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Abstract

Rey: An Intensive Single Case Study of a Probation Youth with Immigrant Background Participating in Wraparound Santa Cruz

Barbara Lutz

This intensive single case study highlights the impact of the local wraparound program (WRAP) on a 16-year old probation youth of immigrant background. A holistic lens emphasized the interactive spheres that made up Rey’s (pseudonym) and his family’s world. Theoretical considerations from individual and systems orientations highlighted the complex interrelated factors: social ecology; community psychology; wraparound; attachment; complex trauma; emotion regulation; interconnectedness; family therapy; and coherence. A session-by-session synopsis of Rey’s interactions with the program was followed by an analysis of defenses, receiving support, connectedness, participation, exploration, and emotion regulation. The holistic model offered detailed insight into Rey’s experiences during his work with WRAP. Although the results are individualized, the focus on the single participant allowed for sensitization and increased awareness regarding WRAP’s impact on Rey’s world. The use of the holistic model and the themes that emerged should be examined in further research with different populations and sociocultural surroundings.
# Table of Contents

Copyright page ........................................................................................................................................... ii
Signature page ............................................................................................................................................... iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ............................................................................................................................... iv
ABSTRACT ................................................................................................................................................... v

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION ...................................................................................................................... 1
  The Purpose of the Study .......................................................................................................................... 3
    Background ........................................................................................................................................... 5
  Significance of Research for International Psychology ................................................................. 9
  Theoretical Framework .......................................................................................................................... 13
  Key Characteristics of the Research ....................................................................................................... 16
  Research Questions ............................................................................................................................... 16
  Assumptions ........................................................................................................................................... 18
  Definitions ............................................................................................................................................... 19

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW ........................................................................................................ 24
  Social Ecology ....................................................................................................................................... 25
  Community Psychology ......................................................................................................................... 25
  Public Health Model ............................................................................................................................. 28
  Wraparound ......................................................................................................................................... 29
  Historical, Cultural, and Ethnographic Background of Santa Cruz County ................................... 38
  Culture ................................................................................................................................................... 43
    Specific Interpersonal Elements in the Mexican American Culture ............................................. 44

vi
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American Gang Culture</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Identity Development</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Trauma and Society</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycho-Physiological Effects of Trauma and Post Traumatic Stress</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Trauma</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for the Trauma Treatment of Adolescents with Multiple</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Regulation and Action Systems</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions from the Holistic Model</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Regulation and Coherence with HeartMath</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements from Structural Family Therapy</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure and Experiential Interventions</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfacing Culture, Relationship, and Emotions as Adaptations</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Paradigm</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Case Study</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Single Case Study</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Setting</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design:</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Selection of the Participant</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Considerations and Potential Risks:</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits to the Participant...........................................................................................................93
Assent and Consent: ..................................................................................................................94
Safety and Confidentiality ........................................................................................................94
Mandated Reporting ..................................................................................................................95
Coercion .....................................................................................................................................95
Team Safety ................................................................................................................................95
The Role of the Researcher ........................................................................................................96
Data Collection Strategies and Instruments ...............................................................................97
Archival Materials: ....................................................................................................................99
Case Notes ................................................................................................................................100
Field Diary .................................................................................................................................100
Observations ...............................................................................................................................100
Trauma Assessment ..................................................................................................................101
Wraparound Questionnaires ....................................................................................................102
Tonal Connectedness Map .......................................................................................................103
Instrumentation for Heart-rhythm Monitoring and Feedback .................................................104
Research Credibility and Dependability ................................................................................104
    Addressing Researcher Bias ..................................................................................................105
    Factual Accuracy and Interpretive Validity: ........................................................................106
    Theoretical Validity ..............................................................................................................106
Data Management ...................................................................................................................107
Method Triangulation ...............................................................................................................108
Data Analysis .............................................................................................................................108
CHAPTER 4: NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION, ANALYSIS OF THEMES, ASSERTIONS .............................................................. 110

Bounded System ................................................................................. 110

Rey, the Participant ........................................................................ 111

Family .................................................................................................. 113

Monica .................................................................................................... 113

Alonso ................................................................................................... 114

Joe. ....................................................................................................... 115

Eva and Lila ......................................................................................... 117

Treatment Providers .......................................................................... 118

Felix. ..................................................................................................... 118

Marga .................................................................................................... 118

Leo. ...................................................................................................... 118

Barbara ................................................................................................. 119

WRAP ................................................................................................... 119

Description of Events and Observations ......................................... 120

11.02.11 ............................................................................................. 121

11.04.11 ............................................................................................. 121

11.07.11 ............................................................................................. 121

11.08.11 ............................................................................................. 124

11.10.11 ............................................................................................ 125

11.14.11 ............................................................................................ 126

11.16.11 ............................................................................................ 126
Reflections on WRAP ................................................................. 164
Alonso ................................................................. 164
Monica ................................................................. 165
Joe ................................................................. 166
Felix ................................................................. 167
Marga ................................................................. 168
Leo ................................................................. 169
Rey ................................................................. 171

Analysis of Themes ..................................................................... 172

Theme 1: Defense ...................................................................... 174

Episodes related to defenses in the sphere of family. .......... 177
Episodes related to defenses in the sphere of culture. .......... 178
Assertions on WRAP’s impact on defense in the sphere of culture ......................................................... 179
Episodes related to defenses in the sphere of community .... 180
Assertions on WRAP’s impact on defenses in the sphere of community ........................................ 180

Theme 2: Giving and Receiving Support ................................. 181
Episodes related to receiving support in the sphere of family .... 181
Assertions on WRAP’s impact on receiving support in the sphere of family ........................................ 182
Episodes related to receiving support in the sphere of culture .... 183
Assertions on WRAP’s impact on receiving support in the sphere of culture. ................................................................. 184

Episodes related to receiving support in the sphere of community. ......................................................................................... 185

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on receiving support in the sphere of community. ................................................................. 187

Theme 3: Connectedness .......................................................................................................................................................... 188

Episodes related to connectedness in the sphere of family. ........ 190

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on connectedness in the sphere of family ................................................................................ 191

Episodes related to connectedness in the sphere of culture........ 192

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on connectedness in the sphere of culture ................................................................................ 193

Episodes related to connectedness in the sphere of community. 196

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on connectedness in the sphere of community ........................................................................ 196

Theme 4: Participation .............................................................................................................................................................. 197

Episodes related to participation in the sphere of family. ......... 198

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on participation in the sphere of family .................................................................................. 198

Episodes related to participation in the sphere of culture. ........ 200

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on participation in the sphere of culture ................................................................................ 200

Episodes related to participation in the sphere of community. ... 202

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on participation in the sphere of community ........................................................................ 203

xii
Theme 5: Exploring .......................................................... 204

Episodes related to exploring in the sphere of family. .......... 205

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on exploring in the sphere of family. .......................................................... 206

Episodes related to exploring in the sphere of culture. ........ 207

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on exploring in the sphere of culture. .......................................................... 207

Episodes related to exploring in the sphere of community. .... 208

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on exploring in the sphere of community. .......................................................... 209

Theme 6: Emotion Regulation .................................................. 209

Episodes related to emotion regulation in the sphere of family........................................................................... 210

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on emotion regulation in the sphere of family. ...................................................... 211

Episodes related to emotion regulation in the sphere of culture........................................................................... 211

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on emotion regulation in the sphere of culture. ...................................................... 212

Episodes related to emotion regulation in the sphere of community...................................................................... 213

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on emotion regulation in the sphere of community. ...................................................... 214

Final Thoughts ......................................................................................................................... 218

xiii
List of Figures

Figure 1. General juvenile hall population in Santa Cruz County, showing decrease over time; provided by Scott McDonald, Chief of Probation of Santa Cruz County, and used with permission. ..................................................6

Figure 2. Decline in incarcerated Latino youths in Santa Cruz County, showing decrease in average daily population over time; provided by Scott McDonald, Chief of Probation of Santa Cruz County, and used with permission. ..................................................................................7

Figure 3. Decline in Santa Cruz County rates of juvenile felony and misdemeanor offenses; youth criminality in Santa Cruz County; provided by Scott McDonald, Chief of Probation of Santa Cruz County, and used with permission. ..................................................................................8

Figure 4. Holistic concept for study. ..................................................................................14

Figure 5. Working concept for this study. ............................................................................17

Figure 6. Wraparound model. ............................................................................................31

Figure 7. Data collection strategies. ....................................................................................98

Figure 8. Holistic concept with examples of events, WRAP interventions, and impact. ..................................................................................173

Figure 9. Areas of WRAP impact .......................................................................................175

Figure 10. Tonal Connectedness map ................................................................................189

Figure 11. Initial HeartMath session ...................................................................................215

Figure 12. Second HeartMath session .................................................................................216

Figure 13. Third HeartMath session ...................................................................................217
The emerging paradigm of International Psychology embraces “micro-cultural groups,” such as youths from immigrant communities and “their dreams and aspirations, while remaining mindful of the emerging global macro-culture of global interdependence” during the process of cultural shifting and re-forming caused by migration (Larsen et al., 2011, p. 2). To respond to the surfacing psychological needs on micro- and macro-cultural levels, International Psychology “attempts to integrate indigenous, holistic, and scientific psychologies” (Larsen et al., 2011, p. 2). The need “for more multi-disciplinary approaches to understand and enable the human capabilities that both (i) drive and (ii) result from global mobility” (Carr, 2010, p. 1) is also called for by the United Nation’s Human Development Report for 2009. The wraparound method of service delivery is one of those multi-disciplinary approaches that have been successful nationally and internationally: In New Zealand’s Ministry of Justice and Ministry of Education, wraparound is widely used for such populations as “recidivist young offenders” (Broad, 2008, “Youth Development”), and support for children with special educational needs (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2012). The National Wraparound Initiative focuses on providing mental health services, such as support for foster youth and juvenile offenders, with wraparound within the U.S. (2012).

For the treatment of youths with behavior problems—including those with an immigrant background—many skilled approaches have been developed with the focus on outcome and cost effectiveness. Choices include “group-based, residential, and ‘life-
experiential’ options, like survival camps [and] boot camps,” as well as “family-based and multisystemic” treatment programs (Alexander, n.d., “What kinds of treatment will work?”) such as wraparound, although wraparound services have been applied to a wide variety of different client populations (National Wraparound Initiative, 2012).

However, few studies related to these programs took the time to pay detailed attention to the experiences of the youth participating in these programs, such as their life journeys, their culture, and their ways of understanding the different worlds they navigate. Wraparound programs embrace a holistic view of the participants and support integrative interventions. Still the voices of the youths requiring help can get lost in the efforts focused on treatment success. Yet listening to the concerned youths is the key to a better understanding of the complicated realities they face and to creating the appropriate networks of support for sustainable positive outcomes.

This research applied a holistic lens to understand the complex and interrelated world of the participant and focused on the experience of a youth on probation with an immigrant background, as he participated in a local wraparound program (WRAP). Although WRAP introduced a strengths-based, participatory treatment approach that provided the context for this research, it is the voice and experience of the adolescent who took part in it that was highlighted along with the process of the designated WRAP team.
The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to understand how a male Mexican American adolescent with immigrant background, mental health issues, and involvement with the juvenile justice system was impacted by the application of this holistic lens through which he was seen and on which wraparound treatment interventions were based. This research sought to deepen the understanding of how the participant experienced WRAP in order to inspire the application of the holistic view for sensitization and greater understanding of the holistic approach with emphasis on the youth’s voice and complex context. This intensive single case study illustrates WRAP and its working presupposition of building a program around the needs of the participant and brings in the voices of the team members working together in this case. Based on a holistic and systemic worldview, the participant’s situation was highlighted in its contextual uniqueness, to which the treatment approach was adjusted while learning from—and about—the experience of the participant. The participant’s interaction with wraparound and the effect of this relationship on the youth was documented as treatment occurred.

The recidivism of probation youths in general appears to be due in part to their significant trauma history and lack of adequate affect regulation as well as self-regulation, impulse control—and emotional disconnect (Ford, 2002, p. 36). Therefore, providing holistic interventions, such as trauma counseling, teaching affect regulation skills, and reconnecting the youth to her or his family and community, has been found to be an effective intervention strategy for working with this population (Cook et al., 2005). A holistic approach such as WRAP can then look at the complex issues faced by
probation youths with an immigrant background and mental health issues by combining emphasis on the individual level, including cultural identity development, trauma history, and attachment, with the systemic perception of the situation.

The importance of using a holistic approach lies in the necessity for understanding how the unmet needs of probation youths to achieve healthy attachment in a supportive, safe and violence-free family and community, prevent healing from trauma and learning how to regulate their emotions and impulses (Garbarino, 2002, p. xxiv). All too frequently, adolescents, such as the participant in this study, are incarcerated or placed in residential settings: e.g., group homes. Upon their return to their family and community, they often resume their criminal behavior. The dislocation from family and community--as well as the company of others with a similar problematic history and lack of constructive problem solving skills--can lead to a consolidation of the behavior.

For youths with an immigrant background, participation within the community, rather than being removed from it, plays an important role in their cultural identity development (Sue & Sue, 2008). WRAP provides a different option for probation youths so that they can reconnect with their family and community while paying attention to their unmet emotional and social needs. However, despite increased federal support for alternatives to juvenile incarceration during the last two decades, youths with an immigrant background were still overrepresented in the juvenile justice systems, and the continued need for research in areas that explore alternatives to their incarceration existed (Kempf-Leonard, 2007).
Background

According to Greenwood and Turner (2011), “a shift in cultural norms, changes in law enforcement, . . . the use of evidence-based programs, and investment in front-end prevention programs” contributed to a large decrease of juvenile arrests in 2005 (p. 92). Wraparound services have been implemented by multiple counties in California and nationwide, aiming at preventing out-of-home placement of youths. At the time of this study, 31 of the 58 counties in California were using this approach; in 2005, the Mental Health Services Act contained “a very specific requirement that all counties must develop a wraparound program for children and their families” (California Department of Social Services, 2007, “The Mental Health Services Act,” para. 1). In Santa Cruz, WRAP has become part of an award-winning juvenile justice system reform movement characterized by a decrease in the number of detentions (Community Assessment Project of Santa Cruz County [CAP], 2010) as seen in Figure 1.

As illustrated in Figure 2, the alternatives to incarceration, including the WRAP program, have also contributed to lowering the representation of minority youths in juvenile hall (Santa Cruz Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative [Santa Cruz JDAI], 2011). At the time of this study, the majority of WRAP’s client population consisted of youths from Mexican immigrant families. At the beginning of the data collection period in November 2011, the program’s caseload consisted of 38 youth with documented gang involvement in their probation record. Of the 38 youths, 32 were of Mexican descent. 31 were male, and 7 were female, with 5 females of Mexican descent (H. Heath, personal communication, December 1, 2011).
In a 2003 risk assessment by the University of California San Francisco for Santa Cruz County, Rosenblatt et al. (2003) described the reason for WRAP’s emergence the following way, “In 1997, a total of 2,774 juveniles were arrested by local law enforcement agencies, the largest number of yearly arrests recorded over the previous decade” (p. 34). The author went on to state that this amounted to the highest number recorded. Felony arrests had increased at a rate of 63.9% over a 6-year period, with the largest growth in crimes involving violence and weapons.
On a yearly average, 460 youth were being referred to the Probation Department as a result of these serious offenses. This special population of serious and violent juvenile offenders represented a significant concern to the safety of the public and required a response from the Juvenile Court and the Probation Department. (Rosenblatt et al., 2003, p. 8)

This led to years of strategy implementation with focus on alternatives to juvenile incarceration, such as wraparound services. Current statistics show not only a decline of 19.2% in Santa Cruz County total juvenile misdemeanor arrests (CAP, 2010, p. 151) since 1996 but also the decrease in juvenile felony arrests by 28% (Santa Cruz JDAI, 2011). According to the same source, WRAP contributed significantly to this outcome.
Figure 3 shows a continued lower rate of juvenile criminality in the period from 1997 to 2010. While these figures show that wraparound services may be effective, they do not give details on how the program succeeds.

Figure 3. Decline in Santa Cruz County rates of juvenile felony and misdemeanor offenses; youth criminality in Santa Cruz County; provided by Scott McDonald, Chief of Probation of Santa Cruz County, and used with permission.

Currently WRAP for probation youths at Santa Cruz County Children’s Mental Health (SCMH) is engaging youths “with complicated multidimensional problems” (Burns & Goldman, quoted in Stambaugh et al., 2007, p. 143) in a social network consisting of the youths, their families, providers, agencies, and the local community. “Targeted outcomes include increasing behaviors that facilitate functioning in the community . . . and eliminating behaviors that place the child at risk for removal from his or her community” (Stambaugh et al., 2007, p. 144).
To counteract what James Garbarino (2002,) called “our judgmental culture, [which is] often short of compassion for these violent teenagers, preferring retaliation, retribution, and preventative detention to the challenging task of transformation” (p. xix), clinicians with WRAP apply a holistic approach that combines skills in psychotherapy with community based interventions and advocacy. At the same time, the youth and family actively participate in the treatment planning process. This encourages mutual learning between treatment providers and clients about the different sociocultural realities and needs. Dr. Gabor Maté (2010) explained the reason for such a holistic method the following way:

The human brain does not develop on its own. . . . The essential condition for the physiological development of the brain circuits that regulate human behavior, that give us empathy, that give us a social sense, that give us connection with other people, that give us a connection with ourselves, that allow us to mature—the essential condition for those circuits . . . is the presence of emotionally available, non-stressed, attuned, parenting, caregivers. (Maté’s sixth response, para. 3)

In order to sustain the positive contributions of a holistic approach such as WRAP, for example, the decline of youth criminality in the community, a better understanding of this integrative methodology is needed.

Significance of Research for International Psychology

WRAP in Santa Cruz exemplifies how a collective approach can be developed based on indigenous practices, such as those of the Maoris in New Zealand (VanDenBerg, Bruns, & Burchard, 2008, p. 3), and introduced to the United States “in response to the fragmentation of the children’s mental health care system” (Stroul &
Friedman, as cited in Furman, Negi, Schatz, & Jones, 2008). Klopf and McCroskey (2007) referred to Hofstede’s view that the individualistic values that define the Anglo-Saxon dominant culture in the United States contributed to “a society in which ties between individuals are loose and everyone is expected to look after him or herself and the immediate family only” (p. 46). Adolescents with an immigration background are often negotiating access to a different dominant culture, a process that the mental health institutions, including their service providers, often ignore. The wraparound approach helps to look at the multiple layers of their experiences, which is necessary to best understand how to provide the needed support.

WRAP serves as an example of both the internationalization and indigenization of psychological knowledge. “Internationalization in counseling is a continuous process of synthesizing knowledge generated through research, scholarship, and practice from different cultures and using this knowledge to solve problems in local and global communities” (Leung et al., 2009, p. 115). To do justice to the characteristics of the local culture, the “imported” methodology and theories need to be adjusted to “and anchored in local culture” (pp. 115-116).

By illustrating how the participating youth experiences the WRAP interventions, the current study explored the community-based interventions and interactions that go beyond traditional therapy and social work.

Counseling professionals can no longer afford to be ethnocentric and unilateral. . . . A linear and mono-cultural perspective of psychology and counseling cannot adequately respond to mental health challenges, such as poverty, migration, natural disasters, overpopulation and urbanization, and
international war and violence, which are global in size and impact. (Leung et al., 2009, p. 116)

The potential to learn from non-Western psychological approaches becomes apparent when focusing on the interconnectedness of individual clients and providers with the larger context of culture. When collective indigenous cultures are confronted with individualist Western context without losing their essential values, they can help create integrated approaches that have value and application for populations in need of a third option. The Maori people of New Zealand responded to their youths’ need for culturally appropriate interventions by co-creating the restorative justice program. Santa Cruz County probation youths now receive treatment based on the same individualized principles that build on integration of collective and individualist values. In an interconnected world, our options and solutions for psychosocial healing can expand.

For immigrant populations, such as the Latino population in Santa Cruz County, the experience of adjusting to the host country is not problem-free and is often traumatizing (Unger, 2008). Maynard, Ferdman, and Holmes (2010) argued that “intercultural contact requires the active participation of at least two parties, . . . [and that] all sides require some degree of both accommodation and assimilation” (p. 227). Maynard et al. pointed out how “problems arise when the adaptation comes solely from the new settler(s) and no reciprocal adaptation takes place in the receiving society” (p. 227). They emphasized the need to apply the holistic view to influence policy development, which “promotes inclusion in our communities, schools, and work organizations” (p. 227). The methods of addressing the needs of immigrant populations
have traditionally been based on the White middle-class Anglo-European American worldview and focused on individual specific issues rather than the problematic system of coinciding needs (Sue, 2003, p. 6).

On the interpersonal and intrapersonal level, emphasis on emotion regulation provides an important new and integrative avenue to intercultural communication. Matsumoto, Hee Yoo, and LeRoux (2007) described “an emotion focused way of thinking about intercultural adjustment” as “the psychological engine of intercultural adjustment” (p. 80). The authors stressed that cultural expert knowledge alone is not enough to successfully connect across cultural lines.

Developing treatment approaches based on aboriginal community approaches and adapting these treatment modalities to the Westernized world is an important contribution to the practice of an “ongoing inter-cultural dialogue at a global level” (Fay, 2011, p. 1). It can transform our individualistic treatment styles, and enhance cultural competency (Sue, 2003, p. 6) by creating a model of connectedness that fosters the development of interpersonal skills and emotion regulation, which can then later be generalized toward the larger community.

Creating a balance between individualist and collectivist methodology supports a participatory and strength based approach that emphasizes an emancipated and coherent interconnectedness in all participants. According to Dwairy and Achoui (2009), culturally different parenting styles influence emotion regulation in children. In collective cultures, “parents tend to be more authoritarian and to emphasize obedience and adherence in order to maintain the harmony of the collective” (p. 221). In their article “Transnational
Social Work: using a Wraparound Model,” Furman et al. (2008) suggested the use of the wraparound approach for “the service needs of transmigrants” who “engage in lives in different places, countries and cultures, mostly for economic reasons” (p. 498) caused by globalization. They posited that “a coordinating agency or provider is needed in much the same way as the wraparound team is needed in the child mental health model” and recommended “that NGOs, in partnership with intergovernmental organizations, such as the United Nations, can serve as leaders in these wraparound approaches [by] establishing transmigrating services coordinators” (p. 498). Given that the wraparound model is applicable to the above-mentioned issues, this research will contribute to the international discussion on culturally appropriate practices with youths from immigrant communities.

**Theoretical Framework**

This study explored the participant and his world using a holistic lens. Figure 4 shows the four different but interconnected perspectives of the lens:

1. At the individual level the focus is on emotion regulation and safety using constructs from Herman’s (1992) complex trauma model, McFarlane and van der Kolk’s (2007) theories on trauma, as well as Fisher’s (2008) focus on “trauma and the body.” Observed trauma responses and a history of traumatic events were noted according to Briere and Lanktree’s (2008) trauma questionnaire for adolescents. Interventions include establishing safety and building skills in emotion regulation according to Ogden, Minton, and Pain (2006) as well as learning heart rhythm feedback as developed by McCraty and
Figure 4. Holistic concept for study.
Childre (as cited in Thurber, 2003). Sue and Sue’s (2008) model of the cultural identity development in relation to self, family, community, and society, supported deeper understanding of the cultural issues impacting the participant.

2. At the interpersonal or family level, focus is on the participant’s attachment to caregivers as delineated by Bowlby (1969) and Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978). According to those authors, attachment influenced qualities such as trust, socialization skills, competence in social cues, emotional connectedness to others, and fulfilling interpersonal expectations. Interventions included family conferences (Furman et al., 2008), family therapy (Nichols & Schwartz, 1995), attending to family needs, and identifying, supporting, or introducing safe external emotion regulators (Ogden et al., 2006).

3. In the sphere of culture and community, Prilleltensky and Nelson’s (2009) community therapy model was used to look at the participant as he connected to the dominant macro-culture as well as to diverse micro-cultures, such as the family’s culture of origin, immigrant culture, and/or gang culture. Community building and culturally sensitive approaches, such as supportive interactions with the community, social institutions, school or law enforcement, as well as dialogue with members of the same and different cultures, support the creation of a participatory micro-culture. Interventions also promoted engagement in experiential opportunities offered in the community (Lung, Stauffer, & Alvarez, 2008), encouraged finding or creating a cultural space, and learning about one’s cultural roots (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2006).
4. Lastly, de Jong’s (2002) public health model encompassed at the larger picture and included cultural issues and practices that either helped or hindered the participant’s participation and well-being. Interventions on this level included advocating for needed societal changes; bridging of cultural gaps; addressing cultural, environmental and emotional trauma; as well as bringing attention to the complex consequences of such issues.

**Key Characteristics of the Research**

This study’s key characteristics were derived from the holistic lens: Focus on the youth’s ability to regulate his emotions, his ability to feel safe, his trauma history, cultural identity, attachment to caregivers, his connectedness to—and role in—family, community, and culture, as well as the cultural practices that help or hinder his well-being. The study also looked at the interventions provided during the youth’s participation in WRAP, and the impact on both the participant and the embedded researcher. Figure 5 was my working concept, combining the five spheres with the assessment of possible problem areas and interventions.

**Research Questions**

The research question guiding this study asked, How does WRAP impact the experience of a probation youth with immigrant background in Santa Cruz County? To further explore this topic, I created central guiding questions after Creswell’s (2007) model for portraying the participants experience in a case study:
Figure 5. Working concept for this study.


- Which experiences shaped this youth?
- Who were the people involved in his life?
- What themes of response emerged during the time of research?
- What theoretical constructs helped understand this youth’s responses to his life circumstances?

The following questions expanded the focus of this research to include the experience of the use of a holistic lens and an integrative treatment approach:

- How does the application of a holistic lens affect the participant’s experience of treatment?
- How does the holistic view affect the work of the clinician and the participant, as it is a circular process?
- How does the better understanding of a youth with immigrant background in Santa Cruz County who is participating in WRAP, increase the knowledge about WRAP’s impact?

Assumptions

This research assumed that in the context of immigration, cultural adaptation and complex trauma clinical work needed a different lens from the traditional focus on a single model. An integrative approach addressed many different interactive spheres: It needed to include the individual, the family, culture, community, and society.

The wraparound approach had been shown to provide an interactive holistic perspective and placed the locus of change in the different spheres. In this study it provided the base for a holistic view of the participant and his world.

Understanding participants from an integrative perspective positively impacts the participants’ experience and brings out their unique voice. The holistic view of the
participant and how he developed in response to his specific context sensitized the 
clinician, researcher, or reader to the complexity of the participant’s needs.

**Definitions**

The following are the operational definitions for the purpose of this intensive 
single case study:

Anglo in this study refers to the English-speaking macro culture with “English-
oriented cultural patterns” (Klopf & McCroskey, 2007, p. 261). It is used interchangeably 
with the term *White*.

Acculturation means “the change in individuals whose primary learning has been 
in one culture and who take over traits from another culture” (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003, 
p. 15).

Assimilation is the absorption of a culture into the dominant culture (Klopf & 

Attachment is emotional bonding with another being, person or place.

Community is the immediate context of “extra-familial systems” that “exchange 
information, energy, and material” (Nichols & Schwartz, 1995, p. 490) with individuals 
and families. This “social context” of families includes extended family, teachers, law 
enforcement, institutions, and “other social agents” (p. 491).

Complex trauma is the prolonged and repeated exposure to events that threaten 
the safety and stability of a person.
Connectedness is “the adolescents’ caring for and involvement in specific relationships and contexts within their social ecology” (Karcher, 2001, “Abstract”) and “the attachment that develops in response to parental support” and “feelings of belonging” (Karcher, n.d.). Connectedness reflects the links to self, others, and society.

Culture is an “orientation system” (Klopf & McCorskey, 2007, p. 275) that consists of “assigned roles and tasks within a given frame of the routines of daily life” (Super & Harkness, 1997, p. 4). It includes “commonly shared practices” (Super & Harkness, p. 5) within a specific locality, which inform the way people interact with each other and care for each other.

Cultural competency is characterized by the ability to self-regulate in the face of unfamiliar behavior patterns while being able to communicate effectively and appropriately “with people from other cultures” (Klopf & McCrosky, 2007, p. 266).

Cultural identity is part of early socialization into the micro-cosm of family, and taught by our caregivers (Newsome, 2001, p. 146). Depending on the culture of the family or caregivers, people either become part of the dominant cultural group, of a minority group, or create their own unique blend of culture, class, and history. The cultural identity development is different for people from the dominant culture than for those belonging to so-called minority cultures. It is different again for people stigmatized, excluded, or penalized by another culture or micro-culture. Sue and Sue (2008) defined the stages of “racial/cultural identity development in people of color” (p. 233-283) (conformity, dissonance and appreciating, resistance and immersion, introspection, integrated awareness), and then compared it to those of “White racial identity
development” (naïveté, conformity, dissonance, resistance and immersion, introspection, integrative awareness, commitment to anti-racist action).

Cultural pluralism is the “maintenance of distinct entities among cultural groups” (Klopf & McCroskey, 2007, p. 261).

Emotion regulation is the self-management skill “leading to objective and measurable improvements in physiological and behavioral functioning” (Thurber, 2008, p. 16). The goal of emotion regulation is the ability to strategize and think creatively about solutions instead of being triggered into fear responses. Emotion regulation also affects intercultural communication, since “critical thinking about cultural differences and being open and flexible to new ways of thinking instead of [developing] . . . fear responses, . . . continually adds new cognitive schemas in the mind to represent the world” (Matsumoto et al., 2007, p. 81).

Experience includes the events the participant lived through and which had a physical and/or psychological impact on his life.

Hispanic, in this study, addresses people from a cultural background where the native language is Spanish as a consequence of the Spanish conquest of the Americas. The term is used interchangeable with Latino for the purpose of this research.

Impact here means the qualitative experience of WRAP services as I observed it in my roles of embedded researcher and facilitator and expressed by the participant, his family members, and other team members.
Mexican American refers to a person with cultural roots from Mexico, who is living in the U.S. Mexican Americans are included in the terms *Latino* and *Hispanic* in this study.

Participation includes the aspects of “voluntary involvement,” “increased receptivity and ability to respond,” “taking initiative,” “fostering a dialogue,” and self-determined change (UN-Habitat, 2012, p. 35). According to Lund (2008), “participation now is increasingly seen as a desired outcome of development to obtain individual and collective rights” and “has become part of a global discourse of development” (as cited in UN-Habitat, p. 36).

Safety is a state of being where the person feels protected from harm and can control her or his environment so that the level of potential hazards is low.

Trauma is identified as the exposure to extreme stressors involving direct personal experience of an event that involves actual or threatened death, injury, or a threat to the physical integrity of another person; or learning about unexpected or violent death, serious harm, or threat of death or injury experienced by a family member or other close associates. (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 2000, p. 463)

The effect of trauma is overwhelming “the ordinary systems of care that give people a sense of control, connection and meaning” (Herman, 1992, p. 33). In response, the affected person has experienced “intense fear, helplessness, or horror” (*DSM-IV-TR*, p. 463), and has developed ways of coping that vary in their effectiveness to ensure the person’s well-being.

Wraparound services are a system-of-care approach implemented by multiple counties in California and nationwide, to prevent out of home placement of youths. Wraparound is based on the following principles: family centered, team based,
community based, culturally competent, strengths based, individualized, collaboration, natural supports, persistence, and outcome based (National Wraparound Initiative, 2006).

WRAP is the specific program implementing wraparound services in Santa Cruz County, California, where the client population consists of youths in the probation system.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This qualitative case study applied the holistic lens (Figures 4 and 5) to a male, U.S.-born, Mexican American teenager with a history of juvenile justice involvement who participated in WRAP. The different spheres of the holistic model (youth, family, culture, community, and society) and the points where they interfaced, were addressed with theories that allowed for an in depth exploration of the complex matter. To understand the experience of this study’s participant from the holistic perspective, this research drew on several different theoretical orientations, some of which covered multiple spheres. Both individual and systemic conceptualizations were needed to do justice to the integrative approach, which focused on intra-personal and inter-personal dimensions, and where they interfaced. For this reason, the key theoretical concepts for this research included social ecology, community psychology, the local community background, culture and cultural identity, trauma, emotion regulation, coherence, attachment, as well as the theoretical foundations of the WRAP approach. It is important to keep in mind that most of the concepts were in themselves culture bound and had been developed from a Western perspective. The spheres and theoretical foundations overlapped on several occasions, which in itself highlighted the need for an integrative lens.
Social Ecology

The theoretical framework for this study as illustrated in Figures 4 and 5 is based on the model of the child psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner (1979). He formulated an ecological concept of child development that established that a child’s behavior is to a great extent affected by the many systems in which she or he is nested as well as by the interchange between these different worlds. Each of the worlds the child is embedded in is, in turn, part of layered, larger spheres, which interact with the specific context of the child. The child, in turn, is an active part in this interaction. Changes in the child have an effect on its world, and changes in its world affect the child. Bronfenbrenner’s model provided an important organizing framework for family- and community-based treatment, where assessment and interventions address problems on multiple levels that include the individual, family, institutional, community, and social context.

Community Psychology

The outer sphere of the holistic lens in this research (Figures 4 and 5) has been inspired by Marsella’s (1998) advocacy for a “global community psychology” and is based on the impact of international “events and forces facing the world today” (p. 1283). Marsella pointed to the need for a “meta-psychology concerned with understanding, assessing, and addressing the individual and collective psychological consequences . . . using multicultural, multidisciplinary, multisectoral, and multinational knowledge, methods, and interventions” (p. 1284). This conceptualization also emphasized the sphere of culture and its relation with all the other levels within the holistic lens. Marsella
pointed out that the Western “emphasis on the individual, objectivity, quantification, narrow disciplinary specialization, and universal ‘truths,’ may be irrelevant and meaningless for non-Western people and their life contexts” (p. 1285). Minority cultures within the U.S. have been further marginalized and excluded by such a methodology. Emphasizing the importance of understanding culture, Marsella wrote that Christine Hall “concluded that psychology in the United States must be revised if it is to be relevant to the multicultural world in which Americans live” (p. 1287). The same strong emphasis on culture has been integrated by Karl Dennis (2005) into the holistic lens of wraparound: he determined “that [wraparound] services need to be designed and delivered . . . [in such a way that they] incorporate the religious customs, regional, racial, and ethnic values and beliefs of the families” served (p. 8).

