Introduction and Research Question
Immigration to North America is on the rise (Statistics Canada, 2006; Migration Policy Institute, 2011). Because of this, public and private school systems in the United States and Canada are facing the simultaneous challenge and the opportunity of a growing number of people for whom English (or French) is a second or an additional language. Furthermore, due to equitable education for all policies such as ‘No Child Left Behind’ act in the United States and similar policies in Canadian provinces such as ‘The Appropriate Education Act’ (Bill 13) in Manitoba, students with special needs or disabilities are becoming integrated into classrooms and schools within the public education sphere.

In this essay first of all, I will explore the North American research on the convergence of EAL and SNE, paying particular attentions to the contributions to the field that have been made to date. In this section, I will analyze and synthesize this research and focus on to what I believe to be lacking in the literature and which areas require further examination. Next, I will explore the Manitoba EAL curriculum documents and suggested resources as well as the Manitoba Education Student Services documents and resources, for in teaching within a Manitoban context, these are the primary documents on which my teaching practices and curricula are supposed to be based. In this section, I will critically evaluate these documents, focusing on what their strengths and weaknesses are and how they fit with SNE/EAL students in Manitoba. Finally, I will conclude with suggestions of considerations for future policy development in this educational domain.

Operational Definitions of Disabilities
Since disability is a complex and controversial notion that exists worldwide, I have sought out definitions that transcend nationality. For example, the United Nations’ (2007) states:

> [t]he term persons with disabilities is used to apply to all persons with disabilities including those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which, in interaction with various attitudinal and environmental barriers, hinders their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others…Disability Resides in the Society and not the Person.

For me, this last statement is crucial, for it recognizes that disability is a socially constructed phenomenon and, therefore, different societies and cultures view disability differently (UN, 2007).

On a similar vein, the World Health Organization (WHO) (2011) views disabilities as:

> …an umbrella term, covering impairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions. An impairment is a problem in body function or structure; an activity limitation is a difficulty encountered by an individual in executing a task or action; while a participation restriction is a problem experienced by an individual in involvement in life situations...

Thus, disability is a complex phenomenon, reflecting an interaction between features of a person’s body and features of the society in which he or she lives. For the purposes of this paper and to simplify matters, although I concede that various societies view
disability differently, I will utilize the WHO definition of disability, since it is more comprehensive in nature.

**Operational Definitions of EAL, SNE and EAL/SNE**

As a teacher, I recognize that disabilities may be cognitive, physical, emotional, and/or co-morbid in nature. Although there are many apppellations used to describe the teaching of students with disabilities, for the purposes of this paper, I use the term, ‘Special Needs Education’ (or ‘SNE’) to be more concise. Although much of the current research uses the expression ‘English as a Second Language’ (‘ESL’) and ‘English Language Learner’ (‘ELL’), these phrases are rather limiting and somewhat exclusionary. As commonly known, many students who are learning English speak more that one other language and thus English cannot be accurately called their ‘second language.’ As well, there is considerable controversy and debate as to when one is a language learner versus when one has mastered a language, for the sake of clarity in this paper, I use the phrase ‘English as an Additional Language’ (‘EAL’). Therefore, when speaking about EAL students who are also SNE learners, I have combined these terms into ‘EAL/SNE’ and will use this term in my paper. Moreover, I will use this designation interchangeably to ensure that neither term may be viewed as superior (or inferior).


…[i]nclusive education is based on the right of all learners to a quality education that meets basic learning needs and enriches [their] lives. Focusing particularly on
vulnerable and marginalized groups, it seeks to develop the full potential of every individual…

The ultimate goal of inclusive quality education is to end the discrimination these children often experiences and to foster their social cohesion into society.

In my understanding, the notion of inclusive education seems to be espoused by countless educational policy makers, administrators and teachers, and practices, and advocated by powerful stakeholders including parents, lobby groups, and politicians. Consequently, classrooms where pupils possess a myriad of learning needs have become the norm and not the exception in many North American schools. As a result, teachers and administrators seem to be searching for effective, research-based strategies and methods with the goal of meeting the needs of these multifaceted learners. Although considerable research has been done in the areas of SNE as well as EAL, to date, the research on the co-occurrence of SNE/EAL is limited, perhaps because this is perceived to be a relatively new or rare phenomenon. However, since I am an SNE teacher who currently works outside the public school system, I have become aware of this reality in my own teaching context where I interact with students who have both profound disabilities and EAL needs.

