Table S1. Results of multiple regression analysis using Working Memory Index (WMI) as predictor (Model 1).

	Estimates
Direct effects	
WMI → Listening comprehension	0.17
WMI → Text reading accuracy	0.28*
WMI → Reading comprehension	0.19
Moderator effects	
Linguistic status → Listening comprehension	−0.23
Linguistic status → Text reading accuracy	−0.20
Moderating effects	
WMI × Linguistic status → Listening comprehension	0.07
WMI × Linguistic status → Text reading accuracy	−0.16
Conditional direct effects	
WMI → Listening comprehension	
Linguistic status 0 (monolingual)	0.17
Linguistic status 1 (bilingual)	0.24
WMI → Text reading accuracy	
Linguistic status 0 (monolingual)	0.28*
Linguistic status 1 (bilingual)	0.12
Mediators effects	
Listening comprehension → Reading comprehension	0.22*
Text reading accuracy → Reading comprehension	0.21*
Conditional indirect effects	
WMI → Listening comprehension → Reading comprehension	
Linguistic status 0 (monolingual)	0.04
Linguistic status 1 (bilingual)	0.05
WMI → Text reading accuracy → Reading comprehension	
Linguistic status 0 (monolingual)	0.06*
Linguistic status 1 (bilingual)	0.03
Covariate effects	
Parents' years of education → Listening comprehension	0.19
Parents' years of education → Text reading accuracy	0.12
Parents' years of education → Reading comprehension	0.10

Notes. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. The analyses have been performed by employing Model 7 of the SPSS macro PROCESS (Hayes, 2013). The model included WMI as predictor (X), listening comprehension and text reading accuracy as mediators (M), reading comprehension as criterion (Y), linguistic status (0 = monolingual, 1 = bilingual) as moderator (W) of the relationship between X and M's, and parents' years of education as a covariate.

Table S2. Results of multiple regression analysis using Immediate Narrative Memory (INM) as predictor (Model 2).

	Estimates
Direct effects	
INM → Listening comprehension	0.51**
INM → Text reading accuracy	0.18
INM → Reading comprehension	0.09
Moderator effects	
Linguistic status → Listening comprehension	−0.24
Linguistic status → Text reading accuracy	−0.24
Moderating effects	
INM × Linguistic status → Listening comprehension	−0.38*
INM × Linguistic status → Text reading accuracy	−0.02
Conditional direct effects	
INM → Listening comprehension	
Linguistic status 0 (monolingual)	0.51**
Linguistic status 1 (bilingual)	0.13
INM → Text reading accuracy	
Linguistic status 0 (monolingual)	0.18
Linguistic status 1 (bilingual)	0.16
Mediators effects	

Listening comprehension → Reading comprehension	0.23*
Text reading accuracy → Reading comprehension	0.24*
Conditional indirect effects	
INM → Listening comprehension → Reading comprehension	
Linguistic status 0 (monolingual)	0.12*
Linguistic status 1 (bilingual)	0.03
INM → Text reading accuracy → Reading comprehension	
Linguistic status 0 (monolingual)	0.04
Linguistic status 1 (bilingual)	0.04
Covariate effects	
Parents' years of education → Listening comprehension	0.14
Parents' years of education → Text reading accuracy	0.13
Parents' years of education → Reading comprehension	0.11

Notes. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. The analyses have been performed by employing Model 7 of the SPSS macro PROCESS (Hayes, 2013). The model included INM as predictor (X), listening comprehension and text reading accuracy as mediators (M), reading comprehension as criterion (Y), linguistic status (0 = monolingual, 1 = bilingual) as moderator (W) of the relationship between X and M's, and parents' years of education as a covariat