In addition to integrating the sphere of society and global community as well as a strong cultural focus, community psychology inspired the holistic lens of this research with emphasis on the many contextual layers of people’s experience. It examined the personal micro-level, the relational meso-level, and the collective macro-level where people’s lives take place (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2009, p. 128). Rather than focusing on the definition and elimination of problems common to the Western clinical approach, the goal was reaching a sense of well-being, “a state of personal, relational, and collective” welfare that manifested on the personal level as “control, choice, self-esteem, competence, independence, political rights, and a positive identity” (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2006, p. 29). Relational well-being consisted of “positive and supportive relationships, participation in social, community and political life.” On the collective
level it entailed the “acquisition of valued resources such as employment, income, education and housing” (p. 29). Interventions in community psychology “focus on competence and strength, prevention” (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2009, p. 128), “social support, personal empowerment, recovery of personal and political identity, and subjectivity and reflexivity” (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2006, p. 29).

Community psychology advocated for a “collaborative model with multiple community stakeholders” (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2009, p. 128) and allowed focus on “blending individual improvement with community change through . . . reform and advocacy” (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2009, p. 129). The authors stressed the importance of participation and stated there exists the danger for community psychology to neglect its “primary allegiance . . . to the most disadvantaged community members and their agenda for social change, . . . with disadvantaged community members having only token participation or only playing the role of consumers of services” (p. 129).

Community psychology’s focus on personal, relational, and collective well-being (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2006, p. 30) inspired the holistic lens for wraparound services and gave a positive focus to the treatment interventions. Instead of following Western psychology’s trend to prescribe treatment and goals for the client’s diagnosis, community psychology “situate[d] personal struggles in the context of larger political and structural forces” and emphasized “control, choice, self-esteem, competence, independence, political rights and a positive identity” (p. 30). Interventions modeled “power sharing, egalitarian relationships, solidarity [through] positive and supportive relationships, participation in social, community and political life” (p. 30). Treatment providers
advocated for the participants when they faced “oppressive social practices manifested in policies and community settings” and assisted them in practical issues, such as finding “employment, income, education, and housing” (p. 30).

Public Health Model

The public health model by Joop de Jong (2002) encompassed all spheres of the holistic lens of this research, providing a compass for prevention, treatment, and interventions. It became a valuable concept for program planning and creating an integrative public health policy. This approach modeled the effectiveness of working with principles rather than with fixed mapped out interventions that have not been adjusted to a local context. De Jong (2002) based his public health model on policy and service delivery principles to help adjust and transform them according to the local needs. The policy principles emphasized culture specificity and aimed at “full citizenship” for the affected populations (p. 25). Service delivery principles highlighted “a contextual, systemic and interdisciplinary approach” and a “community base” (p. 25). The author stressed how “global political, economic and socio-cultural processes” formed the outer field of the human environment and interaction. Local communities produced another layer of connectedness, followed by the family, and the individual. When trauma occurs, Obeyesekere noted that culture defined “the process whereby painful motives and affects are transformed into publicly accepted sets of meaning and symbols” (as quoted in de Jong, 2002, p. 34). Culture determined how the community viewed and treated mental illness and influenced “the person’s ability to utilize resources when trying to cope with a
disaster” (de Jong, p. 36). A cultural theme wove through all layers of interconnectedness. Time is also crucial in understanding context and creating effective interventions (de Jong, p. 42).

De Jong (2002) then established criteria to foster “preplanning and selection of priorities,” which then can be applied according to best judgment, need, and mental health issue in question (p. 44). De Jong described a theoretical construct applicable for “society-at-large,” “community,” and “family and individual” at three stages, “primary prevention,” “treatment,” and “maintenance treatment” (p. 66).

**Wraparound**

In this research, the local wraparound program (WRAP) provided the public health setting and context, where the holistic lens was applied to the experience of a youth. Though the wraparound program had many similarities with de Jong’s public health approach, this research focused more on the aspects of holistic and integrative service provision. Many aspects from community psychology were formative for the holistic wraparound framework as well: The U.S. wraparound veteran Karl Dennis (2005) explained that the wraparound principle of “strength-based [service provision] means that the positive aspects of the child, family and community must be considered and be an integral part of treatment planning and delivery” (p. 7). Wraparound’s central goal was to build a program “around the needs of a specific group [or person], rather than forcing the group [or person] to fit within the needs of the program” (MacRae & Zehr, 2004). This creates coherent interactions between the spheres of youth, family,
community, culture and society. Learning self-regulation skills enables youths to increase their well-being and ability to interact. By connecting with the adolescents and their families, treatment professionals encourage synchronization with efficient societal functioning. Together providers and participants attempt a positive impact on “social and economic oppression, . . . cultural intolerance, [and] crime” (p. 22). Wraparound interventions facilitate access for unique youths with complex issues to a place in the local community.

Figure 6 expands on “a schematic representation of the developmental niche” by Super and Harkness (1997, p. 26), the youth is represented by the field in the middle, surrounded by family, community, and culture. Each of the domains has an influence on the others, and the youth is shaped by each field, while in turn actively affecting them. WRAP interweaves (green coloring) the different areas, supporting the youth’s bi-directional connections as well as supporting the interface of youth, family, community, and culture.

According to Burns, Schoenwald, Burchard, Faw, and Santos (2000), wraparound effected change by supporting coherence between the micro system of the child’s “immediate home and environment” and “the surrounding larger service system” (p. 296). The authors explained that “supportive relationships among the family, school, and community facilitate the attainment of improved behavioral functioning for a given child across a comprehensive set of life domains” (p. 296). Burns et al. (2000) assumed that “effective wraparound programs change the surrounding environment of the child and thus foster lasting changes that occur in individuals, families, and communities” (p. 296).
Figure 6. Wraparound model.
Draguns (2007) “point[ed] to the subtle intertwining of personal experience and cultural milieu” (p. 257-258). He redefined therapeutic work as “the challenge of helping unique clients optimize their functioning within the constraints and opportunities of their specific sociocultural environment” (p. 258). Wraparound was founded on such a trend:

Wraparound programs emerged when mental health professionals took the initiative and influenced “national and regional authorities, urging them to implement psychologically informed policies and programs” (Wessells & Dawes, 2007, p. 268). In 1984, the U.S. “Congress first addressed the concept of an alternative method for identifying and providing appropriate mental health services to children with severe emotional disturbances” (Bickman, Smith, Lambert, & Andrade, 2003, p. 136).

According to Stroul and Friedman this change toward a more collective and community based treatment approach was caused by “the fragmentation of the children’s mental health care system” at the time (as cited in Furman et al., 2008, p. 499). Federal funding was provided to “assist states in developing an infrastructure for the provision of publicly funded community-based services” (Pumariega & Vance, 1999, in Bickman et al., 2003, p. 136). In 1992, the Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children and Their Families Program became “the largest Federal program for child mental health” in the United States (p. 136).

During the 1990’s, comparable developments occurred simultaneously in the Western world; in Europe and Canada, researchers explored alternatives to individual-based treatments and institutionalization. The approaches included the process of “family group decision making, which originates in New Zealand’s Maori tribal traditions”
Westernized mental health systems realized the financial and social advantages to preventing out-of-home-placement, “focus on families’ values and strength, to connect families to formal and informal resources based on their needs, and to meet the system requirements” (Hamilton, 2010, p. 2). New Zealand created its restorative youth justice program with family group conferencing as its main tool in response to the escalation of youth criminality and the ineffectiveness of the Anglo-value-based justice system for the aboriginal population (Love, 2000, p. 16).

The Santa Cruz County Children’s Mental Health consulted with New Zealand’s Allan McRae about the process of family group decision making, which greatly benefited the work with families in WRAP. The cultural origins from the Maori culture of New Zealand brought strong collective cultural elements to the Western system of care approach. Ross (2000) saw the Western indigenization of collective methodologies from the Maori as the “gift from the aboriginal people of New Zealand” (p. 5); In the Maori culture, “any decisions relating to Maori whanau [families] must take into account the complex webs of relationships, qualities, and needs” (Love, 2002, p. 19). The family is a central element in Maori models of well-being, and “individual well-being” cannot be divided from family well-being (Love, p. 19). Family group conferencing is modeled after “Whanau Hui, . . . a gathering of people” with consistent principles and a “spiritual dimension” (Love, p. 19). In this family gathering, “all members may express their thoughts and feelings, in a way that avoids putting down others” (Love, p. 21). “The ultimate aim of the hui is to rebuild the mana [prestige, standing, authority] of the whanau, which may have been damaged by the actions of a member, or which may be
under threat as a result of a crisis situation” (Love, p. 21). The leaders steer the discussion towards possible solutions, and “following the discussion process, whanau members may be charged with the responsibility for performing particular tasks or functions. Resolutions will be aimed toward healing within and between affected whanau, in effect by restoring the balance in a particular direction” (Love, p. 21). At the end of the family meeting, a senior family member “will summarize proceedings, acknowledge the participation of whanau members and the spiritual presence of the ancestors, and . . . close this particular piece of the process” (Love, p. 21).

According to Rauso and Vermillion (2012), wraparound is based on the following nine core principles: “family voice and choice, team based, natural supports, collaboration, community-based, culturally competent, strengths based, persistence, and outcome based” (p. 2). The principles provide a guideline for the application of services, which occurs in the process of four phases: the “engagement phase, initial planning phase, implementation phase, and transition phase” (p. 2). Dennis (as quoted in Kendziora, 1999) explained the holistic nature of wraparound the following way:

We design services to serve the entire family. For example, a child from a poor family may be stealing to help support his family. If he’s caught and incarcerated, that does nothing to change the circumstances that led up to his stealing in the first place. A family-focused approach might work to help the family’s caregiver find a job, which might eliminate the need for the youth to steal. Another thing to note is that when a whole family is served following one child’s crisis, other children in that family can also benefit. (“Family focused.”)

Rauso and Vermillion (2012) provided a description of the wraparound team and the different roles it incorporated for different team members: The family of the referred youth who is the “captain of the team,” the “referring party who brings the mandates and
keeps safety a priority,” the “facilitator” who coordinates the process, and the “family partner” who brings life experience, can co-facilitate, and bridge connections between the professional team and the family (p. 2). WRAP in Santa Cruz County, where this study took place, also included a youth specialist, who co-facilitated and supported the individual youth. The roles were not rigid, and team members could step in for each other on an as-needed basis. Family conferencing occurred often initially on a weekly basis if necessary but was flexible and dependent on family need. During the conferences focus was first on building a connection and then on establishing and progressing according to the family plan, named the “family vision,” which was the joint goal of the family. It also included focus on “domains” that were important to the family, which could include “safety, relationships, health, fun, family, school, jobs, a place to live” and “others” (p. 3). Family conferences addressed the “strengths, goals, and needs of the family,” and the team developed strategies together on how to reach the goals and tend to the needs of the family (p. 3).

Bickman et al. (2003) pointed out that “best practices for implementing and administering wraparound programs are still evolving,” and defined wraparound as “a philosophy of care that creates a definable planning process involving the child and family” with the goal “to develop a unique set of individualized community services and natural supports so that a specific child and family can achieve a positive set of outcomes” (p. 137).

Karl Dennis, the retired executive director of Kaleidoscope, Inc. in Chicago, “pioneered . . . ‘wraparound services’” in the U.S. (2005, p. 1). Dennis implemented
wraparound in his community organization since 1975. His core conviction was “that children can best be served in their families, in their communities, that the assets and strengths of their situation are best known to those closest to the child—and that wrapping the youngster and family with individual human care, supervision, and concern is safer, better and cheaper then tearing apart child, family, community and systems” (Family Advocacy Movement, 2012). Dennis has been an educator, presenter and counselor with a multicultural personal background that he identifies as “part African American, Cherokee, Blackfoot, and Irish,” who emphasizes in “his presentations an understanding of culture and the important role that it plays in the healing process” (Family Advocacy Movement, 2012). Dennis contributed to the internationalization and indigenization of wraparound when he consulted and taught “in China, Australia, Canada, Romania, [and] Great Britain and New Zealand” (Kendziora, 1999, para. 3).

Previous research on wraparound and behavior change in youths highlighted the effectiveness of the wraparound approach. A historical comparison study exploring the “reduction of recidivism using wraparound” services for juvenile offenders with mental health issues (Pullman et al., 2006), indicated that the youths who received wraparound “were significantly less likely to recidivate at all, less likely to recidivate with a felony offense, and served less detention time” (p. 375). In a different study, researchers used behavior analysis “within the wraparound process” (Myaard, Crawford., Jackson., & Alessi, 2000). Positive behavior changes were achieved immediately and over time in the cases of four adolescents with severe emotional disturbance and at imminent risk of long-term residential placement.
Although there was sound research showing positive results of the use of wraparound programs, there was still a lack of information regarding how a participant experienced the program and how applying the holistic lens to the wraparound process impacted the youth, the interventions, and the team. Answers to the research questions of this study will better enable treatment professionals to conceptualize their work in context, to sensitize themselves to the impact of culture and trauma, and to listen to the participant’s individual needs while also considering the collective that surrounds the youth. (The research questions are: How does WRAP impact the experience of a probation youth with immigrant background in Santa Cruz County? Which experiences shaped this youth? Who were the people involved in his life? What themes of response emerged during the time of research? What theoretical constructs helped understand this youth’s responses to his life circumstances? How does the application of a holistic lens affect the participant’s experience of treatment? How does the holistic view affect the work of the clinician and the participant, as it is a circular process? How does the better understanding of a youth with immigrant background in Santa Cruz County who is participating in WRAP, increase the knowledge about WRAP’s impact?)

The unique emphasis of this study on engaging with the treatment team on the ground was necessary to amplify the understanding on how wraparound can increasingly acknowledge and include the populations it serves. This research highlighted the influence of the specific lens with which the participant was seen on the treatment process and its potential to change the observer (be it researcher, treatment provider, family, community or society) and the participant alike.
Historical, Cultural, and Ethnographic Background of Santa Cruz County

Understanding the complex international, national, and local context is an important aspect of the holistic model and a holistic treatment approach in WRAP. The spheres of society, community and culture within the integrative lens (Figures 4 and 5) emphasize the importance of the specific local context. Especially the cultural make up of a community stands out with such focus, and can sensitize the reader to the historic cultural traumata and their effects on the current community. For this qualitative case study, Santa Cruz County created the unique historical, cultural, and demographic setting that influenced the experience of the participant and his WRAP team:

The ethnic history of California after European contact is a chronical [sic] of repeated cycles of expropriation of resources, introduction of cheap labor from new sources (importation of which almost immediately produces racist social protest), and attempts at preventing new arrivals from enjoying the fruits of their own entrepreneurial enterprises (Friedman et al., 1996, p. 11).

According to the same source, the indigenous population of Santa Cruz County, consisting of hunter-gatherers, came under Spanish control in 1767. The Native Americans were exploited as labor, were moved to missions, and their land was appropriated. With Mexican rule from 1822-1846, the protection of Native Americans further diminished and land previously owned by missions was sold to individuals. From 1848 to present times, U.S. rule led to “cycles of exploitation/expulsion of the following major sources of labor roughly in the order of their arrival” (Friedman et al., 1996, p. 11):
Native Americans (Original: genocide, slavery, expulsion)

Chinese (Post Civil War: contract labor, residential/educational/occupational segregation, denial of legal rights and citizenship, eventual immigration ban, resettlement and expulsion)

Japanese (Late 19th Century: contract labor, residential/educational/occupational segregation, denial of legal rights and citizenship, eventual immigration ban, internment during WW II)

Filipinos (1920: contract labor, residential/educational/occupational segregation, denial of legal rights and citizenship, immigration ban)

Mexicans (various periods, especially after 1910: contract labor, residential/educational/occupational segregation, denial of legal rights, immigration bans, expulsions). (Friedman et al., 1996, pp. 11-12)

The influence of institutionalized poverty and racism on the cultural environment in Watsonville, a community in the southern part of Santa Cruz County, in times of economic hardship laid the historic foundation for cultural trauma. This is highlighted by one historic example which led to national attention: During the onset of the Great Depression in 1930, when “White working class men felt especially threatened by Filipino labor because farmers paid Filipinos significantly lower wages than White workers” (Oakland Museum of California, n.d., para. 4). While immigration laws restricted other immigrants at the time from entering California, the Philippines were still U.S. territory, and Filipinos had the right to work in the U.S. After a local newspaper published the picture of a Filipino man dancing with a White teenager, 200 White men destroyed a new Filipino dance hall and “four days of rioting began,” leaving the Filipino neighborhood of Watsonville destroyed (Oakland Museum of California). The incident is known as the “Watsonville Riots” (Oakland Museum of California). The independence of
the Philippines had consequences for Filipino workers. Their status changed from U.S. citizens to aliens, and restrictions on their access to work permits. An increase in workers from the geographically closer Mexico followed (Kang, 2010).

Later Watsonville transitioned into a major food processing center, where the canneries of the 1950s invited cheap Mexican immigrant labor with *bracero* programs. In 1970s, Rep. Joseph Kennedy visited to support better conditions for the farm workers there (United Farm Workers, 1997), later the canneries and *bracero* programs disappeared and the land-owners moved away. A major earthquake in 1989 basically leveled the town. The North American Free Trade Act in 1994 led to a harsh economic decline when many local operations moved to Mexico.

Still the continuously dire economic situation in Mexico and a desire for cheap labor in the United States were the main reasons for the high numbers of Mexican immigrants in the United States. No current or past policies have been able to curb immigration or assist the immigrants in their need to find a place to thrive.

Either the two countries accept the reality of Mexicans entering the United States, whether temporarily or permanently, and open avenues for orderly movement, or both countries engage forcefully and cooperatively to achieve a real “partnership for prosperity” within a framework of multifaceted integration. (Alba, 2010, “Ongoing Concerns,” para. 7)

At the time of this research Santa Cruz County had a “mid-sized population [of] 280,258,” with employment emphasis on “agriculture, tourism, government and high tech” (Santa Cruz JDAI, 2011, “Santa Cruz County, CA—Demographics,” paras. 2-4). Santa Cruz County was predominantly ethnically White and Latino, with a steady increase in the Latino population from 24.9% in 2001 to 35.5% in 2010. The White
population showed a decline from 69.3% to 55.8% during the same time period (CAP, 2010). The county included the two cities of Santa Cruz with 59,000 and Watsonville with 52,000 inhabitants as well as Scotts Valley (12,000), and Capitola (10,000).

“Approximately half of the population lives in unincorporated Santa Cruz County” (Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce, 2011, “Population,” para. 2). Demographics of the area demonstrated a divide in Santa Cruz County between White and the Latino populations. The City of Santa Cruz had a Latino population of 26.79%, while Watsonville’s Latino population amounts to 81%, mostly with Mexican roots (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

The 2007 Santa Cruz County self-sufficiency standard, which “measures the actual cost of living, on a county-by-county basis” (United Way of Santa Cruz County, 2007, para. 1), illustrates that in 2007 the self-sufficiency income “based on a family of 2 adults and 1 infant” in the area consisted of $57,637 annual income (“2007 Annual Income Comparison Chart”). According to the same source 46.7% of the Latino population in the county fell below the standard, with an outcome of 23.2% for the White population below self-sufficiency.

Santa Cruz County’s substantial Latino population accounts for 53% of the “court-aged youth” (Santa Cruz JDAI, 2011, Santa Cruz County, CA—Demographics, para. 4). Up to the late 1990s, “children referred to the juvenile justice system experienced a rate of gang involvement and heroin use higher than children in other California communities of similar size. Latino children represented nearly 64 percent of the children detained in the county’s secure juvenile detention facility (juvenile hall) on any given day” (Cox & Bell, 2001, p. 33).
The economic climate has influenced the attitude towards immigrants and immigration laws. Increasingly, White insecurities around national identity and confusion around national identity, fears of declining values and lost traditions, and overtly racist attitudes (Casas, 2010) have contributed to a politically explosive debate, often keeping the focus away from the needs of the affected populations.

However, Santa Cruz County has encouraged cultural diversity and “the continuance of the ethnic and cultural tradition [of immigrant populations] without it interfering with the group’s standard responsibilities to the general American civic life” (CAP, 2010, p. 261). The philosophy of the local system of care with its dedication to “cultural competence” recognizes that “service effectiveness is dependent upon both culturally relevant and competent service deliveries” (Santa Cruz County Probation Department, 2011, p. 3).

In Santa Cruz County, several measures have been taken to counteract the destructive trends of disproportionate minority contact with law enforcement. A “system of care philosophy” has been adopted that emphasized principles such as “family preservation,” placement in “least restrictive setting” and “natural environment,” “a coordinated service delivery system,” “family involvement,” and “cultural competence” (Santa Cruz County Probation Department, 2011, p. 3). Additionally, the probation department implemented programs to support “balanced and restorative justice,” sought a “detention reform” supported by the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, and engaged in “local effort to reduce disproportionate minority contact (DMC)” (p. 3). The local wraparound program was part of this community
initiative and was identified as a model site of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (Santa Cruz County Probation Department, 2011, p. 3). Goals of the initiative included the following: “to eliminate unnecessary use of secure detention,” “increase the use of community-based detention alternatives,” “reduce disproportionate minority confinement, and address inequities and needs of special populations” (p. 3). The local wraparound program served as “placement prevention program” because the youths on these caseloads . . . [were] in danger of being removed from their homes and ordered into an out-of-home placement due to their behavior in the community and/or continued criminal activity. Following a presentation to, and approval by, the Placement Screening Committee, Probation Officers recommend to the Court that certain youth be ordered to participate (p. 9).

WRAP encouraged trained and licensed psychotherapists to collaborate with probation officers, drug and alcohol counselors, and service providers from the community, to assess and support the adolescents and their families’ connection to internal and external resources. Broad System of Care goals were keeping youth at home, keeping youth in school and learning, and keeping youth out of trouble (Santa Cruz County Children’s Mental Health, 2008).

**Culture**

Considering the diverse and violent cultural background of the actual community where this research took place, further emphasis on culture, as warranted in the holistic model, becomes evident. Culture is a central element within the holistic lens (Figures 4 and 5) as well as in the wraparound approach. It shapes not only community and society around the research participant, but also influences the family and the individual youth.
Because the participant in this study was a U.S. citizen with immigrant parents from Mexico, understanding the Mexican American cultural perspective highlighted some of the dynamic elements of his cultural background. Though the terms Latino or Hispanic include a wide variety of different cultures, this research’s specific focus was on the Mexican American culture and its values.

With a long history of Mexican immigration in the community, it was important to recognize how the different generations have adapted, developed, and created their unique cultural space. According to Klopf and McCroskey (2007), the strong pressure for immigrants and so-called minority populations to assimilate either by conforming to the dominant Anglo culture and to lose their own cultural characteristics, or by ‘melting’ into “a new and unique American culture,” strongly affected the identity of people from immigrant communities and that of their descendants (p. 261). According to Benjamin (1997),

Those families and communities who are able to promote an active understanding and appreciation of culture as well as a positive cultural identity are able to instill a sense of self-protection and value in their children. This seems to mitigate against youth involvement in violence and juvenile delinquent behavior (Isaacs, 1992). (p. 13).

**Specific Interpersonal Elements in the Mexican American Culture**

Whereas immigrants who left their country to settle in the U. S. often have a strong tie to their original culture, increased exposure to the dominant Anglo culture has a strong influence on their U.S.-born children. “Behavior patterns of Mexican Americans are more likely to resemble those of non-Hispanic Whites the longer their generational
tenure in the U.S.” (Silverstein & Chen, 1999, p. 188). This can create an intergenerational disconnect within the Mexican American families, when the adopted values from the main stream culture clash with the more traditional ones that came from the country of origin.

Values influence communication patterns and are the center of the “personal orientation system, guiding and directing behavior” (Klopf & McCroskey, 2007, p. 103). Mexican American values include strong family orientation with emphasis on family as the major support system (Rivera, 2001, p. 101). The family unit teaches its members the collectivist ways of bonding, cooperating, and sharing. In contrast, the individualist value system of the Anglo-American culture emphasizes competition and individual achievement (Rivera, p. 101). The traditional Mexican American family is organized in a clear hierarchy with patriarchal values and rigid gender roles, and teaches children distinct masculine and feminine behavior (Rivera, p. 102-105).

An important component of interpersonal interactions in the Mexican American culture is respeto or respect, which according to Rivera (2001), has different nuances of meaning. Whereas in the Anglo-American culture respect implies “a fairly detached self-assured egalitarianism” (Rivera, p. 108), the meaning of respeto depends on the situation: Toward people outside the family respeto is demonstrated in “appropriate behavior toward others based on age, social position, economic status and sex difference.” Within the family system and in intimate relationships respeto is based on “emotional dependence, responsibility, dutifulness, and mentalismo” or “thinking about the impact of one’s behavior on the other’s feelings” (p. 118). Nevertheless, the author noted that
*respeto* was clearly situated in an “authoritarian framework” based on “fearing, expecting punishment, and obeying” (p.108).

Mexican American childrearing practices differ from Anglo-American ways, notably in the first years of life. There the emphasis is on nurturing and “gratifying the child’s needs rather than stimulating autonomy” (Rivera, 2001, p. 111). During later years, the gender roles and values play a predominant role in the children’s education. Next to *respeto*, Rivera mentioned “*personalismo* or the familial self” as a core principle in the Mexican American culture, which is “a sense of self that includes one’s close relationships as part of who one is” (Roland as cited in Rivera, p. 120). Again, the collectivist emphasis of the other as part of self differs from Anglo-American personality models. The third value that determines Mexican American interpersonal interactions is *individualismo*, which Rivera defined as the “unique set of skills, strengths, expertise and passions of a person” (p. 120). Anglo-American individualism emphasizes separate personhood, individual responsibility, and command of one’s own destiny (Klopf & McCroskey, 2007, p. 88) in the Mexican American culture such “positive characteristics are meant to be used in the service to family and community” (Rivera, 2001, p. 111). *Individualismo* is offered as “a sign of cooperation rather than competition” and the purpose of having a skill is to benefit others in the collective with it (p. 121).

Mexican American verbal communication patterns tend to be more “indirect, implicit, unspoken, and covert . . . [to] subdue angry emotions” (Rivera, 2001, p. 122-123). Conflict that could threaten the collective unit is avoided more often than in the
individualist Anglo-American culture, where higher value is placed on personal advancement than on the collective.

The role of the male in the Mexican American culture has been subject to stereotyping and distortions of the meaning of ‘machismo’ as “masculine entitlement, toughness, sexual potency, . . .. and the right to drink” (Rivera, 2001, p. 124). Rivera called the traditional Mexican American masculine values “genuine machismo,” which is based on “true bravery, courage, generosity, respect for others, protection and provision for family, and a fair and just authority” (p. 124). These values differ mostly from the traditional values of the Anglo-American male in their collectivist orientation.

Rivera tied the emergence of machismo to factors of oppression such as the historical rape of the Mexican Native women by the Spaniards. The mestizo children of these unions were often estranged from the Native male heads of the families. Integrating, imitating, or matching the authoritarian Spanish conquistadores’ behavior could have been an attempt to regain respeto, personalismo, and individualismo (2001, p. 135).

**Mexican American Gang Culture**

The holistic model’s spheres of culture and community included the micro-cultures the participant engaged in. This study highlighted the influence of such a micro-culture in form of the Mexican American gang culture and its influence across borders.

Mexican American gang culture can serve as a micro-culture and alternative to the dominant culture or that of the family’s origin. In the U.S., inner cities issues such as
exclusion, racism, and poverty of immigrants have led to the street use of the term *respect*. It is one of the central themes in the many diverse gang cultures, and youths may fight to their or their opponent’s death to gain, maintain, or repair what they consider *respect*. According to Castaneda (2007), culturally marginalized and oppressed groups create substitute opportunities for a positive collective self-image where the majority culture denies it. In form of respect, the need for a positive group- and self-image is then exploited by the drug mafia and other economically motivated interest groups to steer and control the street gangs (Castaneda, 2007). Gina Castaneda (personal communication, February 5, 2012), now a Watsonville probation officer, who had grown up in the local gang culture, described how homies wear their color, a belt buckle with the initials of their gang, baseball hats with gang initials, and double to triple X size white T-shirts with low cut jeans. The large size clothing code originated, according to Castaneda, in the prison system, where due to racial discrimination people of color were given clothes that did not fit.

The current wraparound cases at Santa Cruz County Children’s Mental Health at the time of the study consisted of 78% Mexican American youths with documented gang involvement in their probation record (H. Heath, personal communication, December 1, 2011). An understanding of their gang culture is a prerequisite for planning and undertaking a holistic treatment approach for these youths. Gang culture provides an alternative cultural solution for youths who have not found their place in the dominant culture, while also being estranged from their family’s original traditions. The gang life initially promises to meet the youth’s needs for “love, power, identity, affiliation, trust,
respect, honesty, friends, loyalty, fun, honor, duty, responsibility, chain of command, punishment, rewards, and rites of passage” (G. Castaneda, personal communication, March 16, 2007). Violence, lack of compassion, not obeying rules, drug use, ditching school, and other dysregulated responses to challenges are all examples of behavior considered maladjusted or unacceptable in both mainstream White Anglo culture and in the traditional Mexican culture. Within the gang micro-culture, however, these behaviors are rewarded and turned into a code of conduct. The gangs are organized in the following hierarchy: On top are the few Shot-Callers with a long history of gang involvement, often incarcerated, “unemployed and involved with drugs” (G. Castaneda, personal communication, February 5, 2012). According to Castaneda, these hardcore members are on average in the early and mid-20s. The widely respected “O. G.s” (Original Gangsters) or “Veteranos,” compared, according to Castaneda, to celebrities, and held the stories and history of the gang. “Soldiers” aged 14 to 17 have been “initiated or jumped in by having several established gang members assault the incoming gang member;” “Claimers, Associates, or Wannabes [from want to be] are younger, on average between 11-13 years of age.” These youths “are not officially members of the gang but act like they are or claim to be from the gang. They may begin to dress in gang attire, hang around with the gang or write the graffiti of the gang.” “Potentials or Couldbes” are “youngsters who . . . live in or close to an area where there are gangs, or have a family member who is involved” (G. Castaneda, personal communication, March 16, 2007).

Historical events and the immigration waves dated from “the forceful takeover of the Mexican-owned greater Southwest in the mid-1800s” (Morales, 1992, p. 129), to the
Great Depression in the 1920s, and a third wave in the 1960s, brought people to the U.S. in search of survival or a better life. However, in the United States “racist attitudes and separate but unequal schooling [employment, and housing] practices and facilities were well in place” (Vigil, 1999). The strategic deportation practices and solely law-enforcement-based measures to address immigration in the U.S. have further exasperated and internationalized the gang problem (Boereman, 2007). The “mass deportations of youths” from the U.S. during the 1990s “contributed significantly to the proliferation of gangs,” and “gangs became more formalized and organized” in Central America. During a lecture in El Salvador, for example, local gang specialist Castaneda (personal communication, February 5, 2012) encountered a street gang that named itself after the Los Angeles 18th Street Gang.

Boerman (2007) pointed at several factors that created the context for the rise of a Central American gang problem: The growing numbers of “deportees [who are] left fending for themselves,” and “ex-combatants” from “civil wars . . . unable to integrate into society” (p. 36), but also adverse conditions in the receiving countries, such as:

(a) extreme poverty and chronic unemployment, (b) high levels of intra-familial dysfunction and violence, (c) social disorganization, (d) lack of government investment in young people, (e) a concentration of marginalized youth in urban areas, (f) corruption among police and public officials, (g) weak and corrupt justice systems, (h) media sensationalism and mismanagement of the gang phenomenon, (i) the absence of political will to address the problem in a holistic manner, (j) draconian anti-mara (anti-gang) laws that have exacerbated the problem, and (k) elected officials decision to ignore the problem in its early stages and focus instead on political and economic reformation. (p. 36-37)
This view of international causes of gang formation sheds a light on the systemic nature of the problem and the relationship between gang formation and societal and cultural well-being.

“According to . . . U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), “transnational street gangs pose a growing public safety threat to urban and rural communities throughout the United States. Their violence, sophistication, and scope have reached intolerable levels” (Boerman, 2007, p. 38). Operating inside the U.S., “gangs prey on undocumented immigrants who are unlikely to report their activities to police, . . . [and] target immigrant youth to join gangs” (p. 39). Boerman suggested that only “a coordinated transnational strategy that includes a balance of law enforcement, prevention, rehabilitation and social reinsertion strategies offers hope for positive outcome” (p. 48).