Analytic Review and Synthesis of Literature
To date, I have read a variety of articles on the topic of EAL/SNE and find that the literature includes qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods, though there is more qualitative research than quantitative studies available. As well, I observe that the authors of these studies and articles present multiple stances, philosophies, and perspectives. For the purposes of this analytic review and synthesis of literature section in order to look at the articles more closely, I have determined the articles to fall into two distinct camps: the first one which I term ‘conservative’ where more a traditional teaching ideologies and strategies are utilized with the a fixed end goal and the second one which I call ‘constructivist’ where multiple viewpoints are conceded and the end goal is determined on a case by case basis.

The Schoen and Schoen (2003) article works from a qualitative perspective and uses the action research to illustrate their case. The authors examine one student, Andy, a fourth-grade student who has been deemed ‘learning disabled’, and is originally from South Korea, and is therefore, trying to acquire English. The authors open the article with a brief but informative explanation of what action research is, and structure their article into a series of four manageable steps, which make it both logical and comprehensible for readers. In each step, the reader is provided with multiple perspectives of what is going on (for example, the point of view of Andy’s teacher, Andy’s parents, and even Andy are stated). In many ways, the article is easy to read: it is well-organized, neither overly academic nor overly simple and practical with its section of ‘Helpful EAL Strategies’ and examples of activities and types of assessments that were used with Andy (Schoen & Schoen, 2003, 19-21). One particular strength of this article is the fact that the authors employed many methods of data collection and a variety of assessment tools including:
“[p] retest and posttest data,… anecdotal records, journal entries and standardized test scores… as well as sight word analysis and writing samples” (Schoen & Schoen, 2003, 20). This allows for their conclusions and suggestions to be more credible. I believe the article is intended for educators who want research that can be easily applied to their teaching practices; as a current classroom teacher, this is something I find to be useful and something that is desired by my colleagues.

Although Schoen and Schoen’s 2003 paper includes many positive attributes, it is by no means without flaw. For example, in the brief section entitled ‘Andy’s Reflections’, they state:

Andy felt like he was becoming more successful in his work as well. At the end of the project, he expressed that he had learned many new things. He started to become a little more confident about his word recognition and writing skills, which was shown in his increased enthusiasm to work” (Schoen & Schoen, 2003, p.21).

For me, this quotation demonstrates a glossing over of the issues, especially since Andy’s reflections are not adequately summarized by the researchers. I believe that the authors have a duty to accurately report Andy’s perspective in his own words. In some ways, the analysis appears superficial since the authors fail to include multiple perspectives (such as those of Andy, his parents, his peers, or his teachers). Because of the subjective nature of the qualitative research, the authors’ multiple viewpoints should be acknowledged in order to eliminate as much bias as possible, while giving a more
accurate portrayal of the situation. While simplicity may be a good thing, I wish that Schoen and Schoen had acknowledged the complexity of these issues.

In contrast to the more practical methodology of action research, Case and Taylor (2005) take a more theoretical approach to the notion of SNE/EAL in their article. However, it should be noted that the common thread between these two articles is the qualitative stance and constructivist perspectives. In the Case and Taylor (2005) paper, the authors discuss the idea that EAL/SNE students possess commonalities in language learning, such as difficulties with pronunciation, syntax, and semantics (Case & Taylor, 2005, 127-8). For me, the term “shared symptoms”, used by Case and Taylor (2005) is a curious phrase, because it conjures up the notion of a medical model where students are pathologized or portrayed from a deficit perspective (p.127). As a result of these similar language challenges, Case and Taylor (2005) contend that EAL students are often and erroneously placed in SNE classes often because of the inadequate training of teachers and the absence of good assessment instruments that differentiate between EAL learners and SNE students (129-30). Perhaps the authors are telling us, albeit in a rather veiled manner, that there may be difficulties found in some students with SNE and EAL needs that cannot be ‘fixed’ by teachers or clinicians.

