their children with capital by passing on the attitudes and knowledge similar to the mainstream culture, which assists individuals in succeeding in the United States. In addition, more acculturated parents can help their children negotiate schoolwork and academic matters in a more effective way (Ngo, 2006). Examining the data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Cohort, Turney and Kao (2009) pointed out that limited fluency of English was one of the barriers for immigrant parents to be actively involved in their children’s education. This perceived obstacle can work against the cognitive and language development of children from immigrant families (De Feyter & Winsler, 2009). In fact, English proficiency of immigrant parents was positively related to the academic performance of their children (Eamon 2005; Lew 2003; Plunkett & Bámaca-Gómez, 2003).

In general, the three forms of capital discussed above (i.e., economic, human, and cultural capital) overlap and influence one another. For example, higher educational attainment and more cultural capital generally secure a higher income, and parents with higher income can provide better opportunities to their children and gain additional types of capital (i.e. human and cultural capital). However, this logic of advancement may not be true for immigrants. Some immigrant parents are unable to secure equivalent employment to their educational level due to their limited English and knowledge of the U.S mainstream culture (Leung, 1998). Knowledge and customs acquired in one’s native country may not be transferred as cultural capital in the United States because the valued cultural codes vary from one culture to another (Buchmann, 2002). Furthermore, a recent immigrant parent with limited English proficiency may possess a higher level of human capital (e.g., knowing how to manage computer systems or having knowledge on child development), but a limited cultural capital (e.g., knowledge about U.S. culture and the American educational system). Given these circumstances, we separately examine economic, human, and cultural capital.

Social Capital
Social capital refers to resources derived from interpersonal relationships that facilitate better adaptation (Coleman, 1988). Coleman (1988) proposed two general types of social capital: Social capital within and outside the family. Social capital within the family is generally defined as time and
effort that family members invest in each other (Anguiano, 2004). Close and supportive relationships with parents have been reported to increase the adjustment and positive educational outcomes of children (Caughlin & Malis, 2004; Lee & Son, 2012; Parker & Benson, 2004; Sun, 1998; Vandewater & Lansford, 2005). Social capital outside the family refers to social networks that consist of the social relationships between parents and community institutions (Coleman, 1988; Parcel, Defur, & Zito, 2010). Numerous studies found that parents’ regular interaction with teachers and participation in children’s school activities were positively related to children’s academic performance (Desimone et al., 2004; Eccles & Harold, 1993).

Immigrant families have been shown to be less likely than non-immigrant families to interact with their children’s teachers and be involved in school activities (Huntsinger & Jose, 2009; Moon, Kang, & An, 2009). Chinese immigrant parents, compared to European non-immigrant parents, considered volunteering at a child’s classroom or participating in a child’s school as less important means for supporting their children’s development (Huntsinger & Jose, 2009). Similarly, other ethnic Asian immigrant families and Mexican immigrant families have less emphasis on participation in the children’s school activities (Moon, Kang, & An, 2009). One explanation of this phenomenon could be limited English proficiency of immigrant parents and lack of knowledge about the U.S. education system (Cheon, 1996; Shin, 2004; Turney & Kao, 2009). How educators are generally viewed in the immigrant’s country of origin may contribute to the interaction patterns between immigrant parents and teachers in the school system (Ritter, Mont-Reynaud, & Dornbusch, 1993). For example, in many societies with Confucian traditions, parents are expected to show respect to teachers and follow teachers’ authority in their children’s education. Immigrant parents with this tradition may wait for an educator’s lead instead of initiating the relationship.

Present Study
Guided by capital theory, the purpose of this study was to examine the roles of family capital in the cognitive competencies of children from immigrant families in the United States. Different from most previous literature focusing on the academic achievement of adolescents, we were particularly interested in the working memory of young school-aged children (5 to 7 years old). We specifically examined the following research questions.

1. To what extent is economic capital associated with the working memory of young school-aged children?
2. To what extent is human capital associated with the working memory of young school-aged children?
3. To what extent is cultural capital associated with the working memory of young school-aged children?
4. To what extent is social capital within and outside the home associated with the working memory of young school-aged children?

In order to answer these research questions, we examined the New Immigrant Survey dataset (Jasso, Massey, Rosenzweig, & Smith, 2005), a nationally representative dataset of immigrants who were newly admitted to the United States as permanent residents in 2003. Following the sample criteria of the original dataset, in this study “new immigrants” refer to those who acquired permanent residency in 2003. This study hopefully broadens the overview on how different forms of capital influence the cognitive competencies of young children with various family and cultural backgrounds.