Within the U.S. society, “the pressures to acculturate and adapt to social and economic exploitation” (Vigil, 1999, p. 271) often left parents without control over their children. According to Vigil, “a firmly entrenched gang subculture . . . [as well as] poverty, stressed families, and other schooling and cultural identity problems stemming from marginalization” pushed youths into the gangs (p. 271). He suggested that “when family fails or falters, somehow the public school must fill the void by fulfilling its obligation to socialize all youths” (p. 272). However, common strategies such as “parent-teacher conferences are often met with parental apathy, among other hindrances,” and “the usual institutional response is to attempt to suppress the problem behavior and/or to remove the child from the school” (p. 274). According to the author, at the same time the “street socialization takes place within a particular culture and compelling reality, with its
own rules, regulations, values and norms that guide children in ways that conflict with school and conventional social habits” (p. 274). He continued that “grouping” of youth with similar emotional and behavioral difficulties “apart from others” can cause “street bonding [that] is reinforced by school bonding” and leads to “a street identity that is strongly group based” (p. 275). The alternative schools, then left in charge of the care of gang youth, tend to “have flexible schedules and home-study provisions,” which accommodate a different pace of learning while inadvertently “providing more time and creating more opportunities for the deviant behavior” (p. 278). The author argues that the “suppression solution” of alternative education and continuation schools and the “concentration of problem students, each with his or her own emotional pressures and anti-social behavior, generates and legitimizes an even higher level of deviancy both inside and outside the school.” Schools intended as interventions then perpetrate the gang problem further. Vigil saw the need for “a broad strategy of educational change especially targeting teacher education, links between home and school, and school policies” (p. 283). He explained that “street socialization occurs in the context of the breakdown of social control” and affirmed how “street gangs fill the gaps with a subculture, a value system, and norms of their own.” A combination of “prevention, intervention, and suppression strategies provide a logical, flexible balance for addressing the needs and problems of children from marginal gang backgrounds” (p. 283).

For the youths “with the weakest ties to either the Mexican-American or Anglo-American cultures . . . the gang subculture provided a means of social adjustment or adaptation” (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 10). “Conflict with rival gangs provides an arena
for the demonstration of street-learned skills, values and loyalties” (Vigil, 1993, as cited in Howell, & Moore, p. 10).

Morales (1992) warned against stigmatizing the youths and pointed out that “predelinquent or delinquent youth groups [are] more commonly identified as ‘gangs’ by law enforcement when they . . . [consist of] minority group persons” (p. 134). He demonstrated how “peer pressure to conform to clothing, walking, talking, music, and hair style (youth culture) is a powerful, universal, adolescent developmental need and is not different for poor, minority youth.” The function and cause of youth gangs reaches from “a youth’s search for excitement in a frustrating and limiting environment” to finding “male role models among peers facing similar difficulties” or a “collective solution of young, lower-class males placed in a situation of stress, where opportunities for the attainment of wealth and /or status through legitimate channels are blocked” (Morales, p. 135-136). In Morales’s experience:

Gang members, significantly more often than non-gang members, come from families exhibiting more family breakdown, greater poverty, poorer housing, more alcoholism, more drug addiction, and more major chronic illness and have more family members involved with law enforcement and correctional agencies. (p. 136-137)

According to the author, gangs became “a surrogate family . . . [where] the gang member receives affection, understanding, recognition loyalty, and emotional and physical protection.” He added that not surprisingly “one of the largest Latino gangs in California is called ‘Nuestra Familia’ [Our Family]” and “gang members call themselves ‘homeboys’ or ‘homegirls’” (p. 137).
Out of “extreme social and cultural isolation” the Latino street gangs formed their own characteristic “cultural pride” (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 20), “conflict with rival gangs provided an arena for the demonstration of street-learned skills, values, and loyalties” (Vigil, 1993, as cited in Howell & Moore, p. 10). The dangerousness of the gang culture has increased over the past 20 years with profitable drug trafficking and is considered a “formidable challenge to U.S. public safety” (Howell & Moore, 2010, p. 20). The Nortenos gang of northern California, emerged in the California prisons in the 1960s and was defined by a “high level of organization, including a written constitution and rigid command structure” (Improve 247, 2009, para. 2). The gang’s rivalry with the Surenos gang is based in gang lore on a prison fight “in which a member of the Mexican mafia stole a pair of shoes from a northerner” (Improve 247, para. 1). For Nortenos “the color red and the number fourteen... low-rider cars and Southern Chicano imagery” became group symbols in the past (Improve 247, para. 2). Currently local themes, such as tattoos of strawberries in Watsonville, California, and icons of the American hip-hop culture, have influenced their style.

In order to build a therapeutic bridge to gang youth, Morales (1992) highlighted the need to take the belief system of the counselor as well as the youth into consideration. On the treatment provider’s side, the author considered negative attitudes such as the following quite common: “anti social personality disorders and/or gang members are untreatable,” “fear,” “belief in the lack of psychological capacity for insight of poor and uneducated people,” “all gang members can be treated,” “gang members are manipulative and will get caught in lies by the therapist,” “the belief that the therapist has the power
and hence will control the interview” (p. 142). The youth may “distrust/dislike authority figures,” begrudge “being forced into treatment,” “sense a generational, cultural, and perhaps language gap with the therapist,” or enjoy a “powers struggle with another social control agent” (p. 142). Morales (1992) concluded that an intervention with gang youth needed to “offer . . . a new, unique, and emotionally corrective relationship with an adult whom he or she can learn to trust and who can provide some support, guidance, nonjudgmental listening, and advocacy at home and with law enforcement, parole, school, employers, and other community persons.” However, “the most important variable related to treatment success . . . is readiness for change” (p. 151-152).

Understanding the factors that can support such “readiness for change” requires a holistic approach that combines systemic and individual assessment and intervention tools.

**Cultural Identity Development**

To further comprehend the impact of cultural issues on the individual level of the holistic concept, Sue and Sue’s (2008) model of cultural identity development examined the research participant’s cultural beliefs and choices. Sue and Sue (2008, p. 242) identified five different stages of cultural identity development. Their model focused on the experience of so-called minorities “as they struggle to understand themselves in terms of their own culture, the dominant culture, and the oppressive relationship between the two cultures” (p. 242). The first stage implies conformity to the dominant culture and self-depreciation or neutrality toward cultural values. Others of the same minority as well as those from a different minority are seen through the lens of discrimination or “neutral”
and without emphasis on cultural values. The dominant group is appreciated and their own minority status accepted (pp. 242-246).

In the second stage, named “dissonance and appreciation,” the person notices racism in the dominant culture and starts feeling “a mix of shame and pride” about her or his cultural roots (Sue & Sue, 2008, p. 247). “Feelings of shared experience” connect the person to others of the same minority, and create a conflict with the dominant culture (p. 243). This view extends to others of a different minority.

Third, the “resistance and immersion” stage, leads to cultural self-appreciation and the appreciation of one’s own cultural group takes precedence over reaching out to those of a different cultural background. The dominant culture is perceived as oppressive (Sue & Sue, 2008, p. 249).

The fourth stage, “introspection,” the “need for positive self-definition” instead of defining oneself “against the dominant culture” becomes evident (Sue & Sue, 2008, p. 250). The person balances autonomous views with the group views and begins to create an individuality that is not usurped by the group. The person reaches out more to other minority groups, understanding the importance of cultural similarities as well as differences. The attitude toward the dominant culture becomes more dependent on the individual encounter, and integration of desirable elements of the dominant culture into the minority culture is evaluated (p. 251).

The fifth and last stage, “integrative awareness,” is marked by a “positive self-image,” “a strong sense of self-worth and confidence” (Sue & Sue, 2008, p. 251). One’s own group provides a basis for “pride in the group without having to accept group values
unequivocally” (p. 252). The person is actively exploring different cultural groups to increase her or his own understanding and to promote “greater understanding among the various ethnic groups” (p. 252). Members of the dominant culture are experienced with what the authors called “selective trust and liking . . . and openness to the constructive elements of the dominant culture” (p. 252).

I used Sue and Sue’s (2008) model, a “conceptual framework to aid therapists in understanding their culturally different clients’ attitudes and behaviors” (p. 242), in this study to highlight the participant’s personal sense of culture. Cultural identity development does not follow the stages necessarily in the above order, and the stages are not exclusive of each other. The authors pointed out that “cultural identity development is dynamic, not static” (p. 257).

**Complex Trauma and Society**

Next to the importance of culture, the holistic lens applied to this study emphasized the complex effects of trauma throughout the five spheres of society, community, culture, family, and the individual youth. According to Herman (1992), the impact of traumatic events negatively affects the “sustaining bonds between individual and community” (p. 214). This leaves the individual reactive and isolated; moreover, the community as a whole is affected as well. McFarlane and van der Kolk (2007) maintained that “emotional attachment is probably the primary protection against feelings of helplessness and meaninglessness” (p. 24). They pointed at “a universal tendency for people under threat to form very close attachments to other people or communities” and
concluded that “external validation about the reality of a traumatic experience in a safe and supportive context is a vital aspect of preventing and treating posttraumatic stress” (p. 25). They observed that “although people are capable of profound bursts of spontaneous generosity to victims of acute trauma, the continued presence of the victims as victims constitutes an insult to the belief (at least in the Western world) that human beings are essentially the masters of their fate” (p. 28).

Consequently, “one core function of human societies is to provide their members with traditions, institutions, and value systems that can protect them against becoming overwhelmed by stressful experiences” (McFarlane & van der Kolk, 2007, p. 25). Hence, societies define themselves by their different ways of handling “the inescapably traumatic events that befall [their] members.” They can either share “the moral and financial burden,” or hold “victims . . . responsible and [leave them] to fend for themselves” (p. 29). In some cultures “people have the right to expect support when their own resources are insufficient”; in others, “they have to live with their suffering and not expect any particular compensation for their pain” (p. 29). The authors claimed that:

both individuals and societies that become too focused on the past lose the flexibility they need to respond to the future. Conversely, individuals and societies without coherent myths about having successfully transcended adversity lack the identity necessary to serve as a guide on how to structure responses to current challenges. (p. 29)

The effectiveness of social support in overcoming trauma, however, depends on the affected individuals or societies’ “comfort” with it, “and [on] the extent to which it motivates them to take charge of their lives again” (p. 30).
According to McFarlane and van der Kolk (2007), “failure to deal with the plight of victims can be disastrous for a society” (p. 33): Increase in “child abuse, continued violence, . . . lack of productivity . . . [and even] political consequences” such as the “rise of fascism and militarism” (p. 33). The authors recommended that:

When dealing with traumatized individuals who (or communities that) deal with their feelings through action, professionals and policy makers need, on the one hand, respect the natural desire to take action to overcome post traumatic helplessness, and on the other, to help people find ways of communicating about the dangers of recreating their traumas in new social contexts. When taking action fails to prevent the return of the trauma . . . both individuals and communities need to acknowledge the reality of what has happened and the pain associated with it. Confronting the past . . . [however, contains] always a serious risk that the exposure of the hurt will not be met with a constructive response. (p. 35)

Within the sphere of society the holistic model addressed “the challenge for any civilized society . . . to find ways both to contain the excesses of violence, suffering, and deprivation, and to provide an umbrella under which children can be raised without being brutalized, victims can get redress for their grievances, and people can grow old without becoming helpless” (McFarlane & van der Kolk, 2007, p. 39).

On the individual level, continuous and random traumatic experiences can impact a person’s ability to regulate emotions, to create internal and relational safety, and diminish the ability to focus and problem solve. According to the Washington State University Extension Area Health Education Center:

The unpredictable and chronic exposure to . . . [complex trauma occurs] most often within a child’s care-giving system, that is intended to be a child’s primary source of safety and stability. . . . Complex trauma has been identified as a principle [sic] threat to the social/emotional competency and learning success of children. (2012)
Earlier, Cook et al. (2005), including van der Kolk, pointed out that complex trauma “can interfere with the development of a secure attachment within the care-giving system” (p. 390). They continued that “exposure results in a loss of core capacities for self-regulation and interpersonal relatedness” (p. 390). Treatment suggestions for complex trauma include, according to Cross (2012), multi-modal interventions with focus on “safety,” “self-regulation,” “self-processing,” “trauma experience integration,” “relational engagement,” and “positive affect enhancement.” Cook et al. (2005) also pointed at the need to consider “ethno-cultural heritage and traditions,” and towards the differing “thresholds for defining a complex trauma reaction as a problem warranting intervention” in culturally diverse populations and their sub-groups (p. 396).

John Briere and Cheryl Lanktree (2008) developed a comprehensive treatment guide for children and adolescents affected by complex trauma. Their manual stressed application of complex trauma assessment with youths with immigrant background living in “unsafe communities” (p. 6). Central to their approach was the “client’s history of attachment relationships and current relational schema” (p. 6). I used their “Initial Trauma Review—Adolescent version” (2008) to highlight the traumatic events that occurred in the participant’s life. (That version has been superseded, most recently by a version published in 2012 by Sage.)

**Psycho-Physiological Effects of Trauma and Post Traumatic Stress**

The personal psychological and physiological effects of trauma and posttraumatic stress are situated within the individual layer of the holistic model. According to Fisher
the stress response of the parasympathetic nervous system consists of “cortisol release [that] leads to decreased heart rate and respiration, physical collapse, exhaustion, weakness, shaking and trembling, increased gastro-intestinal activity, as well as survival responses of freeze and submit” (p. 6). An alternative stress response is triggered when the sympathetic nervous system produces an “adrenaline rush [that] raises the heart rate and respiration, causing muscles to tense, a rush of energy, and suppression of non-essential systems. The frontal lobes shut down to increase speed of [a flight or fight] response” (Fisher, 2008, p. 6).

The impact of trauma and stress on the nervous system triggers strong physiological survival responses: Fisher also addressed the survival responses “freeze,” “submit,” and “attach,” which present coping alternatives to the previous two (2008). The author explained that what she calls “attach” response to trauma can be observed in children clinging to their abusive parent. The survival responses can also occur when a person becomes triggered by an event that reminds her or him of past traumatic experiences.

“After exposure to trauma, most people become preoccupied with the event” (van der Kolk & McFarlane, 2007). According to Horowitz, “repeated replaying of upsetting memories serves the function of modifying the emotions associated with the trauma, and in most cases creates a tolerance for the content of the memories” (as cited in van der Kolk & McFarlane, 2007, p. 5). However, “when people develop PTSD [posttraumatic stress disorder], the replaying of the trauma leads to sensitization; with every replay of
the trauma there is an increasing level of distress” (p. 8). Van der Kolk and McFarlane explored the following six ways of processing information in PTSD:

Persistent intrusions . . . which interfere with attending to other incoming information; sometimes compulsive exposure . . . to situations reminiscent of the trauma; loss of the . . . ability to modulate . . . physiological responses to stress . . . [with] decreased capacity to utilize bodily signals as guides for action; generalized problems with attention, distractibility, and stimulus discrimination; alterations in psychological defense mechanisms and in personal identity. This changes what new information is selected as relevant. (2007, p. 9)

When elaborating on the “compulsive re-exposure to the trauma” (van der Kolk & McFarlane, 2007, p. 10), the authors noted, “this phenomenon can be seen in a wide range of traumatized populations.” They affirmed that “reenactment of victimization is a major cause of violence in society” (p. 11) and listed several studies that linked “drug abuse, juvenile delinquency, and criminal behavior” to previous abuse. “Self-destructive acts are common in abused children . . . [and] many traumatized individuals continue to be revictimized.” The incapacity to regulate affect in people suffering from PTSD stems according to the authors from a tendency “to move immediately from stimulus to response without often realizing what makes them so upset. They tend to experience intense negative emotions (fear, anxiety, anger, and panic) in response to even minor stimuli” (p. 13).

**Attachment Trauma**

Trauma resulting from interactions between the individual youth and the caregivers can be placed within the holistic model’s spheres of youth and family. According to Bowlby (1969) the foundation of a youth’s connection to self and others is
created during infancy, where attachment patterns form during the dependency of the infant on the caregiver for survival. The parents’ ability to care for the child while struggling with such adversities as immigration, domestic violence, poverty, addiction, or racism as well as their own experience of parenting, will have a strong influence on their ability to focus on the connection to the child. The early connections become instrumental in the “construct of internal working models of self and attachment figures that guide the interpretation and production of behavior” (Bretherton, 1985, p. 3) Therefore, a high level of domestic tension, abuse, or lack of parental involvement may become what feels normal to some youths (Ford, 2002, p. 29).

Ainsworth et al. (1978) explored the influence of the caregiver’s behavior on the early bonding patterns in their study of “strange situations”: i.e., laboratory settings (p. vii), observing infants’ reaction to the primary caregiver’s absence and return. Developmental psychology has since adopted the classifications of “secure” (p. viii) versus “insecure” (p. ix) and “resistant” (p. 92), insecure and “ambivalent” (p. xii), “avoidant” (p. xiii), and indices of disorganization and disorientation attachment styles identified by Hennighausen and Lyons-Ruth (2005, p. 4). According to the same source, secure attachment is associated with supportive caregiver behavior. While insecure-resistant, insecure-ambivalent, avoidant and disorganized-disoriented attachment styles are connected to inconsistent, not supportive, frightening, and abusive caregiver behavior. “The secure response pattern . . . was associated with mother’s tender, careful holding, . . . face-to-face interactions, and with sensitivity to infant signals,” while the mothers of “insecure-ambivalent” and “insecure-resistant” children “were not rejecting, but were
inept in holding, non-contingent in face-to-face interaction, and unpredictable” (Main, 1996, p. 237). Spangler and Grossmann (1993, as cited in Main, 1996, p. 237) found that “avoidant” children have a higher heart rate, and were observed with caregivers that “were particularly averse to tactual contact.” According to Main (1996, p. 237) later research findings suggest that:

Observed in peer and school settings, children who feel secure as infants with their mother exhibit greater ego resilience as well as social and exploratory competence than insecure children, and in one high-risk sample, children who were avoidant of mother were observed to victimize others, whereas ambivalent-resistant children were typically their victims.

Main (1996) continued that “when parental behavior is frightening in itself, the attached infant inevitably suffers a collapse of behavioral strategy because it can neither approach (the secure and resistant-ambivalent strategies), shift its attention (the avoidant strategy), or flee” (p. 237). This leads to the “disorganized” attachment pattern and is associated with “a marked rise in cortisol,” “the most pronounced risk for mental disorder,” “disruptive-aggressive behavior,” and “increased vulnerability to dissociative disorders” (p. 237).

The diagnosis of Conduct Disorder with symptoms such as “bullying,” “threatening,” “physical fights,” “use of weapons,” “cruelty to people or animals,” or “forcing someone into sexual activity,” classifies the lack of compliance with social rules and norms, and the violation of “basic rights of others” (APA, 2000, p. 93). It is increasing worldwide and considered the most frequently applied diagnosis by mental health clinicians working with children and youth (APA). It often co-occurs with a lack of supportive and consistent parenting (Ford, 2002, p. 32). “Externalizing disorders [such
as conduct disorder or oppositional defiance] are associated with multiple interacting risk factors including biological and neurological vulnerabilities and ecological, communal, and home environments, especially quality of parenting” (Guttmann-Steinmetz & Crowell, 2006, p. 440). The authors pointed out that “harsh parenting and a lack of parental involvement in and poor supervision of their children’s activities are consistently associated with conduct problems” (p. 440). The children were also exposed to more environmental dangers and risks due to “failure to protect,” and may develop “associated indifferent cognitions about the self and others (e.g., a hypothetical cognition of ‘If my parent does not care, why should I care? Or what does it matter?’)” (p. 440).

While not all behavior problems can be traced to insecure or avoidant attachment, Guttmann-Steinmetz and Crowell (2006) pointed out that “attachment security is a protective factor in situations in which other risk factors are present, such as environmental adversities or individual vulnerabilities” (p. 449).

Implications for the Trauma Treatment of Adolescents with Multiple Vulnerabilities

Understanding the impact of trauma is an important component in developing holistic treatment for adolescents who are involved in the juvenile justice and mental health systems. “Research suggests that severe oppositional-defiance involves a fundamental dysregulation of emotion and information processing” (Ford, 2002, p. 36). Although not all children who experience an insufficient caregiver response or other traumatic events become oppositional and defiant, “children or youths with Oppositional
Defiant Disorder and Conduct Disorder often are observed to experience dysregulated emotion in such forms as fits of rage, difficulty expressing or even feeling love or happiness, intense frustration, desperate anxiety, or inconsolable despair” (p. 36). The *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (4th ed., text rev., APA, 2000) pointed at another important set of factors in addition to the above mentioned low quality of parenting as contributing to externalizing disorders: The manual stressed the need “to rule out a response to environmental stressors and traumata” (p. 97). In work with “immigrant youth” the clinician ought to pay attention to “the social and economic context in which the undesirable behaviors have occurred” (p. 97).

Pat Ogden and colleagues (2006, p. 60) elaborated that “with a compromised social engagement system, clients suffering from childhood relational trauma understandably have great difficulty utilizing relationships, including the therapeutic relationship, for interactive regulation.” She further emphasized that “one of the first tasks . . . [in the work with such clients] is to strengthen the social engagement system” (p. 60).

Schore (cited in Ogden et al., 2006, p. 61) pointed out that in the work with traumatized individuals there is a need for what he called “psychobiological regulators.” A clinician needs to establish safety for the clients by “facilitating interactive repair to keep the clients’ arousal within a window of tolerance” (p. 61). With the experience of “regulatory repair” through the “availability of social engagement and attachment systems,” clients may then learn to self-regulate their emotions through observation and tracking (p. 61).
The impact of prolonged exposure to traumatic events on youths can lead to symptoms very similar to those of conduct disorder, such as misperceiving situations as more threatening than they are, emotional disconnect, and lack of emotion regulation. Taking traumatic experiences and their effect on youths into consideration, brings together the complex and interrelated cycle that many youths in the justice system undergo. Their often extensive trauma history has been the focus of Greenwald’s (2001) research. He proposed that:

Trauma is . . . a key to understanding the development and persistence of conduct disorder. . . . Trauma history is ubiquitous in the conduct disordered population, and trauma effects can help to account for many features of conduct disorder, including lack of empathy, impulsivity, anger, acting-out, and resistance to treatment. (p. 5-6)

Bowlby (1973) pointed out the negative impact of attachment trauma caused by “inaccessible and unresponsive” child rearing and the lack of secure attachment (p. 213). Ogden et al. (2006) identified a child’s “insecure-avoidant attachment and regulation,” where due to lack of parental support “autoregulatory tendencies” develop, which “are sometimes associated with hostility, aggressiveness, and conduct problems” (p. 56). Since the survival of infants is tied to the caregiver response, attachment researchers hypothesize that “masking of negative emotions . . . allows the insecure/avoidant infant to maintain sufficient proximity to the caregiver to ensure protection.” Fisher (2008) related this response to children clinging to their abusers when child protective agencies intervene. While masking emotions “may be adaptive in the context of the attachment relationship with their primary caregivers, it can be maladaptive in the wider social world
where it may be perceived as indifference or even hostility” (Guttmann-Steinmetz & Crowell, p. 446).

**Emotion Regulation and Action Systems**

Viewed on the individual level of the youth within the holistic concept, readiness for behavior change relies on the ability to regulate “if, when, and how (e.g., how intensely) one experiences emotions and emotion related motivational and physiological states, as well as how emotions are expressed behaviorally” (Eisenberg, Hover & Vaughan, 2007, p. 288). Blair and Razza (2007), for example, concluded that children’s readiness for entering school can be better predicted by skills in emotion regulation than by their measured IQ.

According to these premises, probation youths with immigrant background who are accustomed to meet perceived threats and strange situations with survival responses such as “flight,” “fight,” “freeze,” “submit” or “attach” (Fisher, 2008) due to relational or situational traumatization, are ill prepared to tolerate or adjust to any change that is not in their range of experience. Differences might trigger fear and defense responses immediately and leave no room for creativity, critical thought, or learning.

Ogden et al. (2006) established that “all of our experiences . . . involve physical as well as mental actions” (p. 108). The author described eight “evolutionary prepared, psychobiological action systems” that organize “cognitive, emotional, and sensorimotor responses” (p. 108). Managing the complex situations in a person’s sociocultural and environmental context efficiently requires, according to Ogden et al. “a wide range of
potential, available action systems” (p. 108). The first action system consists of “defense,” and entails either “mobilizing defensive strategies” or “immobilizing defensive strategies” (p. 100). They pointed out that “there is an inherent conflict between action systems of defense and those of normal daily life (p. 138). The latter include the action system of “attachment,” which “provides the foundation of all other systems” due to its “crucial role in ensuring survival” (pp. 111-112) by teaching the infant how to respond, and with it how to fulfill the “need for proximity” to a caregiver (p. 112). The action system of “exploration” cannot be “activated unless safety is assured” (p. 114) and “exploration drives curiosity and learning and provides the basis for both educational and vocational activities” (p. 114).

The energy regulation action system [maintains the] optimal balance between states of activity and rest, eating, drinking, sleeping, body temperature, elimination, breathing, physical activity, response to pain and injury. . . . Additionally, interactive and regulatory behaviors . . . modulate emotional and physiological arousal. (p. 115)

Therefore, addictive tendencies can develop when the “regulatory needs” are ignored or neglected (p. 116). The “caregiving action system” focuses on assessing the other’s signals and responds with nurturing (p. 116), while the “sociability action system” focuses on “behavior directed towards . . . community” (p. 117). It “governs facial muscles, the larynx, middle ear muscles and regulates both the sympathetic and dorsal vagal system to enable effective social communication” (p.117). Sociability is formed by the “cultural context of the individual” (p. 118). The “play action system” is related to that of exploration and also inhibited by fear responses (p. 118). It “can lead to new movements and ideas and thus to increased exploration” (p. 118). Elements of this system
such as “excitement,” “pleasure” and “laughter” also “strengthen attachment and social bonds” (p. 119). The “sexuality action system” creates the relational bonds based on attachment, which provide “proximity, safe haven, and secure base,” and in addition forms patterns of “courtship, seduction, pair bonding and mating action tendencies” (p. 120). Ogden et al. pointed out that “experiencing combinations of action systems,” which is necessary to respond to a complex context, “requires a higher-order integrative capacity that is often deficient in traumatized individuals” (p. 110).

Within the interpersonal spheres of the holistic model this research is based on, emotion regulation and the functioning of the “action systems of nonthreatening daily life” (Ogden et al., 2006, p. 111) also plays an important role in intercultural communication: Matsumoto et al. (2007, p. 77) proposed that the capability to regulate one’s affective response to a culturally foreign situation “is a gatekeeper ability that allows people to engage in successful conflict resolution that leads to effective, long-term intercultural communication.” The authors emphasized “the importance of emotion regulation to predict intercultural adjustment,” and point toward “possible cultural differences in emotion regulation” (p. 77). During intercultural communication, the communicants may not know whether the message received was the message sent. Sometimes a phrase in one culture has the same meaning in the other, but other times, the meanings can be opposite. The authors pointed out that in such communication, conflict and misinterpretation fueled by ambiguity are to be expected and anticipated. They advocate for meeting this challenge with “emotion regulation, critical thinking, and
openness and flexibility, where one’s worldview is constantly being updated by the new and exciting cultural differences with which we engage in our daily lives” (p. 83).

While the brain is maturing, caregivers become the external emotion regulators of the children in their care, or what Thompson (as cited in Guttmann-Steinmetz & Crowell, 2006, p. 446) called a “relational emotion regulation system.” Effective or ineffective soothing of strong emotions establishes persistent “patterns of emotion regulation via neural organization and conditioning processes” (Schore as cited in Guttmann-Steinmetz & Crowell, 2006, p. 446). In this study, the wraparound team applied this understanding of emotion regulation and of traumatic impact to support the participant in achieving readiness for change.

**Interventions from the Holistic Model**

Figure 5 illustrated a holistic view of assessments and interventions that covers the spheres of the model from the individual youth to society and community. Interventions from multiple disciplines are needed to embrace the broad spectrum of the holistic lens, and to pay detailed attention to issues within and across the layers. Traditionally interventions are often based either on intra-psychic work or on systemic and community action, whereas the holistic model requires a continuum of care through the spheres.
Emotion Regulation and Coherence with HeartMath

On the level of the individual youth within the holistic concept, teaching emotion regulation skills can be useful since the affected person can gain a sense of control over how she or he feels. “HeartMath has developed a research-based system of scientifically validated tools, techniques and technology to increase emotional self-regulation” (Thurber, 2008, p. 16). To measure but also to coach youths in achieving affect tolerance and emotion regulation, “heart-rhythm monitoring and feedback training are powerful adjuncts to teaching emotional refocusing and restructuring skills and provide a noninvasive window into observing the dynamics in the autonomic nervous system” (p. 16). Rollin McCraty, the director of research for the Institute of HeartMath, stated that “emotions, to a much greater degree than thoughts, activate and drive the physiological changes that correlate with the stress response” (as cited in Thurber, p. 3). His research emphasized that “the heart’s extensive ascending neural and hormonal communication links to the brain make important contributions to emotional experience.” McCraty established a “model of emotion . . . [that includes] the heart, . . . the brain and nervous and hormonal systems, as well as the body’s energetic system . . . [as] fundamental components of a dynamic, interactive network from which emotional experience emerges” (as cited in Thurber, p. 3). By monitoring their heart rhythm, clients and clinicians alike can “recognize that habitual emotional patterns either deplete or renew their physical, mental and emotional resources” (p. 4). Changing the “physiological and emotional patterns that give rise to stress-producing perceptions, thoughts and feelings” is
part of a transformational learning process, which McCraty found “imperative for both individual and societal health” (as cited in Thurber, pp. 4-5).

Current research supported the use of heart rate variability in monitoring dysregulated emotional reactions. Beauchaine, Gartner, and Hagen (2000) identified “Comorbid Depression and Heart Rate Variability as Predictors of Aggressive and Hyperactive Symptom Responsiveness during Inpatient Treatment of Conduct-disordered, ADHD Boys” (p. 425), “Coherence Training in Children with Attention-deficit Hyperactivity Disorder: Cognitive Functions and Behavioral Changes” by Lloyd, Brett, and Wesnes (2010, p. 34) presented the improvement of symptoms after teaching the children “the HeartMath self-regulation skills and coherence training.” In “Cardiac Coherence and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in Combat Veterans” Ginsberg, Berry, and Powel (2010, p. 52) studied “the co-occurrence of reduced coherence and cognition in combat veterans with PTSD” and concluded that “attention and affect regulation” are affected positively by heart rate variability coherence.

McCraty and Childre (2010) looked at coherence from a systems perspective and described it as a “harmonious state . . . where . . . we typically feel connected not only to our deepest selves but to others, even to the earth itself.” The authors “discusse[d] how increased personal coherence can be achieved as people learn to more consistently self-regulate their emotions from a more intuitive, intelligent, and balanced inner reference” (p. 10). The researchers studied the effectiveness of coherence training also in families, work places, and communities, and found that “emotions such as appreciation,
 compassion, care, and love . . . increase the coherence and harmony in our energetic systems which are the primary drivers of our physiological systems” (p. 12).

The lack of coherence in the interactions between youth, family, culture, community, and society, can present a significant obstacle to the participation and well-being of a youth from an immigrant community. In “Coherence: Bridging Personal, Social, and Global Health,” Rollin McCraty and Doc Childre (2010) argued that this universal principle applies to everything including “atoms, organisms, social groups, planets, or galaxies,” and can be experienced as a feeling of connectedness “not only to our deepest selves but to others, even the earth itself. . . . Coherence always implies correlations, connectedness, consistency, and efficient energy utilization” (p. 10).

McCraty and Childre (2010) pointed out that “the feelings we label as ‘positive’ actually reflect body states in which ‘the regulation of life processes becomes efficient, or even optimal, free-flowing and easy’” (p. 11). The authors’ research suggests that the measurable “pattern of the heart’s rhythm is . . . reflective of the emotional state” (p. 12), and that heart rhythm self-regulation techniques can improve “immune function, autonomous nervous system function and balance, and [achieve] significant reductions in stress hormones” (p. 18).

When an organism is in a coherent state or “auto-coherent,” and is then “coupled with other systems, it can pull the other systems into increased synchronization and more efficient function” (McCraty & Childre, 2010, p. 11). Transferring the concept to the interpersonal level, McCraty and Childre identified “social coherence . . . as a stable, harmonious alignment of relationships that allows for the efficient flow and utilization of
energy and communication required for optimal collective cohesion and action” (p. 18-19). According to the authors,

People undergoing social and cultural changes or living in situations characterized by social disorganization, instability, isolation, or disconnectedness are at increased risk for acquiring many types of disease. . . . Loneliness produces a greater risk for heart disease than smoking, obesity, lack of exercise, and excessive alcohol consumption combined. (Lynch as cited in McCraty & Childre, 2010, p. 19)

The researchers’ concept of “global coherence” is based on the theory “that human physiological rhythms and global behaviors are synchronized with solar and geomagnetic activity” (McCraty & Childre, 2010, p. 21). They proposed that increasing coherence on an individual level “is not only reflected in . . . personal health and happiness, but also in the global field environment, which helps strengthen a mutually beneficial feedback loop between human beings and the earth itself” (p. 22).

**Connectedness**

The holistic lens that served as the theoretical framework for this study focused on the relationship between the spheres of youth, family, community, culture, and society. The spheres affect each other and the youth, who in turn influences his context. Karcher (2001) explored the interface between the youth and the layers of the integrative model in the paper he presented at the 109th Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association. Later he explained that “the ecological worlds of connection reflect three groupings: connectedness to self, connectedness to others, and connectedness to society” (Karcher, 2006, p. 18). According to Karcher, attachment
styles “contribute to feelings of relatedness and belonging . . . through expectations regarding the degree of support and warmth other people and places will provide” as well as to the demonstrations of “positive affect toward those places and people from whom they experience social support” (n.d., para. 6). He emphasized the importance of exploring connectedness the following way:

Connectedness, like behaviors and expressions of affect associated with specific attachment styles, reflects a reciprocation of this social support. Like plugging a power cord into a wall outlet, connectedness reflects outward movement and affection towards other people (n.d., para. 6).

Jessor and Jessor (1997, as cited in Karcher, n.d.) established that increased connectedness also multiplies the “opportunities to engage both (a) in conventional behaviors (e.g., reading, working at school, spending time with family) . . . and (b) unconventional behaviors (e.g., risk-taking behaviors) that are encouraged by peers and in contexts not governed by adults.” Jessor and Jessor (as cited in Karcher, n.d.) concluded that “connectedness may have both protective and risk-promoting properties depending on to whom or to what place the connectedness refers.”