I find the section entitled “Creating a Classroom Environment that is Conducive to SLA” somewhat helpful, as recommending that teachers provide students with access to oral language, access to native cultures and languages, and access to reading, which are, to my mind, solid teaching practices that should be employed by all teachers, especially those who work with EAL students (Case & Taylor, 2005, pp129-30).
Although the article provides some strategies for teachers who are new to teaching these students, I wish the authors had gone into more depth and provided more examples of how SNE/EAL students differ in their academic struggles from other students, as well as ideas about future research beyond mere generalizations. In my opinion, the paper would have been enhanced had it possessed more depth, because it only superficially addressed the issues. However, I commend the authors for taking the plunge and working collaboratively in order to initiate investigation into this complex and intriguing component of our current educational landscape in North America.

Like Case and Taylor (2005), Garcia and Tyler (2010) take a more theoretical approach and discuss the commonalities and often misidentification of SNE/EAL learners (114-115). The authors begin their article with a snapshot of an American eighth-grade classroom where the inclusion of students with EAL/SNE is practiced (Garcia & Tyler, 2010, 113-4). This is familiar to teachers because in most North American public schools, classroom teachers work to serve students with a variety of needs and abilities. Garcia and Tyler (2010) describe several characteristics of students who face a number of other academic challenges besides the learning of English. Correctly, they note that often EAL learners are assumed to have a variety of learning challenges and they suggest that “[t]o be meaningful and comprehensible, instruction for [EAL/SNE students] must be culturally and linguistically relevant and also responsive to their disability” (Garcia & Tyler, 2010, 114-5). In other words, the authors suggest that learners from diverse backgrounds respond better when their problems are reflected in the curricula. This concern recognizes the uniqueness of all learners and suggests that teachers are able to reach students at their points of learning. However, the recommendation of using
“adaptations to support learning of all students… [including] supplementary, intensive reading interventions provided by a reading specialist or special education teacher who is familiar with [EAL] adaptations” (Garcia & Tyler, 2010, 117), while very optimistic and theoretical, may not be achievable because of financial constraints and/or a paucity of teachers who have specialized in EAL/SNE teaching. Overall, this article provides a framework (albeit a vague one) for understanding, demonstrating that in order to better serve the diverse needs of all students, teachers need to be open to many pedagogical methods and strategies and to use them in the classroom. (Garcia & Tyler, 2010, 118-9).

On a similar note to the previous article, a recent paper by Blanchett, Klinger, and Harry (2009) works from a theoretical stance, focusing on the overlap of race, culture, language and disability in urban American education. Blanchett et al. (2009) assert that:

[a]n overwhelming majority of children of color [that is, non-Caucasian] throughout the United States attend schools that are largely made up of students of color, and the quality of their school experience seems [but we have no way of truly knowing] to be affected by the intersection of issues of race, culture, language and disability almost three fourths of African American and more than three fourths of Latino children attend majority student of color schools. …[Therefore,] segregated schooling is not a thing of the past as some would like for us to believe, but rather, it is still quite prevalent in the American public school system and in fact has been steadily increasing for the past decade (389).

These authors illustrate the realities for many families using American statistical data from a wide variety of sources to indicate how students of colour, disability, and
language differences have been underserved by the public school system, both in the past and in the present (Blanchett et al., 2009, 390). Blanchett et al. (2009) provide an historical context for how the school system in the USA has evolved and how it continues to serve mainly the educational needs of White, middle-class students and moreover how it fails to meet the needs of minority students (visible, linguistic, and ability status), viewing them from a deficit perspective (393-5). Without actually saying it, Blanchett et al. believe these students to be marginalized. Thus, the authors suggest that because of this reality, urban American schools need to re-examine their policies and practices and determine ways to better serve ‘urban’ students with special needs, academic challenges, and English language learning needs and to be able to work with these students’ families more successfully (Blanchett et al., 2009, 403-5)

Like Blanchett et al. (2009), Alvarez-McHatton and Correa (2005) discuss marginalization without actually mentioning the term and depict several experiences of discrimination and stigma perceived by fifty single mothers of Latina descent who care for young children with special needs. The authors use a mixed methods design and, as part of the study they conduct in-depth interviews in Spanish, English and a combination of the two languages (Alvarez-McHatton & Correa, 2005, 132-3). Alvarez-McHatton and Correa (2005) provide a description of the use of stigma, citing Goffman’s (1963) definition where:

stigma [is] a discrediting attribute assigned…to those who differ in some manner from society’s expectations, customs and mores. It results from a social categorization process that allows for the quick identification of those who are
similar and those who are different and can therefore be considered as “others.” It is not simply the act of categorization that results in stigmatization of certain groups, but, rather the coupling of negative value judgments with particular characteristics that results in an adverse reaction to difference. 