METHODS

New Immigrant Survey (NIS)
The present study used the Adult Sample of the New Immigrant Survey’s first full cohort (NIS-2003). The New Immigrant Survey (NIS) is a longitudinal survey conducted to answer the questions about migration behaviors and the effects of migration (Jasso et al., 2005). The Adult Sample covers all immigrants 18 years or older at admission to Legal Permanent Residence (LPR) during the period of May through November, 2003 and who had visas as principals or as accompanying spouses. The data
oversampled employment-based and diversity visa immigrants and under-sampled spouses of U.S. citizens.

The New Immigrant Survey (NIS) was collected through interviews either by phone or in person. Survey instruments were translated into seven languages (Chinese, Korean, Polish, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese). Key concepts and consent forms were also translated into seven additional languages (Arabic, Farsi, French, Gujarati, Hindi/Urdu, Serbo-Croatian, and Ukrainian). The NIS-2003 achieved a response rate of 68% (n = 8, 573) for the Adult Sample. The participants responded to questions about their health, schooling, family, language use and English proficiency, labor force participation, income, use of government services, networks, travel, and religion. Interviews were completed in a language that the participant preferred (for detail, see Jasso et al., 2005). The participants were asked about their co-residents, including each person's relationship to the respondent, age, birth year, and gender, if they lived with anyone else in the same household. Furthermore, parents who lived with at least one child of age between 5 and 17 in the U.S. were asked to complete an additional section regarding health, language skills, and school subjects about two randomly selected co-resident children. A total of 1,381 immigrants completed this section that detailed 2,026 children. The Digit Span Memory Test was administered for co-resident children aged 3 to 12.

Study Sample

We first selected the respondents' biological, adopted, or step children aged between 5 and 7 (n = 1,241) from the roster data of all individuals in the households of the Adult Sample. Next, we selected 561 children whose parents completed the parenting/guardian questionnaire about their children. Among these children, the 133 children who did not complete the Digit Span Test were dropped from the study sample, which resulted in a sample of 428 children.

In the study sample, 49% of the children were male, and approximately 52% of the sample was U.S. born. The responding parents were 29 fathers and 300 mothers. The mean age of the parents was about 35 years (M = 34.5; SD = 6.3), and their spouse was older by approximately four years (M = 39.5; SD = 11.0). The birthplaces of the respondent parents were very diverse. About one third of them were born in Mexico (n = 132) and 10% in El Salvador (n = 41). Approximately 10% of the sample was born in India (n = 22) or in the Philippines (n = 20). The rest of them were from 18 different countries in six regions. Approximately 80% of the respondent parents lived with their spouse or partner, and 9% of these spouses or partners were born in the United States.

Measures

Cognitive test As a proxy of the child’s cognitive competency, this study used the Digit Span Memory assessment. The NIS uses the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R) version (Jassey et al. 2005). For the assessment, an interviewer reads a sequence of numbers to a child, and the child repeats them back in the original order (Digit Forward) and reverse order (Digit Backward). The Digit Span test is understood to measure attention, sequencing, short-term memory, working memory, and concentration (Hale, Hoeppner, & Fiorello, 2012). It has been suggested that Digit Forward and Digit Backward tests measure somewhat different constructs (Hale et al., 2012). Rather than examining the two tests separately, however, we chose to use combined scores of these two components because our main interest was to examine a more general competence rather than a specific domain of intelligence. The total numbers of Digit Forward and Digit Backward passed were included in the analysis. As seen in Table 1, the average score of the study sample children was 6.75 (SD = 3.47), ranging from 0 to 19.

Capital This study included measures of economic, human, cultural, and social capital in order to examine the association between various forms of family capital and working memory of children. Table 1 presents the variables measuring each type of capital. First, economic capital was measured by household annual income. The information was
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reported by a parent who knew most about financial situation in a family. The total income in U.S dollars was categorized into five categories (1 = less than $10,000 to 5 = more than $40,000). Approximately 46% of the households reported less than $10,000 as their annual income, and 20% of them earned more than $40,000 per year.

This study employed the responses of the adult sample as a proxy for human capital. The original dataset had two questions on the highest education degrees that participants had earned. First, the respondents were asked if they had received any degrees, diplomas, or certificates from their schooling. For those who said yes, their highest degrees that they had received were given from 0 (= none) to 8 (= JD/MD). In this study, the responses to the two questions were combined and recoded as 1 = less than high school, 2 = high school or equivalent, 3 = some college or bachelor's degree, and 4 = beyond college. On average, the immigrant parents of the sample children had less than a high school education with a mean of 1.84 (SD = .99).