Another tool used in this research, David Arredondo’s “Tonal Connectedness Model” (2010), created a map for assessing the “connectedness of the person along the four dimensions of heart, mind, body, and larger meaning” (D. Arredondo, personal notes taken during lecture, November 19, 2010.). This collectivist and integrative approach emphasized both family and community support networks. Arredondo combined the native Toltec wisdom of Tonal with a family tree, which included family members as
well as community support, to create a visual diagram of the community inclusive support network and connective patterns of youths and their families.

**Elements from Structural Family Therapy**

The sphere of family in the holistic concept has been traditionally viewed separately from individual or community with main focus on family processes. This study integrated the family structure and dynamics with elements from Minuchin’s (Nichols & Schwartz, 1995) model into the holistic lens in order to highlight the interactions and interventions on this level.

To regain or uphold systemic coherence, Davidson noted that families “are creatively, spontaneously active, and can use many methods to maintain their organization” (as cited in Nichols & Schwartz, 1995, p. 90). Structural family therapy maintains:

Behavior disorders arise when inflexible family structures cannot adjust adequately to maturational or situational challenges. Adaptive changes in structure are required when the family or one of its members faces external stress, and when transitional points of growth are reached. (p. 218)

Attention is given to the family hierarchy, accommodation and boundaries between family members, family roles, and interactions between the parental and the child sub-systems as well as among sibling sub-systems.

According to Minuchin (as cited in Nichols & Schwarz, 1995), “coalitions” like “cross-generational” alliances between one of the caregivers and a child, can disrupt family coherence and exclude the other parent (p. 220). In an immigrant family, the
parents’ need to rely on their children for translations from English to Spanish, for example, can change the hierarchy and the power dynamics in the family because the siblings subsystem takes on the tasks and responsibility of their parents for interactions with the dominant culture.

**Adventure and Experiential Interventions**

The connection of the individual with the inter-personal spheres in the holistic concept was supported in this research also by interventions based on adventure and experiential therapy (Lung et al., 2008), which utilized the physical environment to create experiences with and for the participant, where supportive facilitation encourages learning of new skills. This approach emphasized the following relational values and expectations: “safety, belonging, appropriate interpersonal relationships, level of challenge, effective communication, empowerment, development of appropriate trust, enjoyment, generosity, empathy, boundaries (physical, emotional, spiritual), tenacity, self-efficacy, compassion” (2008, p. 12).

**Participation**

In the holistic model, participation connects the youth to all other spheres. The youth’s way of participation in family, community, culture and society was therefore of importance in both inclusive assessment and interventions. Hart (as cited in UN-Habitat, 2012, p. 37) developed a seven-step description of ways to participate: In the first, “manipulative participation,” the young person does not hold any power. In “passive
“Participation” the youths are instructed and not actively contributing. “Participation by consultation” involves the voice of the youth but not her or his “decision making. “Participation for material incentives” does not include self-motivated efforts and depends on rewards. In “functional participation,” joint decisions between youths and adults are made to reach a certain end. “Interactive participation” involves the youth in “analysis, development of action plans” and contributing to community organizations. “Self-mobilization” includes independent initiative by the youth, accessing community resources and influencing institutions and policies. The different levels differ in the young participant’s power, motivation, and ability to take constructive control over a project, but according to Hart (as cited in UN-Habitat, 2012, p. 37) do not imply that youth-led projects are better than those with a joint adult and youth leadership. For this research, Hart’s (as cited in UN-Habitat, 2012, p. 37) differentiated look at participation was helpful for noting the “approach and attitude” of the participant and team across the spheres.

**Interfacing Culture, Relationship, and Emotions as Adaptations**

Focusing on the interface between the individual and inter-personal spheres of the holistic model with Pocock’s (2010) perspective on “emotions as eco-systemic adaptations” highlights the notion “that emotional expression in one person is a non-consciously organized adaptation to an emotional ecosystem” (p. 376). The author hypothesizes that “there is no difference between the idea of culture and that of relationship” because “both culture and relationship are about managing otherness; we
are always in danger of not belonging,” and “every encounter with another is to some
degree cross-cultural” (p. 366). Regulation of the emotions that inter-personal encounters
bring forth, depends on the quality of the “relational system,” consisting of “interactive
regulation and self-regulation” (p. 369). The author explained how

The way in which a child comes to feel about her anger, for example depends on
how she experiences her angry self being represented in the mind of the
caregivers. . . . The way in which the caregiver receives the feelings from the
child and responds depends on an evaluation of the appropriateness of such
feelings, which depends, in turn, on both upbringing and culture (p. 371).

Ricky Greenwald examined the connection between “trauma and juvenile
delinquency” (2002) and advocated for the establishment of “a trauma-informed
perspective . . . to conduct disorder” (p. 5). He described a cycle starting with a traumatic
event and/or insecure attachment that takes away the sense of safety in the environment.
This leads to heightened arousal and “minor or even neutral stimuli can be misinterpreted
as threatening, leading to further arousal . . . [which can cause] reinforcement of the
perception of the world as a dangerous place” (p. 8). He continued that “this sensitivity to
threat can lead to a hostile attribution bias, leading—in turn—to impaired social
competence and increased aggressive behaviors” (p. 9). In his article “Traumatic
Victimization in Childhood and Persistent Problems with Oppositional-Defiance,” Ford
(2002, p. 25) discussed “a preliminary conceptual model” that:

Postulates a chronological sequence from (a) victimization in childhood, to (b)
escalating dysregulation of emotion and social information processing (‘survival
coping’), to (c) severe and persistent problems with oppositional-defiance and
overt or covert aggression which are compounded by post-traumatic symptoms
(‘victim coping’).
Pocock (2010), Greenwald (2002), and Ford (2002) addressed the connections between culture, relationship, trauma, emotion regulation, and behavior problems, in order to explore new and different ways of understanding and treating the concerned youths.

In this study the integration of appropriate elements from a variety of specialized theoretical models lent breadth and depth to the exploration of the spheres within the holistic lens. In a multi-cultural community and society the approaches to investigation and treatment need to be able to grasp the complexity of the web in which the participants are involved.

An integrative approach, such as the one introduced in this study, made it possible to capture interfacing factors, such as the effects of the holistic lens on the participant and his treatment. Such a holistic view opened up vast opportunities for treatment providers to bring their own uniqueness to their work with the equally unique participating populations. Viewing the participant in the complex context of the multiple spheres revealed many more creative opportunities for interventions and supportive changes. Current literature still lacks a focus that promotes participation and understanding of the participants in the wraparound process.

Although the wraparound approach has been considered a successful methodology, its practice is still forming and changing. It is important to examine the complexities and possibilities of this method by engaging with the practitioners “on the ground” (Panelli, 2002, p. 119) while learning more about the experience of a participant within his specific context. This study provided insight into the actual process of WRAP with its opportunities, mistakes, frustrations, and connections so that learning can occur
and improved strategies can be developed. The intensive single case study perspective demonstrated how the development of a practical approach, which based assessment and interventions on the holistic lens, becomes both possible and necessary in order to address the experiences of the participant in their complexity and to hear his voice.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to understand how a male Mexican American adolescent with immigrant background, mental health issues, and involvement with the juvenile justice system was impacted by the application of the holistic lens through which he was seen and on which wraparound treatment interventions were based. This research intended to deepen the understanding of how the participant experienced WRAP and to encourage the application of the holistic view for sensitization and greater understanding of the holistic approach with emphasis on the youth’s voice and complex context. This intensive single case study illustrated WRAP and its working presupposition of building a program around the needs of the participant and brought in the voices of the team members working together in this case. Based on a holistic and systemic worldview, the participant’s situation was highlighted in its contextual uniqueness, to which the treatment approach was adjusted while learning from and about the experience of the participant. The participant’s interaction with wraparound and the effect of this relationship on the youth was documented as treatment occurred.

The following questions guided the research process: How does WRAP impact the experience of a Mexican American male probation youth in Santa Cruz County? Which experiences shaped this youth? Who were the people involved in his life? What themes of response emerged during the time of research? What theoretical constructs helped understand this youth’s responses to his life circumstances? How did the application of a holistic lens affect the participant’s experience of treatment? How did the
holistic view affect the work of the clinician and the participant, as it was a circular process? How did the better understanding of a male youth from the Mexican immigrant community in Santa Cruz County who was participating in WRAP increase the knowledge about WRAP’s positive impact?

**Research Paradigm**

The methodology selected for this research study was based on the worldview that lies at the foundation of qualitative research. Each research paradigm responds to specific needs in its historical context: Whereas scientific positivism was formed in opposition to philosophical thought in post-World War I Europe as “a plea for Enlightenment values” and “in opposition to mysticism, romanticism and nationalism,” the emerging qualitative research paradigm developed out of the discontentment with “logical empiricism” and “the analytic synthetic distinction” as well as “verifiability theory” (Godfrey-Smith, as quoted in Gregor, 2004, “The lingering death of positivism,” para. 2). Qualitative research is based on traditions of hermeneutics, “shifting the focus from interpretation to existential understanding” (Heidegger, 1962, p. 125).

To highlight the experience of a participant in his specific and complex context when seen through the holistic lens corresponded with the emphasis on experiential understanding in qualitative research. To examine the intricate interface between the spheres within the holistic model while considering the individual and family, culture, community, and society, the qualitative approach supported an integrative research focus.
A single affirmative or negative result about impact could not encompass the world of the participant in its complexity.

According to Creswell (2007), the worldviews often applied in qualitative research “consist of postpositivist, constructivist, advocacy/participatory, and pragmatist” (p. 30). The postpositivist orientation takes “a scientific approach to research” and includes “reductionist, logical” argumentation as well as “an emphasis on empirical data collection.” It is “cause-and-effect oriented, and deterministic based on a priori theories,” and is structured “resembling quantitative approaches” (p. 20).

The advocacy/participatory worldview, in contrast, is based on the conviction that “research should contain an action agenda for reform,” and includes “a specific plan for addressing the injustices of the marginalized group” (Creswell, 2007, p. 21-22). Pragmatism concentrates on “the outcome of the research—the actions, situations, and consequences of inquiry—rather than antecedent conditions” (p. 23).

To best further better understanding of “the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who live it” and “for understanding meaning, for grasping the actor’s definition of a situation” (Schwandt, 1994, p. 118), I based my study on the constructivist interpretivist paradigm. The “interpretive positions provide a pervasive lens or perspective on all aspects of a qualitative research project,” and often the involved “participants represent underrepresented or marginalized groups” (p. 24). Historically, constructivism comes from the “German intellectual tradition of hermeneutics and the Verstehen tradition in sociology, from phenomenology, and from the critiques of positivism in the social sciences. Interpretivists reject the notions of theory-neutral
observations and the idea of universal laws as in science” (Gregor, 2004, “Interpretivism and constructivism,” para. 3).

The nature of reality, or ontological assumptions, in social constructivism is defined by multiple realities that are socially constructed by individuals. Reality is as participants in a study see it. To bring the perspective of the participants to the reader, their words and the major themes create the evidence. Knowledge is gained through understanding the meaning of process and experience (epistemological assumptions), and the distance between researcher and the research subject is decreased. Values that shape the description are included, and the researcher “includes her own interpretation in conjunction with that of the participant” (Creswell, 2007, p. 17). Social constructivism methodology looks at “the topic within its context, uses an emerging design” (p. 17), and employs “narrative research,” “phenomenology,” “ethnography,” “case study,” or “grounded theory” (p.10).

Strengths of the constructivist approach include the use of theory “as a ‘sensitising device,’” relating observations “to ideas and concepts that apply in multiple situations” (Gregor, 2004, “Interpretivism and constructivism,” para.5), which creates a way to generalize the gained knowledge to a degree. The main weakness of this view is that the emerging “theory... possibly does not have strong predictive power and is of limited generality” (Gregor, 2004, “Interpretivism and constructivism,” para. 6). In my study, however, the focus was on increasing the receptive understanding of the participant and his specific context by means of the holistic lens.
The Case Study

Choosing a design in qualitative research serves to determine the manner in which the study is planned and how it approaches the research question so that the quality of the results is maximized. Narrative research focuses on “detailed stories,” and “collects information about the context of these stories” (Creswell, 2007, p. 56). The material is then re-organized so that “a causal link among ideas” emerges (p. 56). Ethnography interprets behavior against the background of cultural context (p. 69). Phenomenological studies intend to “reduce individual experiences with a phenomenon to a description of the universal essence” (p. 58). Researchers identify an occurrence and “collect data from persons who have experienced the phenomenon” (p. 58). The purpose of grounded theory according to Creswell is “to move beyond description and to generate or discover a theory” (p. 63).

The case study design was my choice for this study because it permits an “intensive and detailed study of one individual or a group as an entity, through observation, self-reports, and any other means” (Tesch, 1990, p. 39). The in-depth inquiry of a case study allowed for many view points and a number of potential causes for the emerging themes. The case study can provide a “holistic view of a process as opposed to a reductionist-fragmented view” (Patton & Appelbaum, 2003, p. 62). Identification of a case, be it “single, collective, multi-sited or within-site,” allows for the selection of “an individual, program, event, or activity” that demonstrates “different perspectives on the problem, process, or event” (Creswell, 2007, pp. 74-75). Case study data collection employs diverse materials “such as observations, interviews, documents” and artifacts”
(p. 75). Analysis in a case study can range between “a holistic analysis of the entire case or an embedded analysis of a specific aspect of the case, . . . or analysis of themes” (p. 75).

The Single Case Study

This study used a single intensive case to focus the holistic lens on the experience of the research participant while he took part in WRAP. The participant’s complex context was unique in its constellation, and the holistic lens used for this research highlighted the many interfacing factors in his life. According to Yin (2009), a single case study is justified under circumstances similar to a single experiment “when it represents a critical case in testing a well-formulated theory, . . . an extreme case or a unique case, . . . a representative, or typical case, . . . a revelatory case, . . . or a longitudinal case” (pp. 47-49). For this study, I employed the intensive case study for its flexibility and comprehensiveness. This method allowed the detailed examination of the complex situations and events in the life of the participant while considering a wide range of data.

Stake (1995) pointed out that while “single cases are not as strong a base for generalizing to a population of cases as other research designs. But people can learn much that is general from single cases” (p. 85). He maintained that learning is often based on generalizations drawn from adding and receiving experiences from others, such as “authors, teachers, [and] authorities” (p. 85). These “naturalistic generalizations are conclusions arrived at through personal engagement in life’s affairs or by vicarious
experience so well constructed that the person feels as if it happened to themselves” (p. 85).

Examples that supported the use of the intensive single case study for this research include “Clinical Supervision: An Intensive Case Study” by Martin, Goodyear, and Newton (1987) and “Pathological Grief: An Intensive Case Study” by Horowitz et al. (1993). By means of their intensive case studies, the authors examined the relationships between participants in detail and included the views of the participants well as those of the researchers. They were able to focus on the interface between different issues and combine current observations with patterns that occurred over a period of time.

**Research Setting**

The setting for this research was WRAP at Santa Cruz County Children’s Mental Health (SCMH) and the surrounding environment from November 2011 to February 2012, where I had worked since 1997. The surrounding environment included, but was not limited to, the holistic service provision in the field, on excursions, at school, and in community or work settings. WRAP served a large Latino population with immigrant background. The program combined probation and mental health services for youths on probation in order to reduce out-of-home placement and recidivism. The innovative approaches, diverse client populations, and committed staff sparked my interest in the study at SCMH. The documentation for the most part followed the natural flow of WRAP and tried to ensure that the participant felt safe in whatever setting documentation was occurring.
Research Design

This intensive single case study was designed to capture the complex context of the participant’s experiences according to the spheres of the holistic model: youth, family, culture, community, and society. The study employed an embedded rhetorical structure or what Creswell called a “funneling approach” (p. 197) to move from the broader context of the case, such as the general immigration situation, to the more narrow setting, such as this youth’s daily environment in Santa Cruz County. I was embedded in WRAP (as depicted in Figure 6 with the green line) and looked holistically at the participant, who was embedded in family, culture, community, and society (as illustrated in Figures 4 and 5).

This study was based on my encounter with this intensive and complex case. Therefore, this intensive case study required that in my role as researcher I also participate because I fully contributed to the activities of the wraparound process, was able to ensure the necessary rapport and closeness to the selected participant to closely observe, notice, and illustrate behavior changes and reactions. This research study documented the treatment and responses of the participating probation youth during treatment in WRAP and contained assessments of his trauma history, affect regulation, and connectedness. As a researcher who was embedded in the wraparound team, I applied the holistic lens to provide detailed insights from theories addressing the complex interplay between the spheres of youth, family, culture, community, and society. This included the cultural elements and the effects of trauma that influenced the layered psycho-social contexts of the participating Mexican American probation youth. I viewed
the participant’s experience of WRAP from micro-social to macro-social levels. A significant part of this study consisted of the theoretical and practical integration of these perspectives within the holistic concept.

This study expressed the perspective of the participant by incorporating his own words, including the view of his family, his cultural context, and his community. Given the growing demand for understanding the needs and specific circumstances of youths with an immigrant background involved in the legal system, this research illustrated the experience of the participant with the integrative local wraparound approach applying a holistic lens.

Access and Selection of the Participant

The participant, his family members, and the WRAP team members became the unit of analysis for this study. For the purpose of confidentiality all names used in this study, aside from mine, are pseudonyms. Involved in the family were Rey, the participant; Monica, his mother; Alonso, his father; Joe, his older brother; and Eva and Lila, his two younger sisters. The mental health professionals in the team included Felix, the probation officer; Marga, the family partner; Leo, the youth specialist; and me, the facilitator and researcher.

To gain access to the participant, I asked for and received permission from Santa Cruz County Children’s Mental Health. I informed the agency about the purpose, timeline, and methodology to be used and pointed out the benefits to the agency in gaining detailed insight into applying the holistic lens to a specific youth and his experiences with
WRAP. I assured the agency of my professional demeanor and that the study would not disrupt the course of treatment for the youth. The agency then offered support by allowing me to select and use a current client for the research and granting me access to the case file.

From my caseload of 10 clients, I selected a case that presented as intense, but not unusual, for WRAP. I intentionally chose a 16-year-old Mexican American male due to the complexity and multitude of his presenting issues, which seemed “more intense than usual” but did not present “with aberrations” (Rubin & Babbie, 2010, p. 150). The participant was in the implementation phase of the treatment process, which further maximized the chances for observing salient episodes within the data collection interval. Minimum criteria for the selection included the following participant characteristics: (a) a minimum mental health diagnosis of conduct disorder; (b) a history of immigration in the family as mentioned in the assessment; (c) a history of traumatic events in the family; (d) gang involvement as documented in probation records; (e) low socioeconomic status as evidenced in family income documented in the client file; and (f) willingness to participate in the research.

I consulted with the following professionals regarding the selection of the participant: the licensed clinical supervisor of the wraparound program, who had expert knowledge of the whole program case load; the child psychiatrist; other team members assigned to the case; and the independent reader of this study, Dr. Stanley Einhorn.

It was important for this study that the participant not question my motives for selecting him. I verbally clarified that he was not selected because he was more “special”
than my other clients or that I wanted to spend additional time in his presence, emphasizing that his selection had not occurred because he was “beyond recovery,” and that declining to participate would not affect our emotional connection.

**Ethical Considerations and Potential Risks:**

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) of The Chicago School of Professional Psychology approved the study (Appendix A), taking into consideration “the risks and discomfort in relation to the benefits to the child and/or society as a whole” (Chicago School of Professional Psychology Institutional Review Board, 2010, pp. 11-12). In addition, SCMH provided a letter of support for the project (Appendix B). Starting with the selection process of the participant, I addressed ethical issues, collecting only relevant and necessary data and doing so in a manner that did not impact the therapeutic process negatively; keeping the data secure as well as warranting the participant’s confidentiality were priorities. The following issues protected the participant and the team from potential harm: benefits to the participant, assent and consent, safety and confidentiality, mandated reporting, coercion, and team safety.

**Benefits to the Participant**

Benefits of participating in this study included the opportunity to contribute to this specific client’s increased understanding of the treatment process and his experience of his strengths and challenges within WRAP. The participant could gain valuable insights about his reactions to treatment in the context of his family, culture, and community.
Through participation in this project, he also could become connected to the broad community of readers nationally and internationally, who would learn about his specific experiences. These factors might help him to fully engage in and benefit from WRAP.

**Assent and Consent**

The participant and his responsible caregivers gave their assent and consent, respectively, in writing. I explained the materials orally in Spanish to the participant’s monolingual Spanish-speaking parents. All team members also gave written consent to participate in this study (see Appendices C to F). A Spanish certified translator translated the materials. Presenting the study to the participant’s parents in conjunction with the youth and the other team members ensured the ethical conduct of the research, including the communication of the choice to opt out at any time. All WRAP team members also had the option to opt out of the study.

**Safety and Confidentiality**

This participant’s gang involvement, a common feature among the WRAP population, required a high level of protection of the participant’s confidentiality. Therefore all names in this study except mine appear as pseudonyms. To ensure anonymity, I have redacted any such events as specific gang membership or the involvement of other persons in the community that might be identifiable. Santa Cruz County is a small community and gang retaliation is a possible occurrence. Illustrations that displayed identifying features will not be presented in this study.
Mandated Reporting

In the initial consent with the agency, both the client and his parents would be educated about confidentiality rules and their exceptions. Because privacy was a priority for me, I repeated this information when addressing assent at the beginning of the study. I informed the participant that I as well as any professionals on the WRAP team were mandated reporters by law and would have to report harm to self and others.

Coercion

In order to safeguard against coercion, I addressed this project with the youth in the presence of professional WRAP team members and the parents, after having determined with the supervisors and child psychiatrist that the youth was developmentally mature enough to decline offers of such nature.

Team Safety

Team safety is a standard procedure at WRAP because the participants are most likely gang involved and have a criminal history. Most youths in WRAP have engaged in violence, such as armed robbery or physical attacks, or have been targeted and shot at by opposing gang members. The participant in this research required safety considerations because the WRAP team members’ assignments consisted of home visits, outings, and office visits with the participant. This allowed me to work embedded within the context of the participant’s environment and helped build the needed rapport. To address safety
issues, I used a cell phone and informed the supervisor about the time and location of all sessions.

**The Role of the Researcher**

My role as the researcher was embedded in the wraparound team, working for WRAP as a facilitator and mental health clinician, together with a youth specialist, a probation officer, and a family partner. From the perspective of facilitator/clinician, I could track WRAP’s impact on the participant in a natural way through the course of the study. I carried a full caseload of clients but conducted research on only one client. The documentation of the interventions, reactions, and perspectives as well as the review and analysis of the data collected for this study, exceeded that which is required in the normal course of providing clinical services to clients.

In WRAP, the mental health clinicians provide the initial assessment, the mental health diagnosis, and the mental health treatment while also facilitating and supporting the meetings with the participating youths and families. As a mental health clinician and facilitator, I assisted clients in reaching their goals and used my experience and knowledge in the field to help with the change process. I also documented, observed, and sought feedback from the clients and actively suggested interventions and possibilities for them to engage in changed behavior. As a licensed psychotherapist I was trained and obliged by law to treat my clients ethically, to honestly reflect on my personal reactions to the client, and to protect clients from serving my own interests. As a former German social worker, I viewed the client population within the larger cultural and socioeconomic
context. My language skills in Spanish supported direct communication with clients and family members from the Latino community.

### Data Collection Strategies and Instruments

This section describes the documents, reports, data collection strategies, and instruments used for this study (see Figure 7). They are routinely applied during WRAP with the exception of the research field diary. I did not use any other strategies or instruments that were not standard for the treatment of other WRAP clients. The different data collection strategies and instruments informed the documents and reports that were funneled toward the analysis for this study.

My observations in the archival records are in the form of assessment materials and case notes written before the data collection period began. Observations are also in the field diary and case notes taken during data collection; they are depicted in a separate box in Figure 7 for clarity. Some of the participant’s traumatic experiences are in the assessment and probation (archival) records because I had documented them earlier, too. As more accounts of trauma emerged during the WRAP process, I documented them in the case notes and field diary. The WRAP questionnaires came during data collection and are in the case file. The process of using the Tonal Connectedness Map and HeartMath tools was documented in both archival case notes and those taken during data collection. The field diary used archival materials and case notes taken during the data collection period to follow or explore patterns and themes throughout treatment. Data for analysis came from the field diary, from archival materials in the case file, and from case notes.
Figure 7. Data collection strategies.
Data management included reports originating at the beginning of treatment as well as documents and instruments continuing through the data collection period. Once data collection started, I used the field diary to tie the current and archival documents and reports together from the beginning of treatment to the end of the data collection period.

**Archival Materials:**

With consent of the participant and his parents, I used archival data from the case file at SCMH to develop a comprehensive illustration of background and clinical implications. Using archival material allowed the integration of data from the beginning of treatment through the period of data collection. The archival data available in the case file consisted of the following segments:

- the consent to participate in treatment
- the disposition report from the probation department including reason for court hearings, present difficulty, juvenile record, minor’s statement, victim statement, personal and family history, health history, substance history, education and employment record, financial status, collateral reports from parents, juvenile hall staff, and Child Protective Services, evaluation, and probation recommendations
- a mental health assessment covering significant cultural issues, family history, issues requiring clinical attention, client strengths, education information, medical/physical health information, peri- and prenatal history, substance use, mental health history, mental status findings, current risk factors, and diagnosis
- the Ohio Mental Health Consumer Outcomes System Youth Problem, Functioning and Satisfaction Scales, the Achenbach-Parent/Caregiver Child Behavior Checklist for Ages 6 to 18, which provided insight into symptoms
Case Notes

The case notes were located in the case file. For this study the case notes provided an ongoing log of treatment events from the youth’s admission into WRAP to the end of the data collection period. The youth specialist and I each documented our interactions with the youth and family in the case notes throughout WRAP, which is standard procedure for all clients at the agency. The case notes contain a brief summary on mental status, life events, the interventions, and the observed response of the participant for each session.

Field Diary

In the field diary, I collected direct quotations from the participant after each session. I reflected my personal reactions and thoughts about the participant, family, and other team members. My field diary also contained my impressions on the research and the wraparound process as well as notes on my dual role as embedded researcher and clinician. The field diary entries served as a bridge between current and past treatment events as they came to my attention and connected emerging themes over time.

Observations

Observations during sessions, photos taken by team members, and mental health status were documented in case notes and extensive field notes. Mental status
observations (Uniformed Service University of Health Sciences, n.d.) during the initial assessment and later WRAP sessions utilized the following categories:

- **Appearance:** Coordination, social conventions, grooming, dress, level of agitation.

- **Interpersonal Style:** Congenial, guarded, open, cooperative, withdrawn, distant, annoyed, irritable, engaging, hostile, shy, relaxed, cautious, defensive, resistant.

- **Speech:** Clear, normal rate, pressured, fast, soft-spoken, stuttering, includes profanity, monotone, mumbling, excited, difficulty finding words, slurred, spontaneous, detailed, poor articulation.

- **Eye contact:** Good [= steady], fleeting, avoided, intense, none, sporadic [influenced by cultural mannerisms].

- **Mood and Affect:** Normal [= culturally appropriate], anxious, depressed, elated, calm, irriated.

- **Sensorium:** Person, place, time, situation.

- **Intellectual Functioning:** Below average, average, above average.

- **Thought:** Coherent, logical, goal directed, tangential, loose associations, blocking, flight of ideas.

- **Judgment:** Insight, impulse control.

- **Dangerousness:** Suicidal, homicidal, intent, plan.

**Trauma Assessment**

During the initial mental health assessment at SCMH, clients and their parents are asked about the family history and significant milestones, self-harm, and hostility toward others but not specifically about traumatic events. The diagnosing clinician can evaluate further, but a formal trauma assessment has not been part of the standard procedure for
youths participating in WRAP. However, after the engagement phase, when a more trusting and safe connection has been established, the participating youth and family often disclose, little by little, more details about what traumatic events have occurred in their lives. When traumatic events are disclosed, careful clinical questioning is paired with safe interventions.

The Initial Trauma Review—Adolescent Version (ITR-A) by Briere and Lanktree (2008) was used to search the archival data and is applied to address the topics with all WRAP clients when clinicians consider it appropriate. The tool consists of questions about the experience of “childhood physical abuse,” “childhood sexual abuse,” “peer sexual assault,” “disasters,” “motor vehicle accidents,” “partner abuse,” “non-intimate peer assault,” “torture,” “police trauma,” and “witnessing trauma” (Briere & Lanktree, 2008).

**Wraparound Questionnaires**

The wraparound fidelity questionnaire, which is given to all WRAP families, was administered during the time of this study’s data collection and helped to assess the participating family’s perspective of the services received. A clinician from a different team called the participant’s family with questions such as the following (the full evaluation tool is included as Appendix G): “Before you had your first team meeting, did someone fully explain the wraparound process? When you first met your wraparound facilitator, were you given time to talk about your family strengths, beliefs, and traditions? Did this process help you appreciate what is special about your family?”
At the end of the data collection period, I spent time with each team member to discuss their impressions on the participant’s experiences during the WRAP process. I used questions such as the following as general guideline, which were adapted from Kristine Artello’s (2010) wraparound assessment: “What are your friends like? What do you like about your school/job?” The full questionnaire is located in Appendix H.

**Tonal Connectedness Map**

At SCMH clinicians used Arredondo’s “Tonal Connectedness Model” (2010) with several client populations to chart the important connections in a child’s life. The participant of this study created a visual map of the significant relationships in his life, and color-coded them according to the dimension of the connection. In the original Tonal, red connection lines identify “love, hate, or fear,” green lines point at “learning or teaching” interactions, blue records “blood, genes, sex, food and shelter,” and yellow links the youth to “higher purpose, meaning, or spirit” (D. Arredondo, personal notes taken during lecture, November 19, 2010.). The following open-ended and closed-ended questions accompanied the construction of the connectedness map:

1. **Emotional level:** “Who do you love? Who loves you? Who do you want to love you? Who is missing you?”

2. **Cognitive level:** “Who teaches you? What are you learning? Who do you teach? What do you think about?”

3. **Physical level:** “Who shares your blood? Does anybody share your body? Who provides you with food and shelter?”
4. Spiritual level: “To what or whom is your soul connected? What are your passions? What matters to you? What do you value?” (Arredondo, 2010).

**Instrumentation for Heart-rhythm Monitoring and Feedback**

The HeartMath measurement devices are widely utilized at SCMH to assess and train youths. To measure heart rate variability as indicator of the physiological effects of emotion regulation,

...the emWave PC Stress Relief System . . . is a comprehensive, easy-to-use software program that turns a personal computer into a heart-rhythm coherence monitor . . . [which] shows how quickly emotions impact physiology in general and heart rate variability in particular. (Thurber, 2008, p. 53)

I used the HeartMath computer assessment tools to measure heart rate variability during three separate occasions while the youth was practicing self-regulation. The tools I used were the computer system, the Dual Drive game, and the hand-held emWave devices.

**Research Credibility and Dependability**

To warrant credibility of this study, I listed rival explanations to the causal explanations and “[thought] about what would have happened if the causal factor had not occurred based on [my] own and others’ expertise and published research studies” (Sorensen, n.d., “Researcher as Detective,” para. 1). I reported disconfirming evidence as well, such as a participant’s failure to achieve some of his goals, such as re-offending despite extensive wraparound interventions, or dysregulation after initial coherence on an internal, interpersonal, and community level.
As an embedded researcher I had the unique opportunity to witness the probation youth’s process while he was experiencing WRAP, and “the ability to perceive reality from the viewpoint of someone inside the case study rather than external to it” (Yin, 2009, p. 119), therefore increasing credibility. The dual role of researcher and clinician also allowed for the “ability to manipulate minor events—such as the meeting of a group of persons in the case” with the purpose to “produce a greater variety of situations for the purposes of collecting data” (p. 112).

**Addressing Researcher Bias**

The disadvantages of this technique included the potential to make a biased choice of research participant and observation period, including “selective observations, selective recording of information, and allowing personal views to affect data interpretation” (Sorensen, n.d., “Researcher Bias,” para. 1). Furthermore the process of doing research while also assuming the role of therapist and advocate for the participant actively influenced the research process of this study. To lessen researcher bias I took the following measures:

- carefully documented self-reflection
- journaling and documenting my thinking during the research process
- routine weekly supervision to provide outside professional support
- discussions and review of decisions and events with fellow team members
- ongoing discussions with the local expert and reader, Dr. Stan Einhorn.
Factual Accuracy and Interpretive Validity:

“Factual accuracy” in this study was assured by including the views and observations of the other team members and the external reader, who was employed at SCMH but was not involved in the specific case. The “audit trail” of the documents and records collected for this research “allowed others to verify . . . [my] description.” To ensure that my illustration of the participant’s reality was accurate and that I “understood the participants’ views, thoughts, feelings, intentions, experiences and portray[ed] them in the research report” (Sorensen, n.d., “Interpretive Validity”), I sought feedback from the participant “in order to clear up any misunderstandings” and used the participant’s “actual language, dialect, and personal meanings” in direct quotations to provide a “thick, rich description,” while protecting the specific identity of the participant.

Theoretical Validity

In this study, longitudinal data were collected over 3 months, so that several events could support my interpretations of observed regularities. Including archival data helped extend the access to documented events in the participant’s life to the beginning of the participant’s treatment. The application of the holistic lens required the use of several different theoretical approaches, such as social ecology, community psychology, wraparound, cultural identity, attachment, and trauma theories. The different—but at times overlapping—theoretical approaches assisted with a comprehensive and integrative analysis. Professional peer review in the form of feedback, challenges to my perspective, and support for evidence and conclusions was consistently available at SCMH. I
discussed planned interventions, proceedings, and findings with the different team members and supervisor at the agency.

**Data Management**

The duration of the data collection period for this study encompassed a time frame of 3 months, in order to provide an in-depth understanding of the participant’s experiences. I chose this time period due to the probability of observing meaningful experiences because a complete observation from the beginning to the end of the treatment was not possible in the frame of this study.