Operational definitions, like the one for stigma, assist readers to more clearly grasp the authors’ intentions. However, since Alvarez-McHatton and Correa (2005) fail to operationalize the notions of ‘disability’ and ‘Latino/Latina’, they do their readers a disservice, since both of these terms are very complex and require further explanation to ensure that the reader clearly comprehends them.

As well as failing to provide complete operationalizations, I am a bit puzzled as to why Alvarez-McHatton and Correa (2005) chose to analyze only twenty of the fifty transcripts (134). I believe that focusing on a mere forty percent of the data definitely limits the study, rendering it weaker than it could be. On the other hand, however, I appreciate the fact that the authors acknowledge several sources of bias in their work including their multiple identities and roles as researchers (Alvarez-McHatton & Correa, 2005, 134-5). This is evident in the statement:

both researchers were cognizant of their individual identities and thus engaged in self-reflection and discussion to ensure that the interpretations were, to the extent possible, accurate portrayals of the women’s lived experiences (Alvarez-McHatton & Correa, 2005, 135).
As well, the authors openly acknowledge the limitations of a small sample and the possibility of the lack of generalizability (Alvarez-McHatton & Correa, 2005, 140). For my purposes, this article, though by no means perfect, provided me with an adequate snapshot of some of the challenges, including discrimination and stigma, that were experienced by a group of EAL, Latina, single mothers whose children have disabilities.

On a similar note to Alvarez-McHatton & Correa (2005), Lai and Ishiyama (2004), in a qualitative study, focus on the perceptions of mothers who have children who are EAL/SNE. Lai and Ishiyama (2004) present Canadian evidence from British Columbia where ten Chinese-Canadian mothers of children with disabilities were studied (99-100). The authors provide a rationale for their study, suggesting that the research literature lacks research on Chinese Canadian parents (Lai & Ishiyama, 2004, 98). The authors also describe the Greater Vancouver and the Lower Mainland regions of British Columbia for the benefit of the reader, many of whom one presumes are American.

For me this article is full of many positive aspects. For example, I appreciate the fact that the authors were particularly careful to maintain confidentiality and respect the privacy of their participants as this seemed to be of particular cultural importance for these mothers (Lai & Ishiyama, 2004, 99). As well, as an educator, I welcome the authors’ recommendations for practice section of the article, and concede that teachers who work with immigrant parents of Chinese descent need to be aware of cultural and linguistic issues, dynamics, and expectations that may differ from those other Canadians hold (Lai & Ishiyama, 2004, 105-07). Moreover, as a teacher in a multicultural society, I welcome the suggestion that:
empathy is key […]. Educators in multicultural societies have an obligation to be open to different practices for teaching and learning, and not dismiss educational practices from other parts of the world (Lai & Ishiyama, 2004, 106).

Overall, I find this article to be useful, especially the fact that it is a Canadian piece whereas most of the articles retrieved so far have been American.

In a similar vein to Lai and Ishiyama (2004), Hoover and Patton (2005) emphasize the necessity of valuing students’ cultures, including the family structures and dynamics (233). The authors perceive that the main issue in EAL/SNE to be that “curriculum must meet the diverse needs of the classroom” (Hoover & Patton, 2005, 231). And, Patton and Hoover (2005) list several suggestions on how to differentiate curriculum and how to use teaching strategies to help all students. Moreover, the authors provide a broad, theoretical and philosophical approach on how to effectively work with EAL/SNE students. These suggestions include:

- emphasizing learning and development that facilitates joint productive activities among the students; … [and] ongoing verbal dialogues [as well as] cognitive and academic goals in integrated ways; …high expectations while valuing diversity; and …active earning and inquiry based tasks, (Hoover & Patton, 2005, 232).

Although the Hoover and Patton (2005) article is mainly theoretical, in that it provides an overview of issues and corresponding research, it is also somewhat practical, as evidenced by the user-friendly checklists, which were designed by the authors for use
by teachers in their daily classroom practices (Hoover & Patton, 2005, 233-4). These checklists, upon deeper reflection however, seem to remain in the theoretical realm and may not appeal to busy teachers who tend to shy away from what is often perceived as ‘more work’. Overall, the article works from the premise that differentiation of instruction as well as providing adaptations to EAL/SNE students is crucial. This is in keeping with our current educational reality of inclusion in the mainstream classroom.

