**Data Analysis: Sample Write-Up**

 To identify emerging patterns in the data as well as to inform subsequent data collection, data analysis began in the earlier months of fieldwork. For example, in accordance with Yin’s (2018) recommendation to begin with the smallest unit of analysis in an embedded case study, we began by forming a profile of each English learner (EL) with a disability participating in the study, tracing their educational history in the district. We then proceeded to the next unit of analysis—the instructional supports and accommodations—by combing through IEPs, identifying the services, specially designed instruction, accommodations, and goals for each participating EL and then compiling the results. To understand how the service provision program models were implemented in the schools for both special education and English as a Second Language (ESL), we triangulated IEPs, staff interviews, and observation data, identifying if and how services varied across participants.

To gain a holistic understanding of the entire embedded case study, we continued with data analysis but through coding the data. We first established a preliminary codebook based on our initial readings of the data set. Separately, each author used this codebook during the first cycle of coding in NVivo. Specifically, we employed *open coding* (Saldaña, 2021), whereby we evaluated the data line by line, comparing each datum against our provisional codes. As we encountered data that did not align with our codes, we made additions to the codebook, while also removing or adjusting codes that lacked relevance to the data set. Once we completed the first cycle coding, we examined the consistency of our codes through a coding comparison analysis in NVivo. As recommended by Campbell et al. (2013), we sought an intercoder reliability of 95% for each code. For codes in which we did not meet or exceed 95% intercoder reliability, in tandem, we reviewed the codes, discussed the variance, and then came to a consensus about their meaning and usage in the data set. For the second cycle of coding, we used *axial coding* to bring the discrete codes together through broader categories (Saldaña, 2021) that were informed by the theoretical framework, intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989, 1991). By utilizing both inductive open coding and deductively-driven axial coding, our coding typified a hybrid inductive–deductive approach (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006).