During the course of research, the participant and team met regularly. I scheduled family meetings, individual meetings, and experiential activities according to the needs and availability of the participant and his family. I collected case notes after each in-person or phone contact with the participant and submitted them to the case file. I reviewed the case file, probation disposition report, and ongoing case notes, organizing them in themes corresponding with the spheres in the holistic model. I also collected observations from my field diary after each session, wrote down the participant’s comments during conversations in session, and collected drawings and pictures.

At SCMH case files are placed in a locked chart room in accordance with state, federal, and HIPAA regulations. The same procedure applied to the chart of the participant of this study. The additional field notes and materials were stored at the county facility in a locked file cabinet. The data were kept safe there for the duration of the research process. After completing this dissertation and after the required period of
record keeping, the materials will be shredded or disposed of in the designated and safe disposal sites for confidential data provided by SCMH.

Method Triangulation

As shown in Figure 7, the following different types of data collection procedures comprised method triangulation, which started the analytic process: careful documentation of each session with the participant and the family; the use of archival records from the case file, such as the probation disposition report; therapeutic conversations with the participant and family during sessions, including interview style questions with focus on the personal behavior and motives; case notes from the youth specialist, my notes as facilitator and clinician as well as embedded researcher; direct observation of the participant’s mental status and reaction to interventions; physical artifacts, such as photos taken during activities or relevant news clippings reflecting the themes. I entered notes into the field diary after each session. Additional methods of data triangulation were mentioned above in the section on theoretical validity.

Data Analysis

Both “sufficient time in the field,” and the “extensive body of evidence used as data” (Erickson in Creswell, 2007, p. 289) collected, provided scholarly substantiation of the participant’s experience of WRAP as seen through the holistic lens. Then the analytic process started with the narrative description of the facts in the form of diary style summaries. The entries came from the combined documents and reports as shown in
Figure 7, including experiences and interactions documented in case notes, field diary, archival data, and notes on conversations with the team members. In order to “hear what the data had to say rather than splicing them into arbitrary units before searching for topics, themes or meanings” (Thompson & Barrett, 1997, p. 60), these summarized descriptions were part of this study. This approach maintained an extensive account of the case and its surrounding field.

Following this process, I analyzed the themes in which the data were organized according to the spheres of the holistic model in Figures 4 and 5 (youth, family, culture, community, society, global community). As themes surfaced during the analysis, I organized them in clusters that interfaced between the spheres and occurred over time. Those categories included the following: defense, receiving support, connectedness, participation, exploration, and emotion regulation.

Memos helped to explore the relationships among categories such as the association of traumatic experiences and their effects with the concept of culture as an adjustment to the societal context. The findings were asserted by interpretations utilizing the theoretical construct of the holistic lens and the integrated clinical theories as described in the literature review. The description, themes and interpretations were then balanced in equal parts, so that a reasonable view of this case could emerge.
CHAPTER 4: NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION, ANALYSIS OF THEMES, ASSERTIONS

This section introduces the bounded system of the case, which consisted of the participant and his WRAP team. The introduction focuses on the youth, the participating family members, the professionals, and me in my dual role as clinician and researcher. The “narrative description” (Stake, 1995) of the three months of the data collection period follows in diary-style summarized entries, which state the facts, in the moment reflections, and connected events, as I recorded them (p. 123). Subsequently the analysis of themes begins, where I cluster connected ideas on the experiences of the youth and provide details supporting the emerging topics on what had an impact on him (Creswell, 2007). Then I develop key issues further to increase “the understanding of the complexity of the case” (Stake, p. 123) by including the holistic lens and the integrated theoretical constructs introduced in the literature review. I assert my findings by providing an interpretation of the data coherent with my “personal views and the constructs in the literature” (Creswell, 2007, p. 244).

**Bounded System**

The case selected for this research consists of a system with several interrelated parts: the WRAP team members including Rey, his family, and the professionals. The case is bounded by the time frame of the data collection period, which was expanded by the use of reports that illuminate the members’ background.
Rey, the Participant

Rey was referred to WRAP through the court in October 2010, due to the imminent danger of his being sent to an out-of-home placement in a group home or correctional facility. After an initial screening, he was assigned the same team of providers as his older brother, Joe. Rey had already established a relationship with the team by attending family meetings together with his brother.

Rey’s situation was “more intense than usual” for several reasons: He had come to the attention of the authorities early on, as evidenced in his juvenile record, Child Protective Services-documented investigations, and assessments done through his school. His older brother was part of WRAP at the same time, and each of the brothers had been in WRAP for a year at the beginning of data collection. This allowed the team to form a stable relationship with all family members and gave us detailed and unique insights into Rey’s experiences within his social context.

Rey was a 16-year-old Mexican American youth from an immigrant family. He was the second oldest of four siblings, with one older brother and two younger sisters. He was born in the U.S. and had learned to speak English and Spanish fluently. His parents came from rural Mexico and were monolingual Spanish speakers. They settled in Santa Cruz County in 1992 to work in the strawberry fields. After initially arriving without papers, they were able to attain residency. The family’s annual income amounted to $23,000. Rey’s extensive record with juvenile justice—starting at age 13—was documented in his case file and included theft, vandalism, robbery, assault, and drug use.
In school Rey had been diagnosed since first grade with learning disabilities in attention and auditory processing, as well as a speech and language disorder. His 7th grade school records showed only 69 days with school attendance, and 175 total negative attendance records, indicating late or no attendance. After briefly attending the special education resource classes at the local high school, Rey decided to go to an alternative high school instead.

Rey was affiliated with a local Hispanic street gang and had been cited by probation on multiple occasions for possessing gang paraphernalia. School records showed what the officials considered several gang-related incidents, including suspension due to bringing a knife to middle school. Rey had spent a total of 99 days in the local juvenile hall at the beginning of WRAP and had been placed there a total of 10 times since age 13.

Reports by Child Protective Services (CPS) included an investigation of allegations of sexual abuse of Rey’s older brother by community members. Other documents focused on several occasions where Rey and his brother were seen in the family van without clothes on, possibly engaging in sexual activities. The case file also contained a report from the school due to both boys’ poor hygiene and statements by neighbors that the children were observed to be unattended most of the day. Another investigation took place due to a statement by Rey at age 13 that his father had given him beer. Even though some of the allegations were not considered unfounded, none of the investigations led to further interventions by CPS.
Family

**Monica.** Monica was the 44-year-old Mexican mother of Rey. She was a monolingual Spanish speaker and worked in the strawberry fields from April to November. She came from a large family in a rural community in Mexico, where she completed grammar school before her marriage and later migration to the United States. She married Alonso in her 20s. He was the brother of her older sister’s husband, and his family lived in the same small town. Monica first followed her husband to California without legal documentation. She reported that she felt homesick a lot and missed her mother. According to the family partner, the early part of her marriage in the U.S. included homelessness and domestic violence. As a result Monica returned to Mexico on several occasions. Her re-entry into the U.S. was complicated by the fact that she did not possess legal papers at the time. Back in California she gave birth to Joe and Rey. Monica talked to me about how she tried to solve the problem of Joe’s jealousy of and violence toward his younger brother by telling Joe that he would always remain her favorite and that he needed to help her with the baby. Monica reported that when she was pregnant with her third child, Eva, her husband was sick and could not help her. She travelled to Mexico with Rey to have the baby at her mother’s house. Alonso, who could travel legally, had already dropped Joe off in Mexico and returned alone to California. Monica stated that she left all of her children in their grandparents’ care in Mexico after Eva’s birth and came back to the U.S. to work. Joe was 5 and Rey was 3 years old at the time. About 6 months later, she was able to bring the children back to California. Her last child, Lila, was born in California. Monica was able to obtain residency about 10 years
ago. Since then she has travelled to Mexico with her children every second year, while Alonso stayed at home. The years in between, Alonso visited Mexico by himself.

During the period of WRAP services, Monica told us that she had been able to negotiate the system to gain support for housing and food for the family. She kept the important papers and made the necessary phone calls to the authorities. Monica stated that she felt her sons were often the target of law enforcement, and she tried to defend them against “unjustified” accusations. Probation reports indicate that on several occasions she told the police the boys were not in the house, even though the officers were sure that Rey and Joe were hiding inside.

**Alonso.** Alonso was Rey’s 49-year-old Mexican father; he worked with his wife in the strawberry fields. He was a monolingual Spanish speaker who left school in Mexico at age 10 to find work. His own father had died when Alonso was 6 months old. Alonso remained illiterate but supported himself and his family with his work as a migrant laborer. Alonso recounted several dangerous border crossings into the U.S. in his youth, including swimming across a large river and walking through the desert for several days. During the immigration amnesty in the U.S. in 1986 he was able to obtain his legal residency. He then returned to Mexico to marry Monica. Alonso said that he became ill with epileptic seizures when the first two children were very young and Monica was pregnant with the fourth. He had to go to Mexico to get health care, eventually recovered, and returned to his work in the U.S. Alonso disciplined Rey and his brother Joe with beatings until Rey was about 10 years old, at which time he stopped because CPS became
involved. Alonso stated that Joe was much calmer than Rey from early on and that he and his wife preferred Joe to Rey, who got angry a lot. The case file indicated that Alonso had received several citations for drunk driving and driving without a license and that he had been incarcerated for a week on one occasion. The family relied on him and Joe for transportation with the two family cars.

When Joe, and two months later, Rey, were referred to WRAP, Alonso attended every meeting together with Monica during the first year, even though both lost several hours of their work during the harvest season. In November 2012, Monica’s job had already ended, but Alonso was still able to work the last month until the harvest and preparations were completely over. He did not attend WRAP meetings as often during this time.

**Joe.** Joe was the family’s first-born son and 1½ years older than Rey. Joe mentioned that in his early childhood, he spent a year with his grandmother in Mexico, away from his parents and siblings. He attended kindergarten there, after his father had dropped him off. In the beginning of WRAP Joe conveyed to the team how his dad had told him he was just going to fetch him a bicycle and had promised that he would be right back. After that, Joe did not see him for a year.

Joe was referred to WRAP after spending 6 months in a group home for violating his probation terms by committing new crimes. Joe’s juvenile record started at age 14 and included the following activities: breaking car windows, throwing rocks at cars, burning the facial hair of a man, being out of range on the electronic monitoring device, attempted
burglary, failing to attend counseling, possession of a sharpened screw driver and
claiming to be part of a local documented criminal street gang, being intoxicated with a
blood alcohol level of 0.169%, stealing, and driving without a license. Rey was present
during all activities in Joe’s record, with the exception of getting out of range with the
electronic monitor and not attending counseling.

Alonso had started teaching Joe how to drive when he was 10. The WRAP team
noticed during our first sessions with the family that Joe drove the car to the probation
building. When Felix, the probation officer, addressed with the father that this was
against the law because Joe was a minor, Alonso praised the skillful driving abilities of
his son. This went on for several sessions, until Joe took the initiative and either parked
the car out of sight of the probation officer or asked Alonso to drive. When the WRAP
team addressed each family member’s strengths in our meetings, Alonso consistently
brought up how safely Joe drove. He recounted how the whole family attended a social
event where he, Alonso, drank too much, but Joe drove everyone home just fine. Felix
pointed out again that Joe should not been driving, and Rey and Joe grinned while Alonso
kept insisting to Felix what a great driver Joe was, until Monica elbowed him.

WRAP initially engaged both Joe and Rey in many experiential activities
together. Both brothers enjoyed learning to climb. The case file noted that Joe was faster
than his brother and became certified in belaying other climbers, whereas Rey could not
pass the safety knot test. Joe did well in alternative high school, finished a work program,
and communicated well with all team members.
When the parents started their seasonal work again in April 2011, their parental supervision decreased and the police reported to Felix that they had seen Joe with gang related peers frequently. Joe started missing scheduled activities with his youth specialist, Leo, and his drug tests contained higher levels of alcohol and marijuana. After eight months of WRAP services, Joe was again placed in a group home following his conviction for stealing his girlfriend’s uncle’s car, drinking with Rey and some friends, and driving around until the police were alerted and tried to stop them. Joe subsequently led the police on a high-speed car chase until he was cornered; all of the youths were arrested. While Joe ended up in another 6-month placement, Rey was released back home with continued WRAP services.

**Eva and Lila.** Rey’s sisters Eva (12) and Lila (10) were present at some of the WRAP meetings. They took part in an excursion to the zoo after the family dog died. Monica reported that they did well in school and went to an after-school program until the parents came home at night. The sisters became the theme of several WRAP sessions, when in early 2011 Rey decided to claim their room to get space from Joe. The parents told us that Rey had thrown all the girls’ belongings into the parents’ room. After two meetings, during which the whole team confronted his behavior, Rey agreed to return to his brother’s room.
**Treatment Providers**

Rey’s WRAP team consisted of Felix, Marga, Leo, and me, Barbara. Each will be described separately.

**Felix.** Felix, the probation officer, was a 34-year old bilingual Mexican American man born and raised within the local community. He had 4 years of experience working on the different WRAP teams. In WRAP, probation officers participate in the family meetings while also doing the probation duties, such as home searches, urine drug tests, and school checks during the week. Felix also functioned as a male Hispanic role model for Rey.

**Marga.** Marga, the family partner, was a 33-year-old bilingual Mexican American woman who had been contracted through a community agency to be part of WRAP. Her role was to support the parents as a community member with personal experience in navigating access to institutions providing support services or housing. She was new to WRAP when services began for Rey.

**Leo.** Leo, the youth specialist, was a 48-year-old German client specialist, who had been working with probation youths for 11 years. He had limited Spanish language skills. His role was to support Rey and his brother reaching their goals, engaging more in the community, introducing them to opportunities and activities that taught them new skills, and being a supportive adult male role model in taking on tasks within the local
community. I shared some of the youth specialist’s tasks as the facilitator because the team worked with both youths, Rey and his brother Joe, simultaneously. Leo is also my younger brother.

**Barbara.** I, the facilitator and researcher, am a 50-year old German licensed psychotherapist. I had been working with the agency for 14 years and was part of WRAP for 2 years. I am fluent in Spanish. My role was to coordinate the family meetings and assist the individual family members in reaching their goals.

**WRAP**

WRAP’s purpose was defined by the team as the following: to keep Rey and Joe out of placement if possible; to help them and the family identify their needs and goals; to recognize their strengths and obstacles; to assist them in accessing the resources in the local community that they needed to fulfill their goals. “Increased school attendance” was an initial goal identified by Rey, and lack of transportation was listed as an obstacle to getting the family safely to school and work on a daily basis. Strengths initially included interest in outdoor activities and sports. After a year in treatment, the following strengths were added: ability to communicate with more and different community members, ability to work with tools, and being “bilingual, hardworking, and reliable.” At the beginning of WRAP, Rey had listed his needs as “money and my high school diploma” (Treatment plan, February 16, 2011). One year later at age 16, he added “a job.” Family strengths included the parents’ consistent engagement in the meetings, their ability to provide for
the family and to garden and cook. Additional family strengths were the mother’s participation on excursions with Rey and his siblings and her modeling of consistent and successful pursuit of her goal to pass the written driver’s license test.

During the meetings, we often started with a therapeutic activity: team members passed around a ‘hot potato’ timer, and whoever held it when time was up, answered a question from a therapeutic game. The family’s enthusiasm showed in giggles and jokes, tongue-in-cheek answers, or the discussion of the issue at hand. After the opening activity, we created an agenda of important objectives and target activities for the coming week. We addressed what needed to be done and who would participate in reaching a specific goal. The team members suggested and elicited interest in activities to problem-solve or to try out, either for all together or for individual family members according to their expressed needs. Meetings usually ended with a round of appreciations.

Description of Events and Observations

In this section, the events that occurred during data collection are stated in diary style summaries and are connected to events reported in archival data. The field diary bridges observations with entries from case notes and historical/contextual comments. To clarify the origins of the different types of documentation, *internal comments and planning notes from the field diary are displayed in Arial font italics*, and historical/contextual information is in Arial Narrow font.
Rey’s 16th birthday fell on the Mexican holiday of The Day of the Dead, as his mother jokingly recalled when we came together to celebrate. During our last WRAP meeting, I had asked Rey to choose a restaurant and invite family and friends to join and had informed him that WRAP would treat. The team had started birthday celebrations earlier this year, when Monica had told me about her upcoming 44th birthday. I took Rey to select a card for her and buy some flowers. Rey told me that their family did not celebrate birthdays, but he chose a musical card, and I added some roses. Even though Rey remarked that this did not look “cool,” he brought his mother the card and flowers.

Rey came to a local diner together with Monica, Eva, and Lila. I joined him there with the youth specialist, Leo, and the family partner, Marga. Felix, the probation officer, could not come to the celebration due to another assignment, and Rey’s father, Alonso, was still at work in the strawberry fields where he would be working long hours until the end of the season.

Rey was dressed in a White T-shirt and black pants, smiled with deep dimples showing on his cheeks, and ordered the largest dish on the menu—tri-tip steak with shrimp and mashed potatoes. He looked down when we sang “Happy Birthday,” a song we all knew how to sing in English. In Mexico people usually sing the more complicated mañanitas. After we congratulated Rey, he laughed and thanked us in a calm and confident voice. I noticed Rey’s ability to stay engaged with the group with eye contact and nods, while being the center of attention during the song. When I first met Rey, he often left for the bathroom when the WRAP team focused on him.
The attention of our group did not stay with him very long, however, because shortly after the song Rey’s mother wanted to discuss practical matters around her plan to take the children to Mexico over Christmas. *I interpreted the mother’s attendance of Rey’s birthday celebration as “more of an opportunity for a free meal, and to assure that practical matters such as the passports would get taken care of.”* During our wait for the food to arrive, Marga, the family partner, took out her phone and scheduled appointments with the passport office and reviewed the passport applications that Monica had brought. *I noted how this changed the focus and how we had allowed the hijacking of attention away from Rey.* Marga and Monica were very concerned about how the timing of Rey’s brother Joe’s release from a group home would match the travel plans. The institution in a different town had scheduled and rescheduled Joe’s homecoming repeatedly, leaving the family unclear about the exact date of his return.

When Rey received the birthday dessert, a strawberry cheese tart, with a song from the servers, he spooned it up quickly while his little sisters looked on. *I noted the irony that although many of the immigrant workers, such as Rey’s parents, work in the strawberry fields, strawberries are also used as the symbol for a local criminal street gang.*

Rey commented, “This is a good restaurant.” After he could not eat any more and reported, “I am full,” he gave the cup to his sisters to clean out.

Monica had dressed up in a clean blouse and jeans for the occasion. During some of the earlier team meetings and excursions, she had worn clothes stained with food or dirt. Rey had
made comments about her appearance in the past: Just look at her! All dirty like a *paisa*
[derogatory term for rural laborer from Mexico] . . . and shit.”

When I first started to take Monica to a driving school for lessons in October, I had to pick
her up from her work in the strawberry fields. Driving on a dirt road through the vast fields, I
scanned the bent-down workers who all wore lots of protective clothing against sun, dust, and
chemicals. I had to ask several times until I found the right work crew. Monica came walking
towards me, but it took me a while to recognize her through dust, hat, and multiple layers of
clothing. Others had gathered to look at the white county car with a White woman in it. We stopped
by her house for her to change, and when she came back to the car, she was wearing a stained T-
shirt and torn pants. I mentioned to her that she could influence how people judged her in an
agency by how she dressed. She looked at me for a long time and then asked, “Do you think I
should dress up like going out?” When I confirmed that, she changed into clean clothing.

WRAP and the family had supported Monica in getting her driver’s license so that she
could become the first licensed driver in the family. The father had several DUIs and was not
eligible for a license at the time. We had practiced and recorded test questions in Spanish, and
Monica had studied them by listening with a Walkman while working in the field. She had passed
the written test for her learner’s permit on her fourth attempt in the beginning of October. Earlier
this day, I had taken Monica to a driving lesson in a neighboring small town. Monica reported
feeling more confident about herself and her ability to learn and achieve her goals, and looked
forward to returning to her home country for Christmas, *mi tierra*. 
11.04.11

I picked Rey up for a brief check-in after school, took him for a juice, and chatted with him in the car. When I asked, Rey confirmed that he had a girlfriend, “a good girl, going to school and shit.” I also asked him if he were interested in continuing with boxing classes, but he declined, stating that it was too hard for him to get to practice with his bike, and “the cops stop me without a helmet.” To wear a helmet was “absolutely not cool” and “people laugh about you.”

In a low voice, facing the ground, Rey then commented briefly about the upcoming return of his brother from placement. He changed the subject quickly and said in a more animated, louder voice and with his eyes wide open that he was looking forward to the family trip to Mexico over Christmas.

11.07.11

Rey called Leo to meet with him, so that that they could shop and talk. The youth specialist had set up a work project for Rey with a local bicycle repair co-op. Rey worked three afternoons a week, and logged his hours. Because the co-op could not pay him, Leo went shopping with him for the equivalent of $8 per hour, which was funded by WRAP. Rey told his teachers and friends about his work and that he was proud of his job.

11.08.11

I took Rey’s mother to another driving lesson and she addressed her worries about her older son. The group home where he was placed had changed the date for his release
and the permissions to visit on many occasions, using family connection as a reward or behavioral consequence. The mother expressed her anger and frustration about this policy. “They think they can do anything to us. But the whole family is suffering!”

When I asked her about her relationship to Rey, she told me how much harder it was for her to connect with him. “When he does not want to do something, he does not talk or discuss things. He just does not do it.” I listened to her rather than telling her that I believed her preferential treatment of the older brother might have had an influence on Rey’s behavior in the family.

11.10.11

Monica told me during our time travelling to her driving lesson that Rey had been reacting with anger when she instructed him to clear half of the boys’ room for his brother. He had thrown things around and was very angry about having to give up the space that had been all his for the past 6 months.

After I brought the mother back home, I checked in with Rey. He disclosed that he had been “talked to” at the bicycle co-op but assured that he thought the feedback “was not all bad, and shit.”

He did not get into further detail about it, but changed the subject to how his friends treated girls without any respect. When I asked him to elaborate, he recounted that they whistle, laugh, or follow girls that pass them, but that he had noticed that girls “got spooked” by that. I confirmed to him that girls didn’t like those behaviors. I told him I
thought it spoke for him that he noticed that this was not a good strategy for a guy to get closer to a girl.

11.14.11

I connected with the youth specialist, Leo. He filled me in that when he checked to see if Rey did his hours at the bicycle co-op, Rey was not there. The co-op team voiced the following criticism: Rey showed up less and less predictably and often wore gang colors. Leo said that he was becoming more and more frustrated with Rey and felt that his efforts keeping up the rewards program seemed not effective anymore.

I explained to Leo that it was crucial to stay engaged with Rey at this point. Leo stated he felt that Rey was taking advantage of him. Afterwards, I realized that my fear that Rey was getting more involved with gang-related peers and was less approachable. I wanted to activate more positive support for him. The girlfriend seemed a good influence, and I hoped that she would stay in Rey’s life as additional support, especially with the uncertain but imminent return of his brother to the family home.

11.16.11

I received another frustrated call from the youth specialist. Rey had missed another scheduled day at the bike co-op. Leo decided to cancel an outing that we had planned so that we would not reinforce negative behavior with a reward. I argued against
pulling back when more attention to Rey and his behavior was needed but agreed we
needed to talk and address the issues rather than do an experiential intervention.

When I took the mother to her driving lesson, she brought along Rey’s little sister,
who was sick and not in school that day. Both recounted an incident with the passports,
which were now ready for the Christmas journey: the mother had left a bag at the food
stamp office with all the important papers and some money. According to Monica, the
whole family trip to Mexico “was in that bag.” Luckily, when she sent Lila to look for the
bag after noticing its absence several hours later, Lila found it and brought it back to the
relief of all family members. Lila chimed in, “If a guy like Rey had found it, he would
have taken it and kept it!”

Monica went on that she had noticed that Rey was nervous about his brother’s
return. We talked about how to prepare for the change in the family dynamic and
brainstormed how to support the shift for all family members.

I agreed with Monica that her plan to take all the children to Mexico over Christmas was a
good strategy to keep the kids busy and provide them with new and positive experiences. I
mentioned that working or volunteering would be good as well, and told her how proud Rey had
been recently after reporting to me that he had worked with Alonso’s friend for a day, making “real
money.” Monica turned to me and said, “Don’t believe that. He never worked for a friend of the
family. He lies.”

I remembered then that on the day Rey had told me he worked in construction for a friend
of his dad, he had also made some comments about a drunken man from Oaxaca, who “just
handed out money to us.” When I took him to a restaurant to celebrate his first day at a “real job,“
he looked at the Chinese owner, an older fragile looking woman, and stated, “I bet she would give you her money if you jacked her.” I had asked him why he said that, but he did not respond.

I noted later that when the pieces of this incident had come together for me, I felt shocked. While Rey most likely wanted to look good in front of me, he had possibly threatened and intimidated an illegal immigrant with his buddies, and taken his money, realizing how easy it was for them. In all probability he then assessed the Chinese woman for a similar treatment. I realized that there were more signs for his increasing engagement in criminal activities, which could lead to his arrest or an out-of-home placement. I also noted how glad I felt about working in a team, where the youth specialist had also caught on to more delinquent behavior. I was astonished that the mother, who had previously lied for both of her sons equally and had protected them from consequences of their behaviors, trusted me enough to tell me about Rey’s lie.

I felt angry towards Rey and at a loss regarding my interventions that focused on what I saw as Rey’s strengths. I was relieved by the mother’s idea for the whole family to leave for Mexico over Christmas, and I hoped it would keep Rey and his family safe during the holidays.

In our time together, Rey’s mother also talked about her hope that the boys would learn how to work and how to improve their general conduct during their time on the family’s little ranch in Mexico. She herself would rather live there than in the U.S., but she thought that Eva and Lila needed the education and services available here.
11.18.11

I picked up Rey from his home and sat down with him in the juice bar to create a Tonal map of connectedness (Arredondo, 2010). After we did the map, Rey chose a new smoothie flavor for the first time. Usually he chose strawberry flavor, but this time he tried passion fruit. Rey reported that Felix had visited his school today and said that “the Mexican teaching aide” had complained to him about Rey’s behavior problems. She had said “bad stuff” about him. He complained, “She doesn’t even speak English but is trying to tell on me to my P.O.!”

After a while, I addressed with Rey that according to Leo, he did not go to the bike co-op on Monday and asked what was happening. Rey replied, “I hung out with my girlfriend, you know. Just had some fun.”

11.21.11

Leo reported that he had met with Rey after some phone calls back and forth. Leo was frustrated with Rey’s lack of commitment to showing up at the bike co-op and demanded that Rey show more motivation for the reward project to continue. He refused to buy items that Rey had requested for some past hours and told Rey that he needed to work more consistently. Rey had at first avoided Leo, making excuses about other commitments, but had then met with him and talked to him. He reportedly told Leo that he wanted to spend more time with his girlfriend, for whom he rode his bike long distances in order to be with her. However, Rey reportedly made a new commitment to Leo. Leo said that when Rey honestly told him he was getting bored with the bike co-op
work and rewards instead of “real money” but was interested in a “real job,” Leo told him that the team would support Rey with a renewed attempt to get him accepted into another job training program. Following an orientation, this project provided actual paying jobs in the community for the adolescents they accepted. Rey had applied to the program last fall but was disqualified because he was not yet 16 years old. I had spent five of our meetings helping Rey to get his ID and his applications ready and to appear on time for the orientation appointments. His birth certificate was in bad shape, with the birth date hard to decipher. The edges of the document were actually burned. Originally, Rey’s mother kept important paperwork in a box under her bed. During WRAP she started bringing the documents to a bank safe. Rey had followed through with diligence, being ready and well groomed when I picked him up, remembering appointment times and presenting politely to the staff. However, he omitted the fact that he was not yet 16, which was one of the requirements of this federal program. Because he would turn 16 later that year, he was able to attend the first session before anyone found out. When the program staff found the error, they kept his papers, and asked him to come back when he was 16. Rey told me then that he was very disappointed and had very much looked forward to working.

Also today, I connected with Rey’s teacher, who related to me that Rey was “well-liked” in school, and that his attendance had greatly improved during the last year. This coincided with Rey’s involvement in WRAP. However, per the teacher Rey usually arrived at school one hour late every day, which kept him behind academically. The parent involvement had also been good in the last year. Additionally, Rey had shown that he cared about his family and community. The teacher had seen him cry in front of his classmates when they discussed a gang related shooting, which killed a 6-year-old boy
who was playing at home. The boy had been hit with a stray bullet. Rey’s behavior reportedly had escalated for some time. When discussing Rey’s current issues, the teacher wondered if the loss of the family dog could have triggered the recent low points. I knew how Rey’s whole family had been affected by the loss.

In late summer, Monica had called me very upset, telling me that somebody (I could not understand the name) was very sick. After a while, I had figured out that it was Poochie, the family puppy who had been with them for only 3 months. When I asked if she had brought him to the vet, she had pleaded with me, crying, to come. When I arrived at the house, I saw that Poochie was lying in a puddle of blood, foaming out of his mouth. I helped the mother wrap him in a towel and drove them to the veterinarian. Poochie was too weak to be saved. Monica had cried, and I had comforted her as best as I could. She then asked me to come back when all the kids were home because they all were very attached to the little dog. I did so and noticed how Rey was touched, turning silent and trying not to show that his eyes were watery. He told me he had not always been nice to the dog, had thrown things at him, and teased him. When I told a story and made some drawings of “doggy heaven” for the little girls, Rey had listened and assisted me gently by bringing the art supplies and holding the pens. The mother had listened as well, and we had planned a family outing to the zoo to have some more contact with live animals.

Rey’s teacher provided additional information. She told me that Rey was part of her alternative education class voluntarily because he qualified for special education at the regular high school. Rey had chosen alternative education rather than enduring teasing by peers, which he had experienced when going to special education classes. The teacher was aware of Rey’s problem with the teaching aide and had stated that many
students had a problem with her style. According to the teacher, Rey’s ability to communicate and to make eye contact had improved significantly. At the same time, however, there appeared to be a wavelike pattern of issues with in-school behavior, compliance, and following through with assignments. Currently the teacher was under the impression that he was at a lower level of compliance, but she stated, “We like him here.”

11.22.11

During my next excursion with Monica to her driving classes, I addressed the need for Rey to get to school on time. Monica told me that she was unable to get Rey out of bed in the morning and that she hoped we supported her by talking to him about it. The mother told me she was very preoccupied with arranging the trip to Mexico. She also was upset that she still had not been told when her older son would return from placement. All she knew was that his “time was up” and that he could arrive any time now. Multiple calls by Marga to the facility had been met with suspicion by the agency, and the responsible probation department did not communicate with the mother or the team. Finally, probation responded and informed the team that the group home based the exact date of Rey’s brother Joe’s return on his behavior and that his attitude had not yet been good enough.

11.30.11

Our family meeting was scheduled after the parents’ work, and we had planned to welcome Rey’s brother Joe back. Before his arrest in May, we had always included both
brothers in the family meetings. Joe was back for the first time after 6 months. He had finally been released and sent home via Greyhound bus on Thanksgiving Day. Monica and Joe sat with the probation officer Felix, Leo, and Marga in the meeting room at the probation office. I greeted Joe and the family and noticed that Rey was not there. Monica stated that Rey was not at the home when they needed to leave, but he responded when I called the house. I drove to pick him up and asked what had happened. First Rey lied, “My sister wanted me to buy her juice at the store,” while the sister barged in telling me that that was not true. I assured Rey that we needed him in the meeting, and he put on a different T-shirt. I noticed his belt with a gang symbol and told him this was a probation issue. He smiled at me, “You did not see this,” and pulled his sweater over the belt. In the car we chatted a little, and Rey told me that his girlfriend was “mad because she thinks I look at other girls.” “Do you?” “Well, there are chicks when I hang out with my friends, you know.” We joined the meeting that had focused on his brother in the meantime. Rey sat upright and looked at me, while his brother held his head down on his folded arms on top of the table.

As a group activity, I encouraged all team members to talk about the different worlds they enter during a single day in their lives. Rey did not understand what I meant but offered, “I am the same everywhere.” When I explained the concept further and asked in which world he got the most compliments or positive feedback, he stated “in school.” When we established an agenda, Rey brought up that his mother had had an accident with the car. Rey had been with her and had advised her to “step on it” after she had damaged another car in a parking lot.
The mother jokingly blamed me, “You said I should practice driving, now see what happened!” she giggled.

I was shocked and asked if everyone was okay. Rey stated, “The cops came but she showed her learner’s permit and he let her go.” She also presented car insurance, after returning to the site. Initially she had followed her son’s advice.

During the meeting the family partner brought up that the boys had been fighting over the cell phones since Joe’s return. Now each of the boys carried a phone, but the mother did not have hers. When I inquired what had happened, Rey stated that Joe had the phone he had earned by working at the bike co-op. “Did he take it from you?” “He just borrowed it.” “And which phone do you have?” Rey pointed at his mother, “Hers.” Leo and I opened up a conversation about re-adjusting to Joe back in the home, and how all have to share the space and resources again. When Leo mentioned a power struggle, both brothers nodded. Leo joked, “And who is on top?” “Both,” was Rey’s quick reply.

We asked about good ways of negotiating space, phones, and necessary things. The mother recounted that she had taken everyone to a field of nopales [cactus], and they all showed us the spines in their fingers. She thought that putting them to work was helpful to teach them values and also to solve the power struggles at hand. Monica stated in a confident voice that going to Mexico would help them see something different and would get them busy in a positive way.