Like Hoover and Patton (2005), Rodriguez (2009) works from a theoretical standpoint in exploring the notion of SNE/EAL students. Rodriguez (2009) is careful to review the research on this topic, noting the often erroneous tendency to equate language difference with disability (453-4). This is evidenced by the author’s cautionary statement: “language difference is not a disability” (Rodriguez, 2009, 454). As a result, Rodriguez (2009) suggests assessing EAL/SNE students using multidisciplinary teams of evaluators, while employing:

accommodations throughout the evaluation and assessment process to ensure nonbiased procedures that do not cover up the skills and content knowledge [these learners] bring to school (454-5).

However, in discussing this process, Rodriguez fails to mention the fiscal implications of utilizing multidisciplinary teams of evaluators. I think this type of educational model could be financially prohibitive for many school divisions and districts.

Additionally, Rodriguez (2009) emphasizes that teachers need to develop academic language, she refers to concepts such as ‘BICS’, ‘CALP’, and ‘comprehensible
input’, strategies such as ‘scaffolding’ and ‘knowledge transfer’, and approaches such as ‘cognitive language learning approach’ and ‘bilingual models of education’, all of which indicate a solid understanding of the issues found in the EAL literature (455-7). As well, Rodriguez (2009) emphasizes the need for multicultural education where teachers and schools possess cultural awareness and sensitivity that benefit all learners and incorporate this on a cross-curricular basis (457-8). However, my biggest criticism of this article is the fact that although the article hails from the journal Urban Education, it fails to explain what the term ‘urban’ or teaching actually means. In my estimation, ‘urban’ is merely a euphemism for impoverished areas in a city whose residents belong to racial and/or linguistic minorities. I wish the author had been more forthright and not so concerned with political correctness in this case.

Like Rodriguez (2009), Hamayan et al (2007) emphasize assessing and evaluating SNE/EAL students using multidisciplinary professional teams (termed by these authors ‘Ensuring a Continuum of Services’ or ‘ECOS’) in order to determine strategies for use with SNE/EAL learners (15). Hamayan et al (2007) advocate using a collaborative model comprised of mainstream classroom teachers, EAL teacher specialists, SNE teachers, administrators, guidance counselors, occupational therapists, and parents (18-20). In this way, each member of the team brings his/her expertise to the table and makes decisions together about how to best serve the learning needs of the student. Hamayan et al (2007) advocate use of response to intervention (RTI) approach with EAL/SNE students since:

RTI can benefit all students by providing timely support in the classroom as needs are identified. If employed appropriately and carefully, RTI can also introduce
high-quality instruction into general educational classrooms across the grades (49).

Moreover, Hamayan et al. (2007) encourage the use of both SNE as well as EAL educators’ expertise in order to generate the necessary interventions (51-3). In this way, the authors suggest that EAL/SNE students will benefit from having variety of learning models and teaching strategies used in their classrooms.

Like Hamayan et al (2007), Rinaldi and Samson (2008) favour using an RTI model with students who are EAL when there is doubt about whether they belong in SNE or not. Rinaldi and Samson (2008) take a systematic, three-tiered, approach. Tier 1, or ‘Primary Prevention’, includes a “curriculum-based measurement of all students” where the students are monitored in terms of the oral and academic language proficiencies, as well as those deemed ‘high-risk’ (Rinaldi & Samson, 2008, 7). Those pupils who appear to have learning difficulties are moved up to Tier 2, or ‘Small Group Training’, where they are given extra support for fifteen to twenty week sessions and are again monitored for progress on a weekly basis throughout this program (Rinaldi & Samson, 2008, 7) . If this second intercession is unsuccessful, the EAL student is then referred to SNE. Rinaldi and Samson (2008) term this Tier 3, or ‘Tertiary Prevention’, where: first of all, the student is provided with one-to one support and progress monitoring; secondly, a multidisciplinary team devises and conducts an individualized assessment plan (IAP); and lastly, the pupil is given an individualized education plan (IEP), where her/his BICS and CALP are monitored for progress on a monthly basis, and strategy interventions for
use with the individual are explored for use in the classroom and at home with the parents or guardians (7-10).