This study employed two different variables to measure the cultural capital of immigrant parents. First, we included the length of U.S. residence of an immigrant parent. Table 1 shows that the parents of the sample children had lived in the country on average 8 years (SD = 6.76). The range was very wide from 0 to 34 years. Second, cultural capital was measured by English proficiency that a parent reported. The NIS included two English proficiency questions on the abilities of speaking and comprehending English. The original scale was from 1 (= very well) to 4 (= not at all). To indicate that higher scores meant better English proficiency, the original scores were reverse-coded and then summed. With a range of 2 to 8, the mean was 4.89 (SD = 1.87).

Lastly, this study included the two different types of social capital suggested by Coleman (1988): Social capital within and outside the home. Social capital within the home was measured by the frequency of parent-child discussions on school-related matters. Parents answered two questions about how often they (or spouse/partner) had discussions with their children about selecting courses or programs at school and things studied in class during the last school year with a 3 point Likert scale from 1 (= not at all) to 3 (= three or more times). Each question was recoded into 0, 1, or 2 and summed afterwards, and the range of the parent-child discussion data was from 0 to 4. Cronbach-α was .63, and the mean was 2.68 (SD = 1.33). Social capital outside the home was based on questions about whether or not they attended school meetings, phoned or spoke to a teacher, and visited a child’s classes. We counted the number of the activities that the respondent participated in. For the study sample, the average was 2.88 (SD = 1.14).

Control variables For controlling for child’s characteristics, we included child’s gender (0 = male; 1 = female), age in years, and nativity (0 = foreign-born; 1 = U.S.-born) in the analysis.

Analysis

As described in the previous section, we first used descriptive statistics in order to capture the general
characteristics of the sample in the variables of interest and the covariates. Next, Poisson regression was employed because the Digit Span test scores, the dependent variable, were the numbers of the corrected answers. Due to the non-independence of children in a family, we adjusted standard errors for the clustering of children within families.

As seen in Table 1, there was a concern of losing a significant number of the sample by list-wise deletion. To deal with missing values, we used a multiple imputation method using mi commands in Stata 12 (StataCorp., 2012). Multiple imputation methods are employed to handle nonresponse bias by imputing missing covariates with several plausible values and creating multiple complete datasets (Vinnard, Wileyto, Bisson, & Winstond, 2013). For imputing missing values, we included the covariates and several auxiliary variables possibly associated with the missingness. The auxiliary variables included in the analysis were the ages of the respondents and their spouse/partner, the nativity and education of spouse, and marital status.

RESULTS

Table 2 presents the results of the multiple imputation Poisson regression. For interpretation purposes, we report incidence rate ratios as well as Poisson regression coefficients (Bs). The incidence rate ratio (IRR) refers to “the relative change in the incidence rate for one unit change in a given variable,” and can be calculated by exponentiating coefficients (Long & Freese, 2006).

Economic capital measured by household income did not significantly predict the Digit Span scores among young children of new immigrant parents (B = .006, p = .746). Parental education level, an indicator of human capital, was not associated with children's cognitive competence (B = .047, p = .172), either. Regarding the roles of cultural capital, there were different results between the effects of English proficiency and the length of US residence. Parental English proficiency was positively associated with children's Digit Span scores (B = .051, p < .01). In other words, a one point increase in parental English proficiency increases the expected number of correct answers in the Digit Span test by 5%. In contrast, how long an immigrant parent had lived in the United States was not related to the scores (B = -.001, p = .814). We found no significant effects of discussion on school-related matters with children (B = .031, p = .121) and social capital measured by parental participation in school activities (B = -.012, p = .623).

Table 2 also shows the effect of the control variables on the Digit Span scores. Whereas child's gender was not associated with Digit Span scores (B = .062, p = .158), the child's age was positively related to the scores (B = .205, p < .01). In addition, a child's nativity was related to their cognitive test scores although it was marginal. Compared to their foreign-born counterparts, US-born children of immigrants showed lower scores in the test (B = -.156, p < .1). That is, being born in the United States to immigrant parents decreases the expected numbers of corrected answers by 14.5%.