We gave the mother positive feedback on how she took charge and tried to keep the boys busy, and we talked about how participating in activities, such as jobs, sports, or new experiences, could keep boredom and negative peer influence at bay.
Leo used our sibling relationship as an example that hierarchy does not work between brothers and sisters but that power sharing is a lot more sustainable. I suggested for both brothers to pick up boxing to keep busy until the departure to Mexico. Rey and Joe showed initial interest. During the meeting, Rey was the more communicative of the two, answering questions and keeping eye contact. Before Joe went to placement, he had charmed everyone with thoughtful comments during our meetings on what needed to change in the family. He had pointed out how his father only made negative comments but did not know how to acknowledge strengths. Now Joe just sat there in silence with his head resting on his folded arms.

After this encounter, I was worried about the increasing “hanging out with friends,” which had cost Rey the trust of his girlfriend. I thought of her as support for him, who was encouraging him to go to school and to engage on a peer level suitable for his age. I remembered that the struggle between the brothers had previously escalated Rey’s behavior problems. According to the family partner, Rey’s older brother won the fist fights. When the mother had told us she had heard Joe and Rey beat each other up behind the locked door of their room before Joe’s placement in a group home, both got arrested shortly afterwards.

Leo voiced his disappointment about Joe’s withdrawn behavior, and I told him that to me the placement where he had been did not sound like a place where much improvement could happen. I felt I had to counteract the youth specialist’s hopelessness. At the same place, I also noted that I felt extremely bad about the
mother’s accident and questioned my initial strategy to empower her by being the first legal driver in the family.

12.02.11

Leo called me the next day, telling me he was frustrated because when he tried to get Rey’s help with a repair at the bike co-op, Rey was again not there. He had checked with the coordinators of the co-op, and they related to him that both Rey and his brother had come by earlier. After they left, a wire cutting tool was missing. Leo did not want to put his efforts into helping Rey remain involved at the bike co-op anymore. I pleaded with him to keep Rey and his brother busy till their trip to Mexico, or to try at least to get them into the boxing studio. I explained that “nothing stops a bullet like a job” (Boyle, 2011) and the need for engaging Rey and Joe in activities that kept them away from the streets.

I felt alone, frustrated and worried. Now that increased interventions were needed, we were unable to engage Rey or his brother. I could not do the motivating and attending all by myself and noticed that I was invested in the case to become a success story. I wanted 24-hour interventions for the family and had become desperate for Rey and his family to make some progress. I pondered whether I was too attached to seeing some success in Rey’s data for my research or whether the increase of conduct disorder symptoms and their effects as well as the declining energy in the team, affected me. I could not tell them apart.
12.05.11

I called the family partner, Marga, because I could not bring the mother to her driving lesson due to a conflicting appointment. Earlier I had connected with Rey’s brother and explained to him how the boxing could be a good investment in time and might lead to a possible job because we were developing a youth work program with the boxing studio. He was interested in going with Rey, who had been there, and agreed to check it out. When I talked to Marga later that day, she told me it was her impression that both brothers did not really want to go boxing. She continued that she had heard from the mother that Joe and Rey were pushing her to try out marijuana, to hide it for them, and to leave for Mexico before school would end for the girls. Marga laughingly told me she believed I should look for a different research subject than Rey. She found that the brothers were not motivated to engage in any serious project before the trip.

12.06.11

I visited the bike co-op during the time Rey needed to put in hours and was happy to find him there. I told him how neat it was that he was back and that I would let Leo know. He replied, “I want to keep coming here. You know, it’s like my job.” He said that he had told his brother as well. Then Rey asked if I could quickly take him out and bring a bike part that he got in the co-op to his home. I told him “no” because I needed to check in with the project coordinator. I thought that he wanted to use me and did not want to encourage any absences during his project hours. Rey and I looked for the coordinator, who talked openly about Rey’s mixed behavior in the project. The coordinator noticed
the recent lack of commitment and stated that for having participated in the co-op on and off for about a year, Rey had very little skills. He had addressed with Rey that his habit of cursing and ending every sentence with “and shit” was not acceptable in any real work environment. I asked about suggestions and ideas to increase the quality of Rey’s engagement. The coordinator recommended some of the project’s weekend workshops to learn how to fix bicycle transmissions. Rey said he was interested in the training. I asked in Rey’s presence about the missing wire cutter. The coordinator told me that they had found the tool; it had just been misplaced. I felt relieved after hearing this because if Rey was stealing from the project, his sense of supportive connectedness would have been weaker than I had assumed. Rey had been suspected of a theft at his school a year before when a classmate’s phone was missing, and only Rey had been in the classroom. The phone was never recovered, but Rey’s home was searched by probation without turning up the phone.

I called Leo and reported that Rey had been at the co-op and that the wire cutter had been found. Leo said he was happy to hear that and hoped Rey had responded to their conversation. I also spoke with Marga to hear how her drive with the mother had gone and what her impressions during recent home visits were. Marga stated that on one of her visits both brothers hid in the house while she talked to the mother. In the beginning of WRAP a year ago, the probation officer had noticed Rey hiding from him as well. Felix had done a home routine probation home search and had asked Monica if the boys were there. She had made an evasive comment, and Joe came forward hesitantly. Subsequently Felix found Rey in the closet,
clearly pretending to be sleeping. Only after some coaxing and waiting, he gave up this stance and engaged reluctantly with Felix.

The mother told the family partner how upset she was that she had no phone anymore but was paying the bill. Marga reported that the mother confided in her that she was hiding marijuana for the brothers and that they told her to smoke it herself. Marga wondered if the giggly behavior of the mom during the last meeting was not caused by intoxication. According to Marga, the accident had affected the mother more than she let on during our meeting, and she had been nervous about letting me know about it. The brothers were again locking the door and fighting physically with each other.

Marga confirmed that currently the mother talked more positively about Rey than about Joe, which was a reversal of her usual pattern of preferring and praising Joe more than his brother. Marga reported that the driving lessons were very meaningful to the mother and that they gave her hope that she could improve her life in other areas as well, such as getting her citizenship or learning English and getting a better job. Marga repeated that she believed I needed to look for a different research subject than Rey. She believed that Rey and his brother would end up in placement soon.

12.07.11

Together with Leo and Marga we had arranged a van to take the family on a small outing with lunch to welcome Joe’s brother back to the team. The day trip was also meant to reconnect with all before the Christmas vacation. Felix, the probation officer, did not
come with us. He had been promoted and told us he had to juggle his old job as well as new duties for some time.

When we parked at the house, the mother, Rey and his two sisters were ready and looking forward to the activity. Joe, however, refused to come because he was still in bed. During the drive Monica addressed her fear of not being able to travel to Mexico because there were difficulties with the social security check. Someone was using Joe’s social security number and too much income had been reported.

Family partner Marga immediately revealed her own experience with the social security system. I encouraged her to help the mother make some phone calls. I had to prompt Marga several times before she stopped telling her own story and responded to the family’s needs. *I was frustrated about her slow response. I had seen her present herself as an expert on such issues during the year we worked together, and not always seen her follow through. It looked to me as if she wanted to be begged to feel important.* Later Marga and Monica made successful phone contact with the agency.

After walking through a rural little town, we sat at a Mexican restaurant. We talked about how things were different now for the family after Rey’s brother’s return. Rey and the girls said that it was hard to make space and that Joe was not in a good place. I added that the experiences Joe had made in the group home might influence his behavior. The mother complained that Alonso, the father, got her into the problems with social security “because he just picks up the phone and pretends he understands English.
Then he just says ‘yes, yes’. *Tonto* [stupid]!” She called the father stupid in front of all present.

During the dinner, Rey’s sister Eva did not like what she had ordered. Rey asked her what was wrong and then helped her find the cheese in her chile relleno. He also made sure his youngest sister sat at the right distance to the table, moving her chair closer. Leo and I observed how Rey cared for his siblings in a relaxed and nurturing way. Leo mentioned that it suited Rey well to play the role of “the good brother,” which usually was Joe’s part. Rey commented on the country style Oaxacan restaurant, “This is a big place for a guy from Oaxaca.”

He showed his sisters the ducks in a little enclosure and walked around making conversation: “It would be good to rent a room here.” When Marga asked everyone what they were looking forward to most on their trip to Mexico, Rey replied, “To just chill.” Rey talked and smiled a lot on the way back, when I playfully made faces with the sisters and took pictures. Nearly back at the family home, we saw a bad accident, where a large frozen goods truck had completely smashed a passenger car. Monica looked at the scene and started tearing up. Eva asked her mom if she was crying. Trying to cover her teary eyes with her hand, Monica responded with an accusation, “Rey always tells me only to cry when bad things happen to someone in the family!” Rey listened silently in the seat behind her. I mentioned that we are all connected, and everyone gets affected when something bad or something good happens. Rey looked out the window. *Later I noticed that I had not asked him how he was doing but dismissed it.*
Marga called me and described an IEP meeting at Rey’s school that had been a disaster. Instead of focusing on how to support Rey and help with his disabilities, the teaching aide had accused him of being disrespectful and aggressive. There was no translator for Monica. At some point, the aide and Monica started yelling at each other in Spanish, while teacher and director looked on, until both the teaching aide and the mother broke into tears. Marga recounted how she told all to discontinue the meeting, bought the mother some hot chocolate to calm down, and complained that this kind of meeting was bad for the mother’s health because she had high blood pressure. Marga also criticized that the probation officer was not involved more because he would have been in a better position to help with the school issues.

I was surprised that I did not know about the meeting after just visiting the school, and that the IEP had been performed without translator, psychologist, or specialized professional staff. I asked if I could help, and once she agreed I drove by the house, where I found Marga, Monica, Alonso, a family friend, and Rey standing in the garden. Joe looked on from the window, and the girls ran in and out of the house. When I drove up, Rey whistled at me. I ignored that, greeted everyone and noticed that Monica looked still pale and confused. I approached her, and she told me still with tears in her eyes that during the IEP meeting the aide “complained about Rey checking out girls, but that is his age!” Rey stood in the garden with his head down.

Monica changed the conversation to their upcoming departure for Mexico and reminded me to bring her some of the photos from previous outings “to show to my
family there.” When I saw that she had calmed down, I asked her permission to take Rey with me and talk to him for a little. Then Alonso approached me with a small potted Mexican spice plant and gave it to me. I had admired it in his garden before. I thanked him and put it in the car.

Passing Joe at the window, I asked how he was doing. He apologized for not having come to our outing the other day. Rey got in my car quickly. He let out an audible sigh. After driving for some time, I asked Rey what had happened at the IEP. First he was reluctant to talk about it, “I am cool, whatever, I am over it!” He breathed very fast. I stated that I believed that he could do well in school when he felt respected. He replied, “I even apologized, you know? In Spanish, ‘Perdoneme . . . and shit,’ when they were both crying!” I gave him lots of positive feedback for his effort to right the chaotic situation and listened to his perspective. I also ensured him that we, as the team, would look into what had happened there because it did not sound like what an IEP meeting was supposed to be like. I asked what had happened with the issue around girls that his mother had mentioned to me. Rey made a smacking noise and explained, “Like kissing sound. My friend did it and I was just there . . . in school. I only did it once.” I commented that I would not like to be “smacked” at myself, and that girls usually respond better to being treated with respect.

We talked about what needed to happen next with school and agreed that he had done well with apologizing for his part. We planned that he would go back to school on Monday, while Marga and I would check in with the teacher, director, and Monica.
On the way back from a juice bar, Rey asked, “Can I ask you a question?” “Yes.” “What would you do if you saw your husband with another girl . . . and shit?” I looked at Rey raising my eyebrows and started jokingly, “I’d kick his . . . no. But I would talk to him, see if I know her, if she was just a friend. There would definitely be some trust issues. Is that what happened with your girlfriend?” “She saw me in the car with some girls . . . and my friends. After the first time I explained it to her and she was okay. Now she doesn’t reply when I text.” I asked how he felt and what his plan was. Rey replied, “I won’t chase after a girl. She’ll come around. Or I’ll get another one.” I said that sometimes there were misunderstandings, and it could be worth it to talk about things. Rey reconsidered, “If I run into her I’m just going to say ‘Whatsup’ and be cool and see what happens.” I agreed that that was a good plan.

*We passed the town plaza, and Rey pointed out to me where a row of people with lots of luggage stood. “That’s where the bus stops for Mexico!” He was excited. I asked if this is where he and his family would be leaving on the next Wednesday, and we engaged in a conversation about the trip. “There are friends from here coming over there, too,” he explained. “Lots of them with their families.” Looking at the long line of people and baggage, Rey brought up the people from Oaxaca again. “The Oaxeños are ugly and small. Some are okay. They are scared of me.” He mentioned the incident of finding a drunken man from Oaxaca a couple of months ago, who “was just handing out money. I guess he thought we would beat him up.”*
I remembered that this was the incident where he had lied to me about earning money by helping his father’s friend. I decided against addressing the issue at this point to not overwhelm him after the negative school experience. The fact that “lots of friends” were going to the same part of Mexico concerned me. Both of the brothers’ gang-related behavior could then continue across the border. I also felt critical of Leo for not engaging with the family more. Then there still was a need to continuously strengthen the boys’ respect for their mother. I believed that through her driving lessons I had seen her gain more confidence to play a more active parenting role. The awful situation in the school seemed counter-productive to me.

Marga called later and told me she had followed up with Rey’s teacher and all agreed to repeat the IEP with focus on support for Rey’s learning disabilities.

12.12.11

I tried to collect the photos that the team had taken during the past year in our work together, so that the mother could show them to family in Mexico. I found some in my camera, but all team members had taken pictures. Marga and Felix were unable to find any of their photos, and Leo complained that it was too much work to locate them. I explained how beneficial it would be for Rey and his family to have images of positive experiences and memories to talk about in Mexico. My own photographic efforts had been limited, and I noticed how hard it was to keep track of the images from the excursions we had undertaken together.
12.13.11

Leo came through and brought me pictures of many events, and I put together an album. When I arrived at the family home, Monica greeted me with a smile and thanked me for the pictures. Someone from Rey’s school had called and apologized to her. She stated she would advocate for better services for Rey on their return, that he should be permitted the use of a calculator in math, and that he needed speech therapy. Monica told me that she had heard good things about me from the mom of another client of mine who came from the same village in Mexico. We chatted for a while, and I asked her about her strategies to control the boys’ behavior during the vacation. Monica mentioned that she could rely on the support of her community in Mexico, that there were no opportunities for them to get in trouble in her “ranchito,” and that there was a facility there for addicts and other problem youths. “If they don’t behave I will just leave them there,” she said.

12.14.11

On the day of Rey’s family’s departure I met Leo at the office briefly. He mentioned that he planned to buy Rey’s brother some pants for the Christmas vacation as a way of re-connecting with him. Marga and I had decided and shared with the family that they would not get Christmas presents this year because they were celebrating in Mexico, and funds were limited.

The previous year Marga had arranged new bicycles for all children and some clothing for the adults through a Christmas wish program. Because the boys’ bikes were blue, the color of the opposing gang, Rey was shot at while riding his new bike for the first time near his home. When
Marga re-collected the bikes to have them repainted, the process took a long time. Rey became frustrated and had a friend leave a message on Marga’s phone, “Bitch, bring my homie’s bike back!” He later apologized, and eventually the bicycles came back in green, a neutral color.

To ensure that Rey and the other siblings would receive some clothing items for the Christmas vacation as well—and to model a fair approach—I got permission from the supervisor to spend some funds on the rest of the family. Leo and I went to the family home in separate cars. Joe and Rey were meeting with their uncles and cousins in the yard, already packed and waiting for the parents, who were picking up the sisters from school. The bus for Mexico was leaving in 3 hours. Leo took Rey shopping, and I kept talking to Rey and the family members, waiting for the sisters to arrive. Rey told me that the best present for his relatives in Mexico was “money,” and that his family owned “a little house, smaller than this one, but on a big piece of land.” He was not looking forward to the 3-day and 4-night bus ride “without showers!”

While we waited for his sisters, I offered to engage with Rey in the HeartMath computer game on my laptop. He liked the idea and pulled out a new slim Dell laptop on the garden table. The uncles and aunts were watching us with interest. “I lost the charger” he said, indicating that he wanted to try if mine fit. It did not, and it dawned on me that the laptop was most likely stolen. I did not comment, but later questioned that choice.

Rey engaged with interest and motivation in the HeartMath Dual Drive game, showing his ability to regulate his emotions toward coherence to his uncles. He explained to them, “The more you relax, the more you can drive!” He also modeled to them the deep breathing technique that he used to focus and calm himself down. I was happy and
excited about his understanding of the HeartMath tool and that he remembered what I had taught him earlier this year. One of the uncles wanted to try it as well. Rey smiled when the uncle could not get his car moving on the display. When the parents arrived with the girls, I asked them if there was still enough time to take the girls and Rey out shopping for some clothes. The mother agreed with a smile. We still had 2 hours until departure.

Rey helped his sisters find their sections in K-Mart and patiently waited for them to pick out some T-shirts and pants. He found his own and showed it to me. He had taken down his mother’s shoe size on my request, and together, the siblings picked out some pink running shoes for her.

While the girls tried on their pants, Rey and I talked about the recent gang shooting of a 14-year old boy from the community. Rey commented with a calm and composed facial expression, “It is sad, he was so young.” I told him I was glad they were leaving the country for Christmas because the violence in the community was picking up. When we reached the cash register and were over the allowed limit for our purchases, Rey volunteered to give up one pair of pants. All chatted happily and excitedly about the trip now and thanked me for the clothing. Back at the house I said my good-byes, wished all a Merry Christmas and a good time in Mexico. The father stated he would miss them all because he was staying home this year. He had travelled the previous Christmas to Mexico by himself. The family always took turns, one year the father left by himself, the other Monica went with the children. Someone always took care of business at home.

*I felt touched, happy, sad, as if my own family members were leaving. The family had become really close to me, but I was glad that they were going away.*
for a while. I wrote that I wished that the mother’s high expectation in connecting with the Mexican cultural values and traditions would come to fruit. The Christmas break seemed to me important as well for the team to de-stress and re-focus.

01.11.12

In the new year, I made contact with Alonso to hear about the return of the family and what kind of involvement on our part he thought would be needed on the boys’ return. He told me the family had returned from Mexico for some days already. When I met Leo, we decided to visit and welcome them back. We also wanted to schedule a meeting with the probation officer.

When we came to the house, everyone except Joe was in the garden, Rey handling a bicycle. We asked about the trip, and gently pointed out that Rey was wearing a hat with gang coloring and a belt with a gang initial. Rey made excuses for both. The hat showed his support for a sports team, and about the belt he stated, “I got that from my girlfriend, it’s her name!” I asked him, “What is your new girlfriend’s name?” and he mumbled something. We reminded him about his probation terms not to own gang items, and asked more about the trip. The highlight for Rey was “hanging out with my friends” and that “there were girls there.” I prompted the parents and Rey that his school had started 2 days ago. Both parents stated that they did not know this.

Monica said she had shown the pictures to her family and that the brothers had met some girls from a neighboring town in the U.S. with whom they wanted to stay in
touch now. When he heard his mother talking about the girls, Rey smiled. He asked if he still had access to the computer lab that I signed the brothers up for last year, planning to email the girls. I confirmed that he could use the community facility. Rey’s bag had been exchanged on the long way back in the bus, and all family members laughed when Rey told us that the one that he took home “was full of some lady’s stuff.” He pronounced “lady’s stuff” in a tone that let us know his shock when he opened the bag. Rey later added that in his own bag was “a necklace I got from my friend. It was very fucking nice with gold and shit!” I noticed that his verbalization skills had worsened a bit from before the trip. Because the family spent many days on the bus together, they knew the lady and planned to drive to the town to exchange the bags the next day.

Alonso was glad they were home and said he was driving the family to the town where the bag exchange should take place. He remained without driver’s license. I asked Monica if she had kept up her driving in Mexico, but she had not been able to continue her driving practice. She mentioned that on her return she found out that the car insurance did not pay for the accident and that they had sent her a bill of $4,000. She blamed her husband for not putting her on the insurance plan and intended to not pay that bill. Before leaving, I encouraged Rey to get back to school as soon as possible, and scheduled the next meeting.

I was shocked and did not quite understand why the insurance would not cover the car. I thought that the team needed to look into this further. In my efforts to empower the mother with the driving I had become very invested in her attempt to get the driver’s license. I wrote that it had already shifted the family
dynamic some and that Monica had modeled a lot of persistence to her family. The accident felt to me like a severe setback.

01.12.12

The next morning, when I called to check in with Monica about taking the last driving classes and scheduling an exam, Rey answered the home phone, not yet back in school.

01.18.12

For our scheduled meeting with Felix and the whole team, only Monica, Alonso, Eva, Lila, Leo, and I were present. We asked why the brothers were not there. The parents stated they had left the house because Rey and Joe were not back in time. So they took the girls and came.

We addressed the highlights of the trip for the girls, such as the dogs at the ranch and the de-horning of a calf that they witnessed. The mother said that she enjoyed most the Christmas festivities in the Mexican community and that the visit to her village was overall very enjoyable. The father had called the family every night and asked them to come home to him fast. We explored the issues around the accident more, when Marga came in late. She stated she had lots of experiences with accidents and insurance and volunteered to look into the policy with Monica.

Felix had visited Rey’s school and had received more complaints. The teacher told him the whole atmosphere in the classroom changed when Rey came back. He had
continued his habit to always arrive one hour late, disrupting the flow. I repeated to the parents that Rey had to go to his school on time to be able to stay enrolled there. We decided to visit the brothers at the house in the coming days and scheduled another meeting for the following week. Together with Felix, I tried to convince the parents to take a more active role in setting limits. Taking away the phone, not giving them money unless they earned it were some of the examples we listed. Maria commented she was angry that now that Rey had taken hers, she had no more cell phone. We encouraged her to stop paying for the boys’ phones. She agreed.

Alonso and Monica asked me to schedule the next set of driving lessons for Monica, so that they could get a better insurance policy and drive legally. Alonso revealed that he paid a high amount ($500 per month) to the insurance company because he did not have a driver’s license. However, he needed the insurance to register the car.

I was frustrated after this meeting. Marga’s way of being late and then taking over the meeting with her ideas felt intrusive. I wondered why both brothers were not participating. At the same time I acknowledged that due to the journey into such a completely different world, some disconnect could be expected.

01.20.12

When I came to the family home to pick up Monica for her driving lesson, Rey was not in school. When I asked why, he responded with lies and excuses, “I am waiting for a friend to drop me off.” I offered to take him to school on the way to the driving
class, but he declared, “I don’t want to waste his gas.” I reminded him that the school might not let him continue if he did not go. “Well, they can put me into another one, what the fuck.” After thinking for a moment he added, “No, I want to be at this school. That’s my school, you know.”

When Rey’s mother was ready to leave, he looked at her and snickered, “She is wearing those gay shoes. It’s the cheap Uggs, not the real ones.” I defended Monica, commenting on his lack of respect and stated, “I know you can do better than that. Are you going to try?” “Yeah.”

While driving Monica, I had a chance to talk to her more about the family’s time in Mexico. She told me about the following incident with the boys: The mayor of the little township had approached her, accusing Rey and Joe of having defaced the school wall with gang related graffiti. The opposing gang had written all over it, and the whole school wall was a mess. The mayor reportedly knew Monica and Alonso well and told her he would normally call the police in cases like this; however, the police were involved with a large drug cartel. If he went that route, something bad would happen to the brothers. They might just disappear. Instead he suggested that they paint the school wall and clean it up themselves. When Monica approached Rey and Joe, they denied their part in the graffiti. They insisted it was not their ‘handwriting’ and refused to paint the wall. In the end, Monica stood there for a whole day, hiring someone to help her because she was too small to reach the higher parts of the wall, and painted over the graffiti.

I looked at her in shock and disbelief and asked her if she could not have found a way to enlist the boys’ help. I also suggested consequence like taking away spending
money, or grounding them to stay in the house. She replied that she tried, but they refused.

I became painfully aware about the continuous parental disempowerment.

Later Monica remembered how hard things were when she was still travelling illegally between Mexico and the U.S. Even though she could travel easier now, she wished she was not separated from her mother. She liked life in Mexico better. Her husband, however, was very happy about her return to the U.S., she said. He had told her to come home during every one of their nightly phone calls and had missed her.

01.21.12

I followed up with a visit at school, where the director let me know that Rey had been disrespectful to girls and the teacher. He had also continued to arrive late, and the director wanted to put him on a contract. She recommended that I see him that day.

I arranged an office and Rey came out of class, greeting me politely. He sat down on the office chair behind the desk and noticed a USB stick on the computer, “You can get Internet with these” he stated wistfully.

I explained that with a laptop computer he could just go to the library or a café and get online. “I don’t want to walk around with a computer and sit down in a café and shit. That’s not cool!” “Just a way to have access until you can buy a modem.”

I told him that his behavior had come to the director’s attention. “I am always in school and shit,” was his reply. “When did you get here?” “Around 10.” “When does school start?” “9:15.” I gave him an example of how I structured my morning to make it
to work on time. We figured out that he would have to leave the house at nine at the latest. Rey started listing the things he had to do first, “I have to iron my clothes and shit. And eat something. And clean my shoes.” I addressed the upcoming behavior contract and asked if he would try to stay in this school. “Yes, this is my school. I want to finish it and graduate and shit and maybe go to college.” After a while, I asked him what had happened at our last meeting when the parents came in by themselves. “I thought we meet only every other week and shit.”

I asked Rey more about the family trip to Mexico as well. “What was different in Mexico?” “You can just go to the store and buy beer, even a little baby can go. But you have to watch out with drugs. They make you eat them. The soldiers do.” He had seen someone “get fucked up by the drug cartel” and knew someone else who “has not been seen after being deported to Mexico. There were shootings every day.” I asked why he didn’t help his mother to paint the school wall. He replied, “I didn’t do it. I didn’t even have a spray can and shit.” “Well your mom didn’t do it either.” “Oh, she is just all scared about the drug cartel.”

Later, we talked about his relationships. His former girlfriend had stayed away and he had not made any more contact, “I don’t chase them—I replace them” was his smug reply with a grin. Then he added, “But she was a good girl. She even cooked for me! And she stood on my toes when I was all fucked up, so I could stop drinking. Her dad knew me and let me come to her house.” “So you lost a good girl?” He thought for a while and then told me about his new female friends in a neighboring town, “They have wheels and shit.” While we were talking, Rey became animated and made more eye
contact. When I left, he shook my hand and said, “I will try to be in school at 9:15 on Monday.”

01.23.12

Rey was placed on a behavior contract with the school and met with Leo. He was told that he could not break any more school rules, or he would face being expelled and having to go back to the office of education to find a new school placement. Leo talked with Rey about how to stay in school by showing up on time and being respectful to teachers and peers. He also mentioned better attendance at the bike co-op.

Later that day Monica and I met with a community volunteer to practice driving. At the driving school they had instructed Monica to increase her confidence by practicing between the driving lessons until the exam. Alonso appeared. He sat in his car and observed how Monica parked, reversed, and drove rounds in a church parking lot. On the way back, after an hour, we saw Rey walking towards the home a little too early for school to be out. Half an hour after I left Monica at her home, she called me with the news that Rey had been expelled from school.

I encouraged her to go to the school with Marga, the family partner, and find out what had happened. I also called the office of education and scheduled an appointment for both Rey and his brother, who also needed reassignment for an alternative school. I received an appointment for the following week for both brothers, when mentioning the name of Felix. Later Marga asked me how I managed that. She had gotten nowhere trying to schedule a meeting for Joe.
01.24.12

Monica was not at home at the scheduled time to meet the volunteer. After I waited for a while, she arrived in the car with her two sons, Joe driving. I greeted all, and then took Joe and Rey for a snack while the mother and the volunteer practiced driving. The boys had planned to drop off the mother and go on a drive themselves, but came with me instead.

I warned Joe against driving without a license. Joe agreed and stated he would wait for his permit later this year. Then I asked Rey about what had caused his expulsion from school. “Nothing. There were girls next to the gym door that wanted to chat. And then that teacher came out and yelled at me not to hang out in front of her door. I said, ‘I don’t see your fucking name on the door’—no I didn’t say the f-word. . .” “But you usually say the f-word.” “But her name was not on the door and that was it. I’m not going to another school.” Rey was quiet.

At a stop for a quick meal, Rey talked with Joe about the worst experiences they ever had. While Joe recalled being chased by a mean big dog as a little kid in Mexico, Rey stated, “When I was smaller, in Mexico, I stood next to a guy who got shot. It was strange, I saw the other guy run away. The one shot just grabbed his side and kept walking. But I was right next to him.”

We also talked about good experiences, and I asked about anything they recalled with the WRAP program. Rey remembered our trip to Alcatraz, and “working at the bike co-op. I am going today,” he reminded himself.
On the way back, both brothers discussed an incident that happened in their town in Mexico the day they arrived. The local TV station announced that a drunken husband had chopped his pregnant wife to pieces with a machete because a friend had told him that the baby was not the husband’s, but his. Rey’s brother explained to me that “in Mexico they show you all the pictures on TV, not like here where they worry if it’s too violent.” Rey chimed in with an excited voice, “I told you about this, remember?” I did not and asked them what they thought would be better. Both agreed that it would be better not to show such scenes so “that little children would not get scared.”

01.25.12

During the next family meeting with the parents, Rey, Joe, Leo, Marga, and myself, the probation supervisor was present, to fill in for Felix. The latter could not attend. The supervisor had been the boys’ previous probation officer, and we talked about each brother’s next steps and goals. Rey wanted to check back in with a job training program that could take him back in now that he was 16, focus on learning how to work “like in a hotel,” and keep showing up at the bicycle co-op.

When the probation officer asked him about school, he slumped down, looked to the floor and said, “It was stupid. I got kicked out for stupid shit. I don’t want to say.” I reminded all of the upcoming appointment at the office of education. On the agenda, I included the mother with her goal to get the driver’s license. The probation supervisor complimented her on her efforts, and the mental health supervisor joined for a moment to
also meet and greet the family. All expressed their support for Monica’s attempt to get her driver’s license.

01.31.12

I accompanied both brothers and the mother to the office of education. The family partner was present as well. The official spoke only English and did not address the mother. He talked to Rey about respect in school and being on time. When I brought up Rey’s learning disabilities, he countered that to receive services Rey would have to attend a regular high school, not an alternative one. Marga and I mentioned the mismanaged IEP meeting and the official stated that he could not help with that; he needed to focus on Rey’s school placement. He acknowledged that Rey had been attending school regularly since October 2011, which was a large improvement in attendance compared to the year before. The official left it up to us to translate for the mother. I had to interrupt him to do so.

Rey sat there with his head down and insisted he would not go to a special education class in a regular high school. He had been teased by the students there. In the end, Rey agreed to go to the school inside the probation building, which had a small student teacher ratio and later starting hours. On the way home he commented, “Man—with all the probation officers there. They can pull you out any time!”

I thought this school was actually a good fit but regretted the official’s cultural incompetency. I wondered if the failed IEP meeting with the family partner’s following complaints did not have something to do with Rey’s forced...
school change. Rey had become very inarticulate and could not speak up for his needs and wants in the context of this school meeting. His body posture changed back to the hunched head down position and his verbal skills became minimal. He nodded his head and gave brief answers when addressed. In the end he had agreed to everything the official said.

02.02.12

Rey called Leo about compensation for hours he had earned at the bike co-op, and Leo demanded that Rey fill out a time sheet in the future, instead of relying on Rey’s and the staff’s accounts. Leo also asked about Rey’s follow up on the work program, where Rey had to bring a work permit from school and other paperwork to get started. Leo had wanted him to do this by himself, but Rey did not do it. Leo expected him to show more motivation and reported that Rey hung up the phone on him for the first time ever.

Leo was getting too frustrated and did not see the whole stressful situation: Rey had to change school after being quite attached to the previous teacher and peers, and needed more support to process the change, rather than pressure to perform in yet another area.

02.03.12

I called Rey’s house in the morning to ensure he had gone to his new school. He was still home, and while talking to Monica, I could hear him protesting in the background, and stating that he was “vomiting and had diarrhea.” I encouraged the
mother to get him to school. She put him on the phone with me. I told him he needed to go because the probation officer would check if he was there. On a later call, Monica told me that both parents had driven Rey to school to make it easier on him. *I felt touched and hopeful when I heard about the parents working together to support Rey.*

**02.04.12**

When I called the next morning, Monica told me that today he really did not want to go to school. I told her that I would take him shopping after school, if he would make it today. The mother yelled this to Rey, who was whining in the background. The whining stopped, and the mother told me that he had agreed. I picked Rey up from school and he was smiling. He told me, “This school is okay. If you are cool, they are cool, not picking at you like that teacher at the other school. I could use a nice shirt for school.”

*I was very happy about his statements. I had not been sure if my strategy of rewarding his attendance was not undermining Leo’s tough stance on incentives at the moment. To me it seemed crucial to send Rey off on a stable path with the first few days in the new school.* We went to a local clothing store, where the owner already knew Rey from his reward program with Leo. Rey moved through the store with ease, asking sales people questions when he needed to and displaying relaxed and appropriate mannerisms. He even asked for recommendations. After a while, he followed the idea of the shopkeeper for a hat that would “keep him out of trouble.”
The next family meeting with the probation officer Felix, Leo, and me, both parents as well as the brothers attended. Rey had gone to school regularly with the exception of the first day when I did not call to remind him. When we addressed this, he stated that he had had a headache. The following 2 days the parents brought him, and he had attended without difficulties.

The teacher had given probation positive feedback about Rey, and Felix encouraged Rey to share it in the meeting. The class had practiced a high school exit exam. “I’ve taken my time with the test. Others just checked it off!” Rey received lots of praise when sharing this.

When we set the goals for the coming week, Rey stated that he wanted to go to school every day. His brother, who had started a different school, was focusing on finding a job. The father’s goal was to keep the boys in school and to go to work. Monica addressed that she was facing her driving exam the following day and that she was very anxious. When I asked her what would help her to relax, her immediate half-joking response was “a cerveza [beer].”