While Rinaldi and Samson’s (2008) model for education and support seems hopeful, the realities of over-crowded schools with large class sizes and not enough teacher-support, not to mention scarce availability of multi-disciplinary teams, presents a challenge. Now granted, in a school where money and resources are not an issue, this model may work. However, the reality of many inner-city, urban, schools where most students come from lower SES and may not have their basic needs met, implementing such a program will not be feasible. Clearly, this article attempts to take an ideal situation and make it a reality. From a purely academic standpoint, these ideas are interesting as an educator may take some of the suggestions and apply them to their practices. Overall, however, using a model like this warrants the support of teachers, administrators, parents, and school superintendents for it to become a reality.

The final paper I examined for this literature review was McCardle et al (2005), which attempted to “illuminate and underscore the complexity of identifying learning disabilities [SNE] in English Language Learners [EAL]” (p.68). In other words, the article gave an overview of the themes and topics of interest that emerged as a result of the 2003 National Symposium on Learning Disabilities in English Language Learners. I chose this article to illustrate the fact that SNE/EAL students are beginning to be recognized by academic researchers and not just by teachers. While the authors contend that there is a wealth of research in the area of SNE within monolingual English-speaking students, they point to the paucity of evidence for students with extreme academic and
learning difficulties within the EAL field (McCardle et al, 2003, p.68). Although the authors maintain that there is a great deal that needs to be studied in order to better meet the needs of SNE/EAL students, they agree that through researching a variety of assessment practices and studying multiple accommodations and teaching strategies, EAL/SNE learners will probably benefit (McCardle et al, 2003, pp. 74-5). Moreover, the authors suggest that increased research needs to be done on how to better use current technology in educational contexts with SNE/EAL students (McCardle et al, 2003, p.75). Finally, McCardle et all (2003) remind the reader that “attention to cultural and context will promote cultural awareness and sensitivity in both researchers and practitioners who work with ELLs and ELL/Ds [EAL/SNE]” (p. 75). As a teacher and a researcher, I agree that we need to be aware of our SNE/EAL students’ cultural context in order that we assist them in ways that assist instead of hinder their values and beliefs.

**Conclusion**

In writing this paper, I read numerous articles about students who have been identified as EAL/SNE learners. However, I found that many of the articles I came across did not address true SNE, tending to look at ‘learning disabilities’ more frequently. As SNE/EAL learners are becoming more commonplace in schools throughout North America, school personnel, including teachers, administrators, and other professional staff, have the responsibility to try and find teaching methods that meet the educational needs of these students. As Heward (2003) says, four principles should guide the education of these students:

1. Students with disabilities have the right to an effective education;
2. Special education [SNE] instruction should be individualized, intensive, and goal-directed;

3. Research has produced a useful and reliable knowledge base for special education [SNE]; and


To my mind, Heward’s (2003) principles should not be limited to SNE students alone, but should include students who are SNE/EAL learners. As educational practitioners, we need to value the EAL/SNE students in our schools and see them as a positive force in the educational landscape: often these students challenge our teaching practices and encourage us to grow and change in order to better serve their diverse needs. Moreover, as teachers, we need to work in collaboration with our students’ families instead of against them. This idea is reminiscent of Thorp (1997), who suggests that:

[p]rofessionals need to explore their own cultural experiences, values, and attitudes. Professionals need to learn as much as possible from families about their cultural experiences, values, and attitudes. Teachers need to carefully evaluate their own classroom settings and curriculum strategies through a cultural and linguistic lens (264).

Thus, as instructors, we need take time in order to truly understand ourselves and then we should learn about our students and their families. Tyler et al (2004) concur with this, pointing out that: “teachers from all racial and ethnic backgrounds must be knowledgeable in culturally relevant pedagogy to deliver instruction to students from
many racial and ethnic groups” (35). To me, this demonstrates the need for educators to go beyond merely covering curriculum and preparing students for the next grade or educational step and to incorporate culture into our daily teaching practices instead. Lastly, I believe that teachers should adopt Harry’s (2002) idea and learn about how different cultures view disability, with the goal of applying this awareness to interactions with the families of SNE/EAL students (133). Because the area of SNE/EAL is relatively new, there is far less literature than one would find compared to the fields of EAL or SNE alone. For me, this only serves as a push to pursue research and writing in this contemporary field: to inform my practice as a classroom teacher and to facilitate the work on my master’s thesis.
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