Table 2. Results of Multiple Imputation Poisson Regression on Digit Span Scores (n = 428)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>IRR*</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>0.051**</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the US</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-child discussion</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School participation</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's gender</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's age in years</td>
<td>0.205***</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's nativity</td>
<td>-0.156†</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *IRR (incidence rate ratio) = exp (B); †p < .1, **p < .01, ***p < .001
DISCUSSION

This study examined what extent to family capital was associated with the working memory of young school-aged children from immigrant families. In general, the findings of this study indicate that the effects of family capital on children's working memory depend on which form of family capital is examined and how it is measured.

Family income and parental education, indicators of economic and human capital, were not associated with the working memory of young school-aged children. These findings are inconsistent with what was expected based on capital theory. These unexpected findings may be related to the fact that immigrant children show better academic achievement relative to their socioeconomic status (Crosby & Dunbar, 2012) and small or insignificant effect of concurrent income in previous literature (Blau, 1998).

Regarding the roles of cultural capital, the results were different across the measures. Parental English proficiency was positively associated with children's Digit Span scores, consistent with previous studies that showed a positive relationship between immigrants' English proficiency and academic achievement (e.g. Eamon, 2005; Lew, 2003; Plunkett & Bámaca-Gómez, 2003). However, the length of residence in the United States was not significantly related to children's working memory. These findings may imply that English proficiency reflects the degree of cultural knowledge better than the length of residence in the United States. Although it is generally true that a longer residence in the United States helps immigrants improve their language skills and gain more cultural knowledge, some individuals are not exposed to the new culture and language and do not have opportunities to expand their cultural knowledge. For example, some immigrants arrive in ethnic enclaves and did not leave their ethnic communities for extended periods of time.

We also learned that foreign-born children showed better working memory than their US-born counterparts, which is consistent with several other studies (e.g. De Feyter & Winsler, 2009; Greenman, 2013) and the so called "immigrant paradox" in education (Palacios, 2008). The immigrant paradox in education refers to the phenomenon in which the first generation youth usually outperforms their counterparts who are second or above generation although the former has less proficiency in English and knowledge of main stream culture than the latter.

Overall, the findings partly supported capital theory in that three out of four forms of family capital were not significantly associated with young children's working memory. Economic, human, and social capital did not predict the level of working memory of young school-aged children but cultural capital did. These unexpected findings may indicate that working memory of children at ages of 5 to 7 is less influenced by family income, parental education, and parent's participation in a child's school and parent-child discussion about school-related matters in new immigrant families. The reason why cultural capital, specifically English proficiency, was related to working memory may be because the Digit Span test was conducted in English or Spanish, and half of the samples were from non-Spanish speaking families.

Several limitations should be noted. First, we did not include any other cognitive competence measures besides the Digit Span scores. Although the Digit Span test is related to important dimensions of cognitive competence, including working memory, concentration, and sequencing, its scores may not be comprehensive enough to reflect general cognitive development of children. Related to this limitation, the study findings should be carefully applied to other cognitive competences of children.

Due to the small sample size of the children of interest in the original dataset, we could not examine the roles of ethnicity/race and family's country of origin in working memory. Ethnicity/race and country of origin can be major macro-contexts for those from immigrant families because immigrants and their descendants are often treated in certain ways based on their ethnic and racial profiles as well as stereotyping in a host society (Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007). In addition, children's ethnic culture matters because their immigrant parents usually hold the culture that they brought from their native
countries, which influences their parenting and eventually children’s outcomes. Furthermore, we could not examine whether a respondent parent’s gender would be associated with children’s working memory due to the small size of father respondents. Fathers’ parenting is different from mothers’ and differently related to children’s cognitive development. For future study, we suggest that various measurements on cognitive competence should be employed to examine more precisely the effects of family capital on children’s development. Future research should also include larger samples and examine whether ethnicity/race and parental country of origin are associated with children’s outcomes. In addition, it would be interesting to investigate the extent to which the gender of a respondent parent is associated with children’s working memory.

Despite the limitations, this study provides understanding of the ways in which family capital of immigrant families plays a role in young school-aged children’s cognitive competence. Specifically, the results emphasize the importance of parental cultural capital on children’s working memory. This finding can be applied towards a better understanding of cognitive development of children whose parents are newly accepted residents in the United States. We also believe that the results can be employed to identify children who lack family capital in order to support these children and their families. In particular, educational programs should be provided for children and their immigrant parents who lack language proficiency. For example, English classes for new immigrant parents may enhance the transmission of a family’s cultural capital to their young children. Responding to the diversity in schools, we call for the continuous attention of educators, researchers, and policy makers on the developmental outcomes of children from immigrant families.
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