We then talked about other ways to handle anxiety and practiced deep breathing. I handed out the handheld emWave devices to all team members. When Monica had difficulties, I asked Rey to coach his mother until the green light indicated coherence and focus. Afterwards we engaged in a round of affirmations for Monica. She smiled when we all told her, “Sí, puedes [Yes, you can].”
I brought Monica back from her failed driving test. She said she was very disappointed. On our way back she was teary and quiet. Later, I took Rey out for our last session of the data collection period. He said he was sad about his mother failing the test and that “My mom was going to give me $40 if she made it! That would have been cool. Too bad.”

I had to smile at how the mother cleverly ensured the alignment of family support with such a reward because verbalizing concrete compliments or support was not a family tradition. “My dad gave her the car keys yesterday and told her to practice, but she did not take it.” I felt my own disappointment about the mother’s defeat, and made some comments about in life sometimes it takes more than one attempt to reach our goals.

We went to a special burger place in a different part of the county and drove through some White middle-class neighborhoods. “It is calm here,” Rey remarked. We drove by a parked police car. “Cops are good,” said Rey. “They keep the neighborhood calm. There are good cops. They do nothing if you respect them. About 9 months ago one stopped me—a White guy—and I said, ‘Yes, officer,’ and put my hands up. He found my butterfly knife, a switch blade, you know—and asked me, ‘What are you carrying that for?’ I said, ‘Protection’ and he took it but let me go. I would have gone to placement if he had made a big deal out of it.” After eating, I set Rey up with the HeartMath Dual Drive game on the laptop. He said he enjoyed the game and easily restarted his car by breathing and focusing on a positive emotion. We later discussed some recent
observations Rey had about girls. He had found a way of getting their attention, “I tell girls, ‘You look nice tonight.’ And, ‘You caught my eye, you know’.” I was surprised. He smiled when I told him this would work well and sounded very mature. “My friends just laugh weird at them, but that creeps out the girls,” he continued.“I just hate ‘stuck ups.’ They don’t say anything.”

Reflections on WRAP

Towards the end of the data collection period, and after I gave the fidelity questionnaire (Appendix G) to Monica, I talked with Rey and the other team members individually about the impact they thought the WRAP process had on Rey, using the WRAP questionnaire (Appendix H) as a guideline:

Alonso

Alonso stated that Rey was still angry in the family home very often and that the connection between Rey and other family members was still not always good. Alonso believed that the legal system had been offering the most effective interventions for Rey. Rey’s legal problems had become lesser since his involvement in WRAP. According to Alonso, Rey was not appreciative of the Mexican culture. Rey detested the poverty he associated with it. Alonso had heard Rey say, “Mexicans are good for nothing.” The dominant Anglo culture did not appeal to Rey either, and he only liked to be with his gang friends. Alonso thought that Rey was thinking a lot about money and mentioned that Rey’s passions and favorite activities included travelling, running, exercising, and
hanging out with his brother and their friends. The WRAP excursions seemed to Alonso to have had a positive impact on Rey. Alonso mentioned Rey was doing a little better than before WRAP. “He listens sometimes now.” The father observed that Rey did better while Joe was in placement and added that he and the mother preferred Joe to Rey. In regard to Rey’s future, Alonso imagined him working in the field like himself or in the street if Rey’s behavior would not improve more. Alonso’s wish was that in the future Rey would have three children and possibly study to find a good job where he could earn more money than working in the field.

**Monica**

Monica, Rey’s mother, made it clear that Rey was less impulsive than when he started WRAP. She stated that when Rey got angry, he either locked himself into the room or left for the street. Now he more often called her and talked to her more. He seemed happier to her. Monica found that his social life had improved by attending school more regularly. She believed that he had fewer problems with the dominant Anglo culture now and “arranged himself” more with the rules of the community. Before WRAP was involved, he was arrested a lot more often. His main social connections, however, were still his gang-related friends. She thought that he liked the traditional Mexican culture and that he had a good relationship to all family members. She found that Rey was now a lot more caring, that he had the motivation to get off probation, and that he showed more respect in general. Money and travels, especially by airplane, interested Rey. She found that he communicated more now, but she was aware that he
drank a lot with his friends. Monica thought that he enjoyed the outings with WRAP a lot. Laughingly, she remembered that in the zoo, Rey had told her that a large chimpanzee reminded him of his dad. She knew that Rey thought the members of the WRAP team liked him and that he noticed when people were mad at him for not following through. She reported that Rey was angry at times when he could not reach Leo. Rey was not leaving out into the street as often as before receiving WRAP services. As an adult, the mother wanted Rey to find a good job in an office, marry a teacher or doctor, and have two children.

Joe

Rey’s brother Joe said that Rey had impulse control when he was calm, but when angry, he “doesn’t think.” Joe thought that growing up was helping Rey to make better choices. According to Joe, Rey acted a little bit different now and was getting more experience on how to act in the community. Culturally, Joe saw his brother creating his own way of being: He got money and respect from his “homies,” spoke Spanish to connect to the Mexican culture, and had to deal with stereotypes being from an immigrant culture in this community. That meant that “the cops pick him out.” Joe found that Rey was connected to his family and grandparents. Through WRAP he had learned to be more respectful, to avoid arrests, to get some life skills, and to save some money. According to Joe, money and family were Rey’s priorities, and currently Rey was getting on better with authority figures. Rey liked to “do some sports, watch football, smoke weed, drink, hang out with girls and friends, and get money.” Joe remembered that Rey
used to like socializing at the weekly BBQs at his previous school. Joe listed the most effective WRAP interventions for Rey: the connection to the bike co-op, the counseling, learning how to work, and understanding how to take care of his money. Joe thought Rey felt well-liked by the WRAP team, and had made some different choices since being involved. Joe believed his brother thought more about the consequences of his behavior now. He saw his brother in the future working at a hands-on job, such as becoming a plumber, being married, and having two kids.

Felix

Felix, the probation officer, classified Rey as a chronic drug user who would definitely fail the court’s requirement to test drug-free for one month. He mentioned Rey’s history with the lack of parental supervision, his intellectual delay, his speech impairment, and his early record of stealing in local department stores, throwing lemons, and other low level delinquencies. Most of Rey’s recent charges centered on gang paraphernalia, not going to school, some violations of the electronic monitoring device, problems at school, and frequently verbally abusing his mother. Felix thought that the most effective WRAP interventions were engaging Rey in rock climbing so that he could feel more confident and talk about his achievements. He remembered joining the team to the climbing gym. Rey had been very engaged and pointed at a hard climbing course, “You should try that wall!” According to Felix, the bike co-op also had a positive influence on Rey. Felix pointed out that what definitely did not work was trying to teach the parents about behavior plans with incentives for positive behaviors as well as
consequences for negative behaviors. Felix saw Rey more as a follower in the gang. He believed that Monica had good intentions but difficulties accessing resources in the dominant Anglo culture. The father’s substance abuse also had a negative influence on Rey. Changes Felix observed included that Rey was not as careless in regard to his delinquency anymore and was more apprehensive. His relationship to his parents had improved, and the parents praised more and judged less. Though Felix felt that his communication with Rey had gotten better, he saw room for improvement. Felix felt warmth for Rey, but not a vibrant family-like connection.

Marga

The family partner, Marga, said that in comparison to when WRAP started, Rey was now taking more time before acting and that he was more conscious about the consequences of his behavior. She noticed that he liked to be acknowledged, that he could display more proper behavior, and was not shutting down when in the community. According to Marga, Rey worried about being seen as “dumb” and had a strong bond to his family. Marga believed that the recent school change was a good “reality check” for Rey. She thought that culturally Rey felt inferior to the dominant White culture, and that he identified with his “homies,” who were all second generation immigrants and claiming a certain gang. She stated Rey liked to tag, and even tagged the front of the family home one time. Some of his friends were older men claiming the same gang, and Marga did not understand that the parents allowed those contacts. She was sure that he did not want to be considered part of the paisas or first generation immigrants like his parents. In her
opinion, it mattered to Rey to be successful, to listen to oldies, do drawings, ride his bike, and date girls. She thought that he enjoyed the WRAP outings that exposed him to a different culture and opened his horizon. Marga pointed out that the family picture taken on Alcatraz was the very first the family ever owned. The least impact on Rey had been our attempts at behavior plans made in the meetings, such as trying to instate a reward system or consequences for negative behaviors.

Marga noticed that Rey was sharing more affection since starting WRAP. He had changed his behavior toward Marga. Whereas a year ago he and a friend had left her a disrespectful message on her phone (“Bitch, bring my homie’s bike back”), she stated on her last meeting with the family, Rey had opened the door in a public place for her. She found that Rey was close to the team and liked to joke and talk about Leo a lot. She observed that he commented on Leo’s German accent as well as how Leo dressed and acted. She believed that Rey respected the team and felt well-liked by us. Overall, Rey could express himself better verbally, held himself more upright physically, and was capable of better relationships. In the future, Marga hoped he would not be in prison but would find the right girl and settle down, working outdoors, possibly in the fields like his parents.

Leo

According to Leo, Rey was now very engaged in the WRAP team meetings. In the beginning he had observed more. Though Rey was still going to the bike co-op, his participation there had declined. Leo believed Rey had a hard time working for his goals,
such as money, and was craving immediate gratification. Through WRAP he had learned how to accept compliments, laugh more, and express joy more freely. Rey still showed some disrespect for his mother, but had at times helped his father around the house. Leo found that Joe’s return from placement took away Rey’s place in the family as the “good” brother and moved him back into a “bad” brother position. Sharing a room with Joe again was very hard for Rey. According to Leo, Rey was now more active in the community, and had not been “in trouble” with the law for 9 months. Before WRAP he had been “in trouble” with probation constantly. Leo thought of Rey as a “wannabe gangster” who wanted to be “cool” and fit into the youth culture, admiring its status symbols and showing off. He despised his parents’ immigrant culture and poverty, but did want any part of the Anglo culture except the materialistic orientation. Leo felt that Rey had no safe connection to his family members, who all preferred Joe to him. Rey had become more pleasant and lovable during the time with WRAP, however.

According to Leo, Rey’s main preoccupations were his material status, his looks, being “cool,” and fitting in. It mattered to Rey to not get into trouble with the law, to fit in, to connect with girls, to try out more independence, and to earn his own phone. Rey had learned to be reliable and show up for appointments at the job training program, and that when he was more outgoing, people treated him better in the community. In the beginning of the WRAP intervention Rey focused a lot on criminal activities in his free time, but he was currently engaging more on age-appropriate activities such as dating and hanging out. At first, Rey spent a lot of time away from home in the streets; now he spent more time in the family home. WRAP helped him refine his social skills, to communicate
better, to make small talk, and to become easier to understand instead of swallowing his words. Leo emphasized how important it had been for Rey to feel respected and accepted for who he was. His image changed from that of “a gangster” to someone trying to be “a nice guy.” Rey now tried longer and harder to achieve his goals, gave up less easy, and was able to admit some mistakes—though without taking responsibility for them. In the future, Leo saw Rey possibly stocking goods in a store instead of doing immediate customer service, having a girlfriend, and growing more mature and independent.

Rey

Rey himself started our conversation by stating that when he got upset he could always calm down by “smoking a blunt.” He felt safe “everywhere” and knew “how to take care of myself.” Rey said that he identified mostly with the gang culture, but second closest to him was the Mexican culture. While he was aware that he had “all the right papers and shit” to be an American citizen, his parents were from Mexico. “What can I do—I’m not going to be a gabacho [White guy].” When I asked Rey about whom he loved, and who he felt loved him, he listed the following: “family, people who support me, you guys.” After a small pause he added, “Girls can say ‘I love you.’ You can’t trust those girls. I rather trust my family than girls!” He continued that his mother, his cousin, and his older “homies” taught him “to go to school and not to fuck up.” He currently thought most often of “girls,” adding “and sex” with a snicker. Rey said that what he really wanted in life was to “graduate, get my diploma, and find a good job.” He described his current life as “pretty chill and going to school.”
Rey liked riding his bike, hanging out with friends, cruising in low-rider cars, such as a Chevy Impala, and going to car shows. His friends were “gangsters, but going to school, cool,” and “covering his back.” He would enjoy smoking an occasional “sparko blank” or joint with them. In his family, he felt closest to his mom, and he thought that before WRAP, he hung out with friends in the street more. Before WRAP he thought he also was a lot “younger,” and that since then he had matured. He enjoyed all the excursions a lot. On the different team members, he commented the following way, “Leo could be talking smack about me, Marga thinks I am a troublemaker who got kicked out of school, my probation officer does not like me, but he is cool.” I asked him about me and he replied, “You don’t talk smack about me, you’re pretty good.” He remembered Leo accompanying him to court as a turning point for him, “The judge didn’t give a fuck, but I really appreciated that Leo came with me.” As a result of WRAP, Rey felt he had made different choices: He wanted to “do good, don’t get caught doing something stupid with a weapon. Keep alert, not necessarily getting rid of the weapon.” In the future, Rey saw himself with “a good job, like a mechanic, they do get paid well.” He did not see himself with a family of his own, “too much drama.” But he wanted to own “a sick-ass car” and stay in this town. Figure 8 depicts examples of the above mentioned events, interventions, and WRAP’s impact on Rey.

Analysis of Themes

The following themes emerged during the review of the data and illustrate the manner in which WRAP impacted Rey, as they emerged during an impact-focused
Figure 8. Holistic concept with examples of events, WRAP interventions, and impact.
review of the data. WRAP affected Rey’s ways of defense, accepting support, connecting with others, participating in relationships and activities, of exploring ways of being within different contexts, and of regulating his emotions. The themes show similarities with Ogden et al.’s (2006) eight action systems mentioned above, which cover hard-wired responses to experiences based firmly on perceived safety. Figure 9 illustrates how indicators of the themes will be addressed in each of the spheres of the holistic model. “Defense” is colored differently to indicate its dual function as protection, and as inhibiting factor that prevents activation of the other themes if safety is lacking.

Theme 1: Defense

To explore the impact of WRAP on Rey’s experiences, and follow his responses, it is important to recognize complex trauma as a forming aspect in his life. Rey’s trauma and distressing history was understood in part through review of his case file, which contained the initial assessment as well as reports from other agencies such as CPS, probation, and school. However, new information emerged continuously in small increments up to the time of the conversations at the end of data collection. When, during the summer, I asked Rey directly about traumatic events in his life, he was not able to recall most of the events mentioned here. However, by checking with him and all team members on different occasions, I was able to compile a more complete list of events.

Traumatic and distressing events in Rey’s life turned out to encompass nearly all categories of Briere and Lanktree’s (2008) adolescent trauma questionnaire with the exception of partner abuse and torture:
Figure 9. Areas of WRAP impact.
- Unavailable and nonresponsive parental care
- Abandonment by parents to grandparent at age 4
- Parental preference of the first-born son
- Beatings by the father and older brother
- Witnessing domestic violence
- Setting fire to a straw storage and barely escaping the flames as young child
- In a motor accident as young child without subsequent medical after care
- Childhood sexual exploitation
- Racism
- Poverty
- Being bullied for attending resource classes
- Witnessing and experiencing violence by gang-related peers
- Witnessing sexual violence by gang-related peers
- Passenger in two high-speed car chases
- Target of shooting when in his house and when riding his bike
- Forced armed take-down by the police

Taking Rey’s extensive history of traumatic events into consideration, his activated defense strategies became an important theme when looking at his response to experiences in the context of the spheres of the holistic model. Defense was triggered by a sense of threat, and according to Ogden et al. (2006), was frequently overused by traumatized individuals. Defense reactions are hard-wired first responses to ensure survival and therefore override other responses when a lack of safety is perceived. I
observed verbal deflecting, mobilization responses that led to activity, and responses characterized by immobilization, as they occurred over time. The following episodes exemplified his activation of defense action systems in response to stressful situations. I also recorded the emergence of changes and alternative behaviors in the course of WRAP. First come episodes related to defenses in the sphere of family and assertions related to assertions on WRAP’s impact of defenses in the sphere of family.

**Episodes related to defenses in the sphere of family.**

- Family pattern: Alonso blaming CPS for not being able to discipline the boys
- Rey bullying sisters after losing fights with Joe
- Taking Monica’s phone after Joe took his
- Leaving the room or home after disputes
- Rey using denial: “I didn’t do it,” “I didn’t use the f . . . word”
- Family pattern: Monica blaming Alonso for mismanaged check
- Family pattern: Monica blaming me jokingly for accident
- Family pattern: Monica complaining about Rey telling her not to cry (when he did not say anything)
- Family pattern: Lila complaining Rey would have stolen a bag with passports instead of returning it (but he had not)
- Family pattern: Alonso and Monica complaining about Rey’s and Joe’s behavior in WRAP meetings
- Both parents reporting Rey is listening more at home when reflecting on WRAP
- Accepting support getting to school
• Connecting with sisters and mother during excursions
• Engaging in games, laughter, with family during WRAP meetings
• Using HeartMath together in WRAP meetings
• Learning how to stay present when being the center of attention during WRAP meetings

WRAP created opportunities for the family to spend relaxed time together and provided a safe container to address the needs of Rey and his family. Rey began displaying responses different from defenses, which are addressed in the following themes: accepting support, connecting, participating, exploring, and regulating emotion. This would be consistent with Ogden et al.’s (2006) supposition that in a safe and supportive environment it is possible to “learn to evaluate whether . . . responses are appropriate to a current situation, . . . learn to inhibit or calm . . . arousal, . . . [and] respond effectively to action systems governing the nonthreatening aspects of daily life” (p. 112). However, Joe’s return from placement and the subsequent trip to Mexico coincided with increased defense activation by Rey.

**Episodes related to defenses in the sphere of culture.**
• Derogatory comments about his parents’ immigrant culture
• Derogatory comments about people from Oaxaca, Mexico
• Targeting immigrants for potential robbery (Oaxaca, Asia)
• Judging non-English speakers, such as his parents and teaching aide
• Justifying robbing a man from Oaxaca due to his lesser status
Increased curiosity about other cultures such as those of WRAP team members

- Noticing misconceptions in his stereotype about people from Oaxaca

**Assertions on WRAP’s impact on defense in the sphere of culture.** Rey first displayed a discriminatory attitude that increased when he was stressed. As discussed by Sue and Sue’s (2008) notion, in the initial stage of cultural identity formation, people “internalize the majority of White stereotypes about their group. . . . The person may believe that members of his or her group have high unemployment because ‘they are lazy, uneducated, and unintelligent’” (p. 245). Rey’s critical remarks about a man from Oaxaca demonstrated what Ronald Hall (2002) referred to as “pseudo racism,” the phenomenon of racial hatred and discrimination between—and even within so-called minority groups. Hall argued that “following years of Euro colonization and/or domination, Chicano(a), Asian and African Americans act out racist behaviors . . . whereby those lighter skinned assume the psychological demeanor of a dominant group” (p. 109). Thus this form of racism could be seen as a cultural mobilization response to the stress of discrimination and exclusion. In the course of WRAP, Rey increasingly encountered opportunities for intercultural dialogues and experiences within the team and the community. Though he did not express a different attitude about different cultures, he noticed inconsistencies between his held beliefs and what he saw.
Episodes related to defenses in the sphere of community.

- Leaving the office during WRAP meetings when addressed
- Hiding in the closet pretending to be sleeping during a probation home search
- Following brother into criminal behavior in the community (mobilization)
- Juvenile record of stealing, destroying property, and ignoring the rules (mobilization)
- Strong attachment to the gang culture where behavior code mandates mobilization and immobilization
- Lying about working to look good in front of WRAP after stealing money
- Continued attachment to the gang culture
- Defacing wall with graffiti while on vacation in Mexico
- Blank facial expression when passing a serious car accident
- Exploring reactions related to behaviors in school
- Stating he is feeling safe in his reflections on WRAP
- Mentioning his need to “cover his back”
- Wondering who talks “smack” (badly) about him
- Feeling that he needs to stay “alert”

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on defenses in the sphere of community

Over the time of his participation in WRAP, Rey’s activation of the defense action system remained frequent. Rey displayed strong immobilization and mobilization responses when his tolerance for stress was exhausted. This would agree with Greenwald’s (2002) supposition that it is important to consider the connection between
trauma and conduct disordered behavior. Ogden et al. (2006) maintained that a history involving extensive traumata can lead to “autoregulatory tendencies,” including “hostility, aggressiveness, and conduct problems” (p. 56).

Rey’s extensive history of distressing and traumatic events set him apart from his peers in the dominant Anglo middle-class culture, who in general have fewer trauma-related events to process. Historically, Rey’s focus was on averting imminent danger and pain, but not on learning, exploring, expanding his horizon, or thinking about his future, as a same-aged adolescent of the dominant Anglo middle-class culture might do. WRAP increasingly developed Rey’s action systems for responding to nonthreatening daily life by introducing him into the community through caregiver actions such as tutoring, counseling, listening, and encouraging. Because such caregiving was missing in Rey’s upbringing due to many contributing factors, such as his immigrant background, historic racism in the community, and poverty, WRAP provided many of the caregiver actions that are the necessary norm for the well-being and thriving of a youth within the dominant U.S. culture.

Theme 2: Giving and Receiving Support

In this study, giving and receiving support emerged as an important theme; the wraparound philosophy encourages giving support through focusing on a family’s needs and hence depends on a youth’s and family’s ability to receive the support for positive change. Not only is receiving support an important factor for families in wraparound, but actually asking for support reflects their increased involvement in the process.
Episodes related to receiving support in the sphere of family.

- Following older brother placing head on folded arms facing the floor during meetings
- Not opening door when picked up for session
- Following older brother’s example for accepting support
- Attending meetings when probation reminded him of court order
- Parents asking for support correcting Joe and Rey’s behavior, although inconsistent ability to follow through with behavior plan
- Rey accepting more support while Joe in placement
- Monica asking for and accepting support for the children grieving the dog’s death
- Rey’s accepting support with Christmas gifts and choosing a birthday card for mother
- Monica, Rey, and Joe accepting being photographed as family for the first time
- Monica asked for a family album to share with family in Mexico
- Parents accepted support in modeling how to get Rey to attend school

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on receiving support in the sphere of family.

The provision of agency support in the sphere of family was a delicate undertaking for the WRAP team. Although support can create a temporary dependency of the family on the treatment providers, it also introduces experiential change to the family system. This follows Nichols and Schwartz’s (1995) point that “new experience for family members is thought to break down confluence, disrupt rigid expectancies, and unblock awareness” (p. 299).
Within the structure of Rey’s family, Joe and Rey formed a coalition that overshadowed and ignored the decisions of Monica and Alonso, the parental unit. This is consistent with Minuchin’s (as cited in Nichols & Schwartz, 1995) explanation that “working out” and adjusting “the pattern of interaction between the parental and child subsystem” (p. 215). Monica and Alonso initially asked for WRAP’s support in changing this power dynamic without realizing what kind of change in their parenting strategy this would demand. They had based their parenting on their own experiences growing up in rural Mexico. Such strategies as relying on neighbors and extended family during their long work hours did not provide enough structure and safety for Joe and Rey, who in turn found it in the gang environment. This follows Nichols and Schwartz’s (1995) explanation that “behavior disorders arise when inflexible family structures cannot adjust adequately to maturational or situational challenges” (p. 218).

**Episodes related to receiving support in the sphere of culture.**

- Past experiences of discriminatory treatment inhibiting trust
- Avoiding cultural differences as a topic during WRAP meetings
- Derogatory talk about people from Oaxaca, China, and gabachos, as family jokes
- Receiving support in addressing cultural differences between team and family
- Receiving support naming values, expectations, parenting strategies, and beliefs in regards to traditional family roles
- Receiving support addressing gang culture, values, lifestyle
- Receiving invitations to celebrate birthdays and holidays
Assertions on WRAP’s impact on receiving support in the sphere of culture.

Rey and his family had experienced discrimination and racism in their interactions with agencies such as school and insurance companies as well as interventions from the dominant culture, which initially impacted their trust in WRAP. This is consistent with Sue and Sue’s (2008) concept of institutional racism.

The code of silence in the gang environment provided another initial obstacle to receiving support for identifying the underlying needs that attracted Rey to the gang culture, such as respect, companionship, joint adventures, and belonging. Castaneda’s (2011) work supported the notion that discussing, or “ratting out,” street gang matters can bring severe punishment by the gang. The WRAP team needed to ensure appropriate handling of those topics by carefully offering a safe conversation style that allowed a general understanding of the matter, while also learning more about this micro-culture from other sources.

By means of consistent contact and sincere offers of support in response to the family’s needs, the WRAP team received trust from Rey and his family. This allowed the team to talk about cultural themes, starting with the different behavioral norms in the cultures and families of origin of the multi-cultural WRAP team members, who thus modeled and emphasized the importance of cultural identity. The significance of building trust was supported by Sue and Sue’s (2008) point that with “sincerity, openness, honesty, or perceived lack of motivation for personal gain,” culturally different clients can begin to confide in the treatment professionals (p. 89).
Rey’s and his family’s needs in regard to dealing with the dominant culture became evident quickly. Facing a different world when entering the macro-culture, the family faced many challenges: for the parents, language difficulties limited their ability to communicate, their minimal reading and writing skills in both English and Spanish limited access to information, such as legal and other important documents. Often the family lacked efficient strategies to get their needs met in the dominant Anglo-American culture.

To support Rey and his family in the culturally different contexts, WRAP offered advocacy, bridging gaps to the dominant culture, as well as introducing excursions and celebrations where Rey and his family could experience the dominant culture in a stress-free manner. Rey and his family accepted this support. Burns et al. (2000) confirmed the need for “supportive relationships among the family, school, and community [which] facilitate the attainment of improved behavioral functioning for a given child” and family across culturally different aspects of the community (p. 296).

**Episodes related to receiving support in the sphere of community.**

- Reluctance accepting support after experiences of getting teased and bullied when receiving special educational services
- Resenting CPS investigations
- Negative experiences with school
- Negative experiences with financial support agencies
- Negative experiences with law enforcement
• Negative experiences in juvenile hall
• Negative experiences when father was jailed
• Accepting invitation to the WRAP meetings
• Negative experience being shot at while riding the bicycle he accepted from WRAP
• Asking someone to threaten family partner to get his bike back while it was being repainted a non-gang color
• Rey accepting Leo’s offer to accompany him to court; he later referred to it as a “turning point”
• Trying out rock-climbing, first with male team member, later also with female
• Trying out ride that simulates free flight
• Trying out boxing
• Accepting support in grieving the family dog’s death
• Visiting the zoo
• Accepting more communication with WRAP team members talking in the car side by side rather than across from each other in an office
• Getting his ID card
• Signing up for a job program
• Accepting support finding a place to get a haircut
• Engaging with the bike co-op
• Receiving support connecting with school
• Going to the doctor
• Coming to the WRAP meeting after Joe’s return
• Finding out about relationships to girls
• Monica accepting offer to attempt driver’s license
• Monica receiving support with navigating agencies and schools
• Accepting invitation to shop
• Accepted invitations to restaurants, walks, climbing excursions
• Accepting support by Marga in IEP meeting
• Changing school
• Coaxing Rey to start the new school

**Assertions on WRAP’s impact on receiving support in the sphere of community.** In the sphere of community, Rey and his family accepted our support soon after WRAP started in October 2011. The parents lived within the Spanish-speaking migrant worker community, disconnected from the English-speaking community. They needed help accessing necessary community resources. Rey and his family had little experience on how to spend time there with each other without having a task or a pressing issue that needed to be addressed. WRAP helped them develop more ease in moving around and using the community as a place to explore and learn. This had a significant impact on Rey. Burns et al. (2000) confirmed that the wraparound model is based on the notion that change can be facilitated by supporting coherence between the micro system of the child’s “immediate home and environment” and “the surrounding larger service system” (p. 296).

Over time Rey and Monica began to ask for support, and the family members continued accepting the team’s invitation to outings, even if that meant spending long
hours together. Accepting support did not always have the intended consequences. It included becoming vulnerable and trusting the WRAP team’s skills and good intentions. It required continually assessing the family’s needs under consideration of the cultural context. Accepting support brought about the decision whether to receive or to deny the offered help. It differed from tolerating prescribed interventions, and thus was coherent with the wraparound core principle of “family voice and choice” (Rauso & Vermillion, 2012, p. 23). Accepting support was a first step for Rey and his family in increasing their awareness of a wider range of options and trusting that WRAP held their interest and voice as a priority. This would agree with Brett’s (2004) supposition that because accepting support also entails the first vision of improving a situation, it can ease dealing with stress and boost existing coping skills. In all phases of wraparound treatment, supporting access to community resources is a major goal (Rauso & Vermillion).

**Theme 3: Connectedness**

The theme of connectedness became significant following Ogden et al.’s (2006) research stating that early caregiver relationships strongly influence the patterns of all future relationships and form the responses to experiences in the sociocultural context. Rey’s interpersonal connections are well illustrated in his Tonal Connectedness map (Figure 10).
When Rey drew his Tonal Connectedness map (November 18, 2011), he used the brown lines for people he loved, yellow for those he learned from, and black stood for additional support. The blue dot represented people he drank with, which included all the males in his life whom he loved and felt loved by. People he loved included his family, four male and three female “homies” or friends, and several cousins. The girlfriend and the WRAP team were not depicted in his original drawing and only entered the picture after, I asked him about where each would be on his map. Rey colored his male gang-related friends in their gang color and connected them with the color he used for love.
connections. The impact of WRAP in the theme of Rey’s connectedness moves through the spheres of the holistic model in the following way:

**Episodes related to connectedness in the sphere of family.**

- Limited eye contact
- Limited personal touches between family members
- Limited positive comments
- Disputes, aggression, violence between Rey and Joe
- Strong traditional sibling alliance between Rey and Joe
- Derogatory remarks about parents
- Parents praising Joe and blaming Rey
- Rey temporarily taking on role of the oldest son
- Rey grieving loss of family dog with sisters and mom
- Rey showing caring for sisters, giving up his own purchases in the store in order for them to keep theirs
- Improved connection to Monica and Alonso
- Renewed aggression and violence between brothers on Joe’s return
- Monica defending Rey’s interest in girls in school, advocating for special services
- Monica putting Joe and Rey to work
- Monica believing Mexico could teach Joe and Rey traditional values
- Derogatory remarks about Monica’s clothing after Mexico
- Rey needing and receiving parental support during school change
Monica and Alonso listing more details about Rey’s life, noticing overall improvement in their reflections on WRAP

Rey confirming close connection with his mother at the end of data collection

**Assertions on WRAP’s impact on connectedness in the sphere of family.** The connections within Rey’s family shifted on several occasions during the course of WRAP. Many factors, such as Monica and Alonso’s own upbringing, personal histories, and encounters with different rules in regard to physical punishment in the U.S. as well as their immigrant status and need to focus on the economic survival of the family, had contributed to a hands-off parenting style. Alonso and Monica were focused on the survival needs of the family and often absent due to work from April to mid-November. They initially felt unable to influence Rey’s or Joe’s behavior and represented a disempowered and divided parental sub-unit, consistent with Nichols and Schwartz’s (1995) description of dysfunctional family processes. WRAP’s encouragement to focus on strengths and positive qualities had some impact over time, whereas teaching behavior plans with consequences for unwanted behavior never worked for Monica and Alonso. In the time before Christmas, Monica was able to execute more parental influence (Nichols & Schwarz, 1995), in part due to her own new sense of empowerment after passing her written drivers’ exam. However, during the trip to Mexico and in the time following the trip, key parental requests to Rey and Joe did not elicit a response.

When Joe was sent to placement in May 2011, the first significant shift in Rey’s behavior occurred. Rey gained both his own room in the family home and, temporarily, the traditional role of the oldest son in a Mexican family, who, consistent with the work
of Rivera (2001), cares for but also rules the younger siblings and supports the parents. Rey’s caring behaviors to his sisters and later his mother had elements of what Ogden et al. (2006) described as a “soft” and “warm” quality of relating (p. 121). However, when Joe returned from placement 6 months later, Rey’s role reverted to that of the second son. He followed the lead of the firstborn, as Rivera (2001) suggested, and had to share his room again. Although Rey still connected more with his family than before WRAP, he also spent more time with the gang-related friends he shared with his brother.

Family dynamics shifted again during the Christmas visit to Mexico. Rey and Joe both disengaged from the family in favor of their gang-related peers. Toward the end of the data collection period, however, Alonso and Monica were able to support Rey with his start in the new school. Consistent with Nichols and Schwartz (1995), they presented a joint caring parental unit and Rey responded.

**Episodes related to connectedness in the sphere of culture.**

- Mexican family hierarchy partially upheld in immigrant context
- Derogatory views of Mexican culture and immigrant culture
- Ignoring dominant culture
- Strong connection to gang-related peers and Mexican street gang culture
- Mannerisms and way of talking resembling gang culture
- Increased curiosity about other cultures (within WRAP team)
- Applying gang culture values and behaviors to relationships with girls
- Ignoring values of Mexican culture in favor of gang culture while in Mexico
• Excitement about Mexican criminal gangs
• More ability to shift posture, facial expression, and language when away from gang culture
• Critique of Mexican teaching aide’s English language skills
• More talking, elaborating on gang culture, Mexican culture, and dominant culture
• Reaching outside of gang culture for additional information on relationships with girls
• Prioritizing support and trust in relationships
• Creating own approach to initiate conversations with girls

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on connectedness in the sphere of culture.

Remaining traditional Mexican values shaped the hierarchical power structure in Rey’s family. Due to the parents’ disempowerment and Joe’s enforcement of his privileges as first-born son and without parental oversight or protection for Rey, this structure created power struggles and negatively impacted Rey’s space for personal development. Nichols and Schwarz (1995) confirmed that rigid hierarchies can cause the “impaired growth as autonomous individuals” of younger siblings in a family system (p. 219).

Cultural factors in part normalized Rey’s subsequent bullying behavior towards his younger sisters: As Rivera (2001) suggested, in a traditional Mexican family “older children [can] discriminate against younger ones on the base that they were not sufficiently male (machos)” and “little girls [can be] either avoided, or a ‘steamroller’ attitude [can be] taken toward them by the boys” (p. 100). However, in a functional
hierarchy, so Nichols and Schwartz (1995), the parents would set boundaries to limit these behaviors.

In contrast to their parents who identified with traditional Mexican values, the Rey and Joe were oriented toward gang culture, which formed around their outsider role from the dominant culture. At the end of data collection, Rey displayed what Sue and Sue (2008) referred to as indicator of “dissonance” (p. 247): Rey had “a sense of personal awareness that racism does exist, . . . and that one cannot escape one’s cultural heritage” (p. 247).

Rey’s negative attitude towards his parents’ traditional culture and their way of bringing it into the U.S. as immigrants, was consistent with Sue and Sue’s (2008) work on the initial stage of cultural identity formation. Rey’s criticism of his Mexican teaching aide’s lack of English proficiency followed a similar pattern and was consistent with Sue and Sue’s (2008) explanation of symptoms of “low internal self-esteem” (p. 245).

In Rey’s case this provided more incentive to join the gang culture, where he could feel a sense of identity separate from both the traditional and the dominant cultures. As Castaneda (personal communication, February 5, 2012) suggested, the strict dress code of the gang signaled participation; it also served to distinguish Rey and his “homies” from the low economic status of their immigrant parents.

The impact of the gang culture in Rey’s life increased when he was able to continue his gang life-style during the family vacation to Mexico with many of his peers. Hence, the gang culture provided for him and his friends an internationally functional
way of cultural expression. This was consistent with Boerman’s (2007) supposition that the influence of criminal gangs has increased across the national borders in recent years.

The values around courtship were very different in the cultural worlds Rey was surrounded by: traditional Mexican culture, Hispanic street gang culture, modern middle-class Anglo-American culture, and Mexican American culture. The traditional Mexican culture, according to Rivera (2001), emphasized “machismo, . . . the ideal of manliness, which is never to ‘crack,’ never to break down, [while the woman is responsible for emotions and the role as wife and mother]” (p. 128). The Hispanic street gang culture, in turn, “rejects traditional images of a Hispanic woman as a ‘wife or mother’ . . . . However, even within a gang, girls are described as ‘bad’ and ‘good’ girls, and ‘bad girls’ like to fight and drink” (Valdez, 2007, p. 5).

In the modern middle class Anglo- and Mexican American culture, a “cultural shift” (Chatterjee, 2001) towards relationships based on more equality and friendship has developed, by engaging in shared activities, such as work, sports, interests, and socializing together.

Talking with WRAP team members in a safe and trusting atmosphere created the space for Rey to process his thoughts on which values were important for him in courtship and relationships. He subsequently created a strategy that would work across the cultures he encountered. Sue and Sue (2008) confirmed that the ability to assimilate and adapt different cultural elements indicates a higher level of integrative awareness.
Episodes related to connectedness in the sphere of community.

- Some connection with teacher at first school
- Connection to gang-related peers
- Negative relationship with police/law enforcement
- No connection to role models in the community
- Consistent relationships with WRAP team members over 16 months
- Receiving feedback about behavior in the community
- Using WRAP as space to bounce off ideas and be listened to
- Addressing frustrations in dealing with family, school
- Increased parent involvement in school issues
- Behavior problems leading to disconnect from school after Mexico
- Some partial disconnect from WRAP after Joe’s return
- Some partial disconnect from WRAP after Mexico
- Re-connecting with WRAP
- Experiencing support in dealing with court, job, school
- Responding to persuasion, rewards, and involvement of WRAP and parents regarding school
- Reporting first success in new school with pride
- Naming WRAP team as people he loved and felt supported by
- Wanting to stay in this town

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on connectedness in the sphere of community.

Rey’s level of connectedness in the community increased significantly through his stable
relationships with the WRAP team members. Growing this relationship took time and authenticity on the side of WRAP, and trust as well as more responsibility for his behavior on Rey’s side. Nelson and Prilleltensky (2006) confirmed that a person’s well-being in the community is based on “positive and supportive relationships,” which encourage and model participation (p. 29). Community psychology (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 2009) supports the emphasis on maintaining the “primary allegiance” with the participant (p. 129). Rey expressed in his own way what Karcher (n.d.) called “feelings of relatedness” (para. 6), when he stated that he loved and felt loved by the WRAP team. This demonstration of “positive affect” (Karcher, n.d., para. 6) was new for Rey, and was reciprocated from most of the WRAP team members in an authentic form of deep, family-like caring, which had grown in the process of the relationship.

It is not surprising that immigrant youths like Rey establish what Werner, Brown, and Altman (1997) called “place attachment . . . [or] a sense of individual and communal identity” (p. 282) by joining the gangs. In the course of WRAP, Rey’s experiences extended beyond the territory of his gang into the wider community, and his parents noticed how much he enjoyed travelling. He had formed alternative bonds to those of his gang with the surrounding community.

**Theme 4: Participation**

Participation was an important theme in this case study in accordance with UN-Habitat’s (2012) research, which pointed at its significance in determining if the involved youth were a “passive or mere token” or if he were actively taking part in the process.
unfolding (p. 36). Expanding the level of participation of a youth in planning the
treatment process, as wraparound philosophy determines (Rauso & Vermillion, 2012),
consists of encouraging increased responsibility and control in areas of family, culture,
and community, and with it empowering the participant.

**Episodes related to participation in the sphere of family.**

- Not many joint family ventures, meals
- Not much positive feedback
- Violent behavior and bullying determines distribution of wanted items
- Domineering of younger siblings and mother
- Leaving or ignoring requests
- Not responding to mother’s request to clean up vandalism in Mexico
- Participating in family meetings, outings
- Participating in gift giving by getting mother’s shoe size
- Selecting shoes together with sisters
- Increased participation in activities with Joe
- Coaching mother in HeartMath during meeting
- Encouraging mother during meeting to take the driving test
- Allowing parents to take him to school
- Setting goals, such as finishing school, getting a good job, during family meeting
Assertions on WRAP’s impact on participation in the sphere of family. Rey’s initial behavior followed Ogden et al.’s (2006) explanation that “with typically compromised social engagement systems, traumatized individuals bring an enormous range of problematic behaviors to the arousal of the sociability system, including . . . a profound lack of social skills and a general difficulty forming social bonds” (p. 118). As Rey let himself be coaxed into participatory action within his family by the WRAP team, small changes began to occur. This is consistent with what Hart (as cited in UN-Habitat, 2012, p. 37) called “passive participation” since it is dependent on instructions. Rey needed support to get started, but then could engage in joint decision making, which followed Hart’s (as cited in UN-Habitat, 2012, p. 37) concept of “functional participation.” When Rey was first instructed, and coaxed, he subsequently showed a higher level of participation, such as sharing his ideas with Monica and his sisters during an outing. WRAP modeled for the parents how to increase Rey’s participation. In family meetings, Rey began to formulate his goals and to participate in action planning, consistent with Hart’s (as cited in UN-Habitat, 2012, p. 37) “interactive participation.”

A shift occurred when Rey gave up his resistance to going to school, and later joyfully reported about his school success. This was consistent with Ogden et al.’s (2006) work, which stressed the initial importance of external emotion regulators in lowering the activation of defense action networks and with it encouraging participation.

During his time in WRAP Rey increased his level of participation in family conversations. However, he did not reach the level of “self-mobilization” or “taking constructive control over a project” within his family environment (Hart, as cited in UN-
Habitat, 2012, p. 37). Very likely the family structure had not changed to the degree necessary to allow his engagement on this level.

**Episodes related to participation in the sphere of culture.**

- Little expression of love and affection in family
- No celebrations of Mexican holidays
- No observation of family traditions
- No participation in cultural institutions, such as church
- No participation in cultural events of the dominant culture
- Orienting dress and posture to gang culture
- Orienting speech to gang culture
- Monica missing Mexican festivities
- Participation in WRAP celebrations
- Participation in WRAP meetings as cultural field
- Participation in recreational activities offered by dominant culture
- Participation in job programs offered by dominant culture
- Participation in school as a cultural field (White teacher, Mexican aide, White alternative education official, later White teacher)
- Continued participation in gang culture
- More smiles as common in mainstream culture
- More talking about his thoughts and experiences
- Less sentences including “f. . . and s. . .”
Assertions on WRAP’s impact on participation in the sphere of culture.

Initially, expressions of love, affection, or compliments on wanted behavior were rare in Rey’s family. This followed Sue and Sue’s (2008) point that “Hispanic cultures . . . value restraint of strong feelings” and associate “maturity and wisdom . . . with one’s ability to control emotions” (p. 37), but WRAP modeled focus on strengths and noticing or celebrating positive behaviors as a parenting tool. In the course of WRAP, Rey responded well to such an approach, which lessened the gap between the dominant Anglo culture and his family’s ways. However, this example demonstrates how delicate the balance between treatment approaches and cultural family norms can be.

Participating in cultural celebrations was not an explicit goal for Rey and his family, yet the WRAP team offered celebrations of successes, birthdays, and holidays to create openings in the family’s day-to-day routines and to generate positive joint experiences in the cultural contexts of Rey’s community. Rey and his family participated in the celebrations and stated that they enjoyed them. However, the family members were not yet ready to initiate their own celebrations. As Werner et al. (1997) suggested:

Celebrations can be used to acknowledge changing power relationships and changing values and circumstances among . . . [people], while simultaneously reaffirming traditional values. . . . Festivals also link macro-level cultural values and beliefs to the individual level. . . . [They] provide opportunities to play out tensions between individual and societal identities, and they highlight aspects of the past, present and future. (pp. 268- 270)

The family was able to remember how things were done in the traditional Mexican culture, including which songs were sung and experienced being part of the mainstream culture, where restaurant workers sang and brought a dessert with a candle.
However, Rey’s participation in a more mainstream cultural context, be it Mexican American or Anglo, still required safety, encouragement, and coaching, and did not yet reach the level of self-mobilization. This followed Ogden et al.’s (2008) point that “the particular social environment that forms the cultural context” executes strong formative power on the sociability action system (p. 177).

**Episodes related to participation in the sphere of community.**

- Minimal school attendance
- Minimal parent involvement in school
- Experiences of discrimination
- Staying within community of gang-related friends
- Breaking laws
- Frequent arrests
- Increased school attendance
- Increased parent involvement in school, still late
- Witnessing advocacy against discrimination
- Witnessing mother going to driving classes
- Witnessing mother getting more involved in school
- Involvement in bike co-op, earlier job program
- Confiding in WRAP regarding difficulties in bike co-op and school
- Apologizing during IEP meeting in Spanish language
- Participating in recreational outings one-on-one
- Participating in recreational outings with the family and WRAP team
- Increased participation in conversations with WRAP team members
- Talking about plans, anticipating trip to Mexico
- Continued participation in gang
- Most likely still bullying and lying
- Fewer arrests

**Assertions on WRAP’s impact on participation in the sphere of community.**

At the beginning of WRAP, most of Rey’s participation in the greater community was restricted to sporadic school attendance and encounters with law enforcement stemming from delinquent behaviors. He displayed the following symptoms of Conduct Disorder as defined by the APA (*DSM-IV-TR*, 2000) “has been physically cruel to people;” “has stolen while confronting a victim;” “destruction of property;” “deceitfulness or theft;” “often stays out at night despite parental prohibitions;” “is often truant from school;” and “the disturbance in behavior causes clinically significant impairment in social, academic, or occupational functioning” (p. 99). The *DSM-IV-TR* (APA, 2000) also stated that “the Conduct Disorder diagnosis should be applied only when the behavior in question is symptomatic of an underlying dysfunction within the individual and not simply a reaction to the immediate social context” (p. 96). Rey’s situation demonstrated that his reactions were both related to underlying dysfunction such as his learning and speech problems as well as caused by his immediate social context in family and community, such as experiencing barriers to access services and discriminatory treatment.
The bike co-op functioned for Rey as a place where he could spend his time, interact with peers without gang relations, and learn new skills. Consistent with Hart (as cited in UN-Habitat, 2012, p. 37), however, the bike co-op resembled “participation for material incentives,” where motivation often ceases over time.

Rey’s engagement in the gang continued throughout WRAP, but to a lesser degree while he was more involved in school and the bike co-op. This would agree with Stevens’ (2011) research, stating that young men who engage in organized crime often can be described as “social solidarity seekers.” Stevens addressed terrorist networks, but the parallels to criminal street gangs seem obvious. To deter “social solidarity seekers” from joining, establishing, or contributing to terrorist, or in this case criminal, networks, he recommended creating ways for their participation in civic society.

Theme 5: Exploring

The theme of exploring emerged due to its importance in creating a base for developing new behaviors by inspiring curiosity, investigating, and seeking new sensations. One of the aspects of exploration in this study is play, which combines pleasure and joy with the experience of exploring. As Ogden et al. (2006) suggested, “if safety is threatened, play is instantly terminated. . . . If threat is prolonged, the ability to play is typically lost” (p. 118). Explorations also support practicing and adjusting newly learned behaviors to different contexts and encountering new resources.
Episodes related to exploring in the sphere of family.

- Not familiar with family games or interactive games
- Routine of same foods/flavors
- Bi-annual trips to family in Mexico without Alonso
- Rey and Joe exploring outside family home on their own/gang
- Rare family ventures to visit extended family
- Losing interest in rock climbing when Joe is better at it
- Frequently mentioning use of alcohol when family is relaxing
- All family members participating in games in WRAP meetings
- Exploring new places together with family members and WRAP (San Francisco, Zoo, San Juan Bautista)
- Exploring climbing studio with family members
- Showing sisters ducks
- Talking about interests with family (travel and flying)
- Trying out differently prepared foods together with family members
- Sharing with each other regarding likes and dislikes (food, games)
- Learning about each other’s interests
- Witnessing each other’s experiences
- Spending extended periods of time close to each other
- Requesting family album to share experiences
Assertions on WRAP’s impact on exploring in the sphere of family.

When WRAP started, Monica and Alonso’s focus was on mostly work and survival rather than fostering of their children’s curiosity and interest, which is common in populations struggling to make ends meet. This would agree with Schmit’s (2012) supposition that “stressful family circumstances can also reduce play time for poor children. When a parent works two jobs just to be able to pay the bills, the energy and resources may just not be there to encourage play time” (para. 2).

WRAP excursions encouraged the family to spend time together in different environments, and supported active engagement between the family members. Consistent with Nichols and Schwartz (1995), such experiential explorations “help people uncover their own aliveness,” and “family relations can be revitalized by authentic interactions” (p. 317). It is also supported by Ogden et al.’s (2006) work, which points out the opening of “a new range of possibilities” through playful exploration” (p. 120). Supporting and witnessing each other’s experience occurred in a natural flow, and space for individual initiative was created. However, on several occasions, Joe and Rey remained competitive, and Rey stated that he lost interest. This demonstrates how he did not feel safe in playful exploration under the pressure of competition with his brother. While all other family members thought of the excursions and explorations as a highlight, Alonso never took part in any of them.
Episodes related to exploring in the sphere of culture.

- Exploring alcohol in family and gang culture
- Exploring drugs in gang culture
- Witnessing/exploring hard physical work, poverty, in immigrant culture
- Exploring friendship, relationships, thrill of getting away from police, fighting opposite gang, in gang culture
- Exploring personal power, violence, values, loyalty in gang culture
- No access to exploring activities requiring parental time/income/transportation
- Exploring school and law enforcement as representatives of dominant culture
- Exploring relationship with people from different culture in WRAP
- Noticing accent
- Asking questions about Germany, learning some German words
- Curious about role of women when this researcher participated in climbing
- Interest in excursions, activities in domain of White middle class, dominant culture
- Exploring culturally different foods (Chinese, Oaxaca)
- Experiencing interest/curiosity about his family’s culture by WRAP team
- Monica exploring driving lessons
- Experiencing interest in his experiences/explorations while in Mexico
- Talking about explorations and experiences in Mexico
- Processing experiences with school, police in dominant culture
- Exploring shopping for personal items
- Admiring material items in dominant culture
• Expressing dislike for Mexican culture
• Processing and discussing cultural views with WRAP team members

**Assertions on WRAP’s impact on exploring in the sphere of culture.** In the sphere of culture, Rey’s explorations and experiences outside of the day-to-day routine initially occurred with his friends and in the frame of the gang culture. WRAP created a space to form new attitudes toward culture by providing different and positive experiences for Rey and his family within the dominant culture. Participating in the WRAP team process encouraged Rey and his family to engage in, to reflect on, to process, and to evaluate cultural experiences while being involved in an inter-cultural dialogue within the team. While Rey still engaged with his gang related peers and did not express increased respect for the Mexican culture, he was able to reflect on his experiences and feel more at ease exploring the different cultural aspects of his day to day living.

**Episodes related to exploring in the sphere of community.**

• Knowing/exploring the neighborhood, lots of short cuts
• Knowing/exploring gang territory, graffiti
• Scanning neighborhood for friends, enemies, opportunities to steal/deal/hide
• Insecure in public places
• Shopping for things he likes
• Eating different foods
- Exploring bicycle repair as job
- Getting an ID
- Exploring activities in the community (go-carts, boxing, rock-climbing, gym, computer lab, library, zoo)
- Processing thoughts on White middle class neighborhoods in community
- WRAP showing interest in his experiences in the community
- WRAP showing curiosity and support for his interests
- Picking a new juice flavor
- Daydreaming about renting a room in a country hotel (Oaxacan owner)

**Assertions on WRAP’s impact on exploring in the sphere of community.** Rey was initially insecure and shy in public places. He did not try out new things, asked the team to order for him, ate only what he knew, and moved awkwardly in new localities. A year later, Rey felt mostly comfortable exploring new places, flavors, and activities. This follows Ogden et al.’s (2006) point that “within a reparative attachment environment” such as WRAP, “interest, curiosity, [and] sensation seeking” can be fostered (pp. 114-115). During the explorations and games that WRAP provided, Rey and his family engaged on both levels: with each other and with the community. Consistent with Lung et al. (2008), creating and facilitating experiences in the natural environment can encourage learning new relational values and expectations. The fragility of Rey’s new set of skills was evident when competition ensued in rock-climbing between him and Joe, and Rey lost interest since Joe was the better climber.
Rey’s interest in exploring opportunities in the community dropped at different times during WRAP. When his curiosity about relationships to girls became stronger, he lost interest in the bike co-op. As Ogden et al. (2006) suggested, “experiencing combinations of action systems requires a higher-order integrative capacity that is often deficient in traumatized individuals” (p. 110).

**Theme 6: Emotion Regulation**

Emotion regulation evolved as an important theme in this study since it provides the base for what Ogden et al. (2006) called “a functional sense of self” (p. 42), which keeps “the level of arousal within the window of tolerance,” and allows for the use of alternatives to defense responses (p. 115). This is consistent with Eisenberg et al.’s (2007) point that only when a person is able to either self-regulate or regulate her or his emotions interactively, can she or he create a space between experience and reaction, where behavior change possible.

**Episodes related to emotion regulation in the sphere of family.**

- Monica stating half jokingly a beer will help her relax before driving test
- Alonso drinking after work and with his friends
- Alonso drinking at family celebrations so that Joe has to drive the family home
- Rey and Joe regularly smoking marijuana and drinking alcohol with friends
- Keeping routines such as Alonso driving without license for years, instead of Monica attempting to get her license
• Joe beating up Rey
• Rey bullying sisters and mother as described in defenses
• Blaming, complaining, denying responsibility as described in defenses
• Using HeartMath together in WRAP meetings
• Alonso and Monica asking for external regulation regarding Rey’s and Joe’s behavior
• Witnessing positive focus in meetings
• Witnessing WRAP’s incentives, coaching, to get Rey to school
• Parents’ functioning as external emotion regulators, caringly bringing Rey to school together

Assertions on WRAP’s impact on emotion regulation in the sphere of family.
Looking at emotion regulation in Rey’s family, it became evident that the family was lacking efficient tools to regulate strong emotions. All family members with the exception of Eva and Lila demonstrated addictive tendencies. Ogden et al. (2006) confirmed that “traumatized individuals . . . [can] form addictive tendencies in response to” stressors (p. 116).

In addition, staying within the known daily patterns, the family protected themselves from unknown or ambiguous situations, which at times also meant limiting their access to resources. This would agree with Matsumoto et al.’s (2007) research stating that it is an indicator for low emotion regulation skills to judge unpredictable events as threatening, and then to avoid them.
Alonso and Monica asked the team on several occasions for help with Rey’s behavior, which illustrated their own reliance on external emotion regulators. When Rey refused to attend his newly assigned school, Monica and Alonso took on the role of the regulatory system after the researcher’s initial modeling, and brought Rey to school. Structural family therapy interprets such joint parental activity as the ability of a family to accommodate a stressed family member (Nichols & Schwartz, 1995).

**Episodes related to emotion regulation in the sphere of culture.**

- Monica hoping that the stay in Mexico could teach Rey and Joe “how to behave”
- Rey trying to look “cool” and orient his behavior on gang-related peers
- Rey apologizing during IEP meeting in Spanish language
- Rey bringing mom roses and card even though it was “not cool”
- Rey refusing to wear a bicycle helmet because it was “not cool”
- Rey initially not wanting to be seen with a laptop in a coffee shop because it was “not cool”
- Rey asking the researcher what she would do if she saw her husband with girls
- Rey noticing Oaxacan restaurant as different from his stereotype for people from that region
- Rey pondering that U.S. regulations on TV violence are better “for little children” than showing the gory details like in Mexico

**Assertions on WRAP’s impact on emotion regulation in the sphere of culture.**

Culture (e.g., ethnic, religious, gang) provides external emotion regulation and
establishes which emotional responses or behaviors to express, suppress, or avoid, in order to be considered part of a specific community. Although Monica believed that traditional Mexican values, such as work ethic and sense of community, would serve as a behavioral orientation for her sons, Rey utilized the gang code of behavior as a point of reference for expressing or suppressing emotions. The WRAP team’s approach represented an emphasis on decreasing uncertainty avoidance, increasing emotional expressiveness and preference for the re-appraisal of a situation, which is according to Matsumoto et al. (2007), a typically Western approach. Thus, emotion regulation is a culture bound phenomenon and requires awareness of the different cultural norms and styles.

As WRAP unfolded, Rey expressed emotions differently when required by different cultural settings. Strategically switching language and making amends were indicators of his ability to auto-regulate his emotions in a stressful situation. When Rey reflected on the differences in restrictions of displaying violence between the U.S. and Mexico, he identified the protective purpose of external regulation through cultural norms.

**Episodes related to emotion regulation in the sphere of community.**

- Stealing
- Skipping school
- Gang clothing, belt
- Hunched forward physical stance
• Short sentences framed in profanities
• No smiles, neutral facial expression
• Walking out on receiving positive or negative attention
• Pretending to be sleeping in the closet
• Hunching forward, looking down, and non-verbal at the COE meeting
• Making sounds at girls: “My friend did it.” . . . Later, “I only did it once”
• “I’ll get another girl” after some talking “When I see her I’ll say ‘Watsup’”
• “I am cool, I am over it,” after a break talking about stressful IEP incident
• First defending daily attendance in school, after some discussion promising he will be on time
• “Well, they can put me in any school,” after some thinking “No, I want to be in this school”
• “I didn’t say the f. . . word,” when addressed first making excuses (“but her name was not on the door”). After some time to think, “It was stupid”
• First making excuses about missing days at bike co-op, then explaining about visiting girlfriend
• Smiling at birthday
• Tolerating attention at birthday
• Staying open to suggestions and staying present when addressing his performance at the bike co-op
• When noticing police in different neighborhood, “Cops are good”
• Recounting his positive experience in school during WRAP meeting, expecting/receiving praise
• No arrest in 9 months
Assertions on WRAP’s impact on emotion regulation in the sphere of community. When entering WRAP, Rey had displayed dysregulated behavior frequently: His criminal activities, violence, multiple encounters with law enforcement, and his behavior in school served as examples. Ford (2002) supported the notion that there is a connection between symptoms of “oppositional defiance” and the “fundamental dysregulation of emotion and information processing” (p. 36).

Rey’s use of the HeartMath tools confirmed WRAP’s impact on his ability to auto-regulate his emotions. In January 2011, I introduced the handheld HeartMath tools to Rey and his family and then offered both brothers to participate in the HeartMath computer game. Joe refused on all occasions, but Rey showed interest and explored the program. During later WRAP meetings, the family used the handheld devices on several occasions. As a technique to reach coherence or a focused state, the team trained breathing deeply and slowly while thinking of a positive emotion. During his first heart rhythm coherence measure in January of 2011, Rey practiced the slow breathing after first observing his heart rhythm on the computer screen. He then tried out how the indications changed when he thought of a stressful event. Subsequently, he attempted to shift back into the coherent state with the green light through the breathing technique. He reached a medium coherent state for 15% of the time, yet remained in “low coherence” for 85% of this measured sequence. The measurements can be seen in Figure 11. On his second measure, which took place before his Christmas travels, Rey achieved the green light, indicating high coherence for 4% of the time and 33% of medium coherence. The results are illustrated in Figure 12.
Figure 11. *Initial HeartMath session.*

Figure 12. *Second HeartMath session.*
I used the handheld devices without the computer for the whole family (with the exception of Joe) during several occasions. I passed out the little emwaves, and everyone tried to all be in the coherent state together by breathing and thinking about a positive event in our lives, with the green light appearing on each apparatus. Before the mother’s driving test, I combined HeartMath with positive affirmations for her and recommended using this method instead of beer to calm down if she felt test anxiety.

At the last measurement at the end of the data collection period (Figure 13), Rey engaged in the Dual Drive game on the computer for about 16 minutes, keeping his car racing and restarting after losing focus. He demonstrated how he could breathe deeply and calm himself down, then take up the task again and proceed. His last try in a new

Figure 13. *Third HeartMath session.*
game of Dual Drive showed his best scores of coherence, where he clearly applied the learned techniques for emotion regulation: He reached high coherence 16% of the time, reached medium coherence for 14% and decreased his time in low coherence to 65%.

In a personal conversation I had with HeartMath researcher Dr. Rollin McCraty on June 4, 2012 about Rey’s results, he confirmed that the findings indicated that Rey was significantly calmer during his last session. Dr. McCraty pointed out that whereas the first measure was done without the Dual Drive game, the second and third were done playing the game. According to Dr. McCraty, the Dual Drive game can make it a lot harder to achieve the coherent state due to the distractions and screen changes. Dr. McCraty found Rey’s last result “for Dual Drive pretty impressive.”

**Final Thoughts**

Tracking Rey’s responses while he participated in WRAP highlighted, the complexity of the factors inhibiting or supporting changes in his reactions. Rey’s process over time displayed the impact of trauma, treatment events, and family factors as well as the effects of cultural and community issues. I was able to see Rey’s unique strategies on how to manage his world. With the holistic model, I followed up with a thorough review of the six different response categories (defense, receiving support, connectedness, participation, exploration, emotion regulation) as they occurred in family, culture, and community. Exploring each of the themes in each of the holistic spheres allowed detailed insights and a more comprehensive understanding than possible with a more linear model. This methodological framework facilitated the integration of individual and
systemic theoretical explanations and led to the inclusion of cultural considerations throughout the analysis.
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION

Summary

The impact-focused review of Rey’s responses to the experiences during his participation in WRAP resulted in the emergence of six themes: defenses, receiving support, connectedness, participation, exploration, and emotion regulation. Tracking the indicators of each theme through the holistic model’s spheres of family, culture, and community—I addressed the sphere of youth as part of the other spheres to avoid duplications, because Rey’s relationships through the spheres were part of every theme, and I addressed the sphere of global community within that of community—led to the following findings:

Examining the theme of defense and the sphere of family revealed that all the family members frequently used to separate from distressing and traumatic events. Rey displayed mobilization responses such as bullying, and immobilization responses, such as disengaging or staying motionless. During the course of WRAP Rey’s responses diversified, which suggested an increased sense of safety. Shifts in the family roles after Joe’s return and the visit to Mexico co-occurred with an increase in intensity of Rey’s defense reactions. Within the sphere of culture, Rey demonstrated the use of derogatory attitudes towards his own and other cultures. This suggested his use of racism as a mobilization defense function against the stress of discrimination and exclusion. As WRAP unfolded, Rey showed more curiosity towards other cultures. Although Rey’s criminal activities and arrests declined, his defense reactions in the community remained
frequent. At the end of the data collection period, he verbalized his need to stay alert and watch his back.

Within the theme of receiving support and the sphere the family, Rey and Joe’s behavior revealed a strong sibling subsystem that rendered the parental unit less effective. While the parents attempted to strengthen their parental subsystem by asking for support from WRAP in controlling their sons’ behavior, Rey and Joe gravitated toward the gang environment. As WRAP unfolded, the parents made small adjustments to their parenting style. In the sphere of culture the family’s experience revealed the effects of institutional racism on the family’s ability to trust outside support from clinicians and community agencies. The data suggest that the gang code of silence was an initial obstacle to Rey’s opening up to WRAP. As the process unfolded, Rey and his family agreed to WRAP’s offers to address and bridge cultural issues. In the sphere of community, Rey and his family accepted support early on. The research suggests that WRAP’s focus on family needs and the team’s willingness to take on practical tasks together, provided an experiential base for trusting.

Connectedness in the sphere of family highlighted the parental priority on work for meeting basic needs for food and shelter. This led to their decreased ability to connect with the children during the work season, which added to family dysfunction when the subunit of Rey and Joe ignored the parental requests for compliant behavior. The boys’ noncompliant behavior increased when Joe was released as well as during the trip to Mexico. This research suggests that although WRAP’s attempts at behavior plans failed, modeling supportive strategies and supporting parental empowerment helped facilitate a
stronger connection between Rey and his parents, to which Rey responded with behavior changes. In the sphere of culture, the study found indicators demonstrating the ineffectiveness and fragmented connection to cultural systems in Rey’s family, where traditions could justify problematic behaviors in the absence of a functional monitoring authority. Rey’s low self-esteem in regard to his family’s culture supported his tendency to search for orientation in the gang culture. As WRAP unfolded, Rey showed an increased ability to integrate different cultural elements into his behavior. In the sphere of community, Rey demonstrated growing connectedness to people and places outside his biological family, gang-related friends, and known territory.

The theme of participation in the sphere of family was evident when, after initial support, Rey showed indicators of a higher level of participation in family interactions. This developing level of participation was impacted by limited space for engagement within his family’s structure. In the sphere of culture, the family’s and Rey’s lack of participation in cultural activities was influenced by poverty and by the immigration history of the family. The tendency in Rey’s family culture to not pay attention to positive behavior could have originated in traditional Mexican cultural trends. As WRAP unfolded, Rey enjoyed participation in more mainstream cultural activities that required encouragement and coaching. In the sphere of community, Rey’s participation shifted from the disconnecting consequences of conduct-disordered behavior to practicing engagement on multiple levels. His increased participation was associated with a decrease in engagement with gang-related activities. Rey’s participation required consistent coaching and did not yet result in self-motivated initiatives in the community.
The family’s low socioeconomic status demonstrated further obstacles. Shifts, such as his interest in girls, his brother’s return, and the trip to Mexico, were associated with a decreased level of participation in areas other than his gang involvement. Rey’s participation in WRAP meetings, however, showed consistent and increased levels of participation with only rare exceptions.

The theme of exploring in the sphere of family became evident through an increasing curiosity and engagement in play by Rey and his family, which served as an indicator for perceived safety. Competition with Joe tended to limit Rey’s explorations, and Alonso’s participation was limited to meetings. In the sphere of culture, Rey’s explorations increased from those within the gang culture to different aspects of his life through his experiences with WRAP. The exploration in the sphere of community indicated significant changes in Rey’s comfort and confidence moving around in different locations. His active and consistent engagement in community projects and activities was subject to decline when conflicting interests or shifts in the family dynamic occurred.

The theme of emotion regulation in the sphere of family was expressed by a lack of efficient tools for managing strong emotions. As WRAP unfolded, modeling and practicing emotion regulation suggested a positive response when Rey’s parents began to take on the role of external regulators. The significant role of culture as an external emotion regulator was indicated by the need for awareness of the different cultural styles of handling emotions. In the sphere of community, a connection between Rey’s conduct problems and dysregulated emotions appeared to be indicated on several occasions. As
WRAP unfolded, Rey showed an increased ability to reevaluate situations in the community and expanded skills in the HeartMath’s emotion regulation technique.

**Discussion**

In the course of this case study, several indicators suggested that the extensive traumatic and distressing experiences in Rey’s and his family’s lives impacted their sense of safety and set them apart from the middle-class norm of perceived security and protection in the larger community. The nature of the distressing and traumatic experiences encompassed all spheres of the holistic model, reaching from traumatic personal experiences, traumatizing family patterns, loss of the orienting value of culture, to institutionalized discrimination, historic racism, and poverty. This provided a catalyst for the activation of multiple persistent defense responses that reached across the spheres of family, culture, and community. This study suggests that as a consequence, the family’s access to the resources and opportunities in the mainstream community was further limited.

Because wraparound programs create change by supporting coherence with the service systems surrounding the family (Burns et al., 2000), the professional team members sought to establish safety in their relationship with Rey and his family by providing dependable supportive experiences with focus on the family members’ needs in the community. Consistent with Ogden et al.’s (2006) work, establishing such a needs-based support increased a sense of trust and safety, decreased defensive reactions, and allowed the indicators of WRAP’s impact in the spheres of the holistic model (receiving
support, connectedness, participation, exploration, and emotion regulation) to occur. This study suggests that WRAP had a positive impact on Rey’s responses in these areas; nonetheless, progress toward his goal remained fragile and subject to change when Rey’s life circumstances changed.

The period of Rey’s and his family’s participation in WRAP was short in relation to the time during which the family members established their pre-existing response patterns. This study suggests that during WRAP Rey and his family learned, integrated, and applied new ways of handling day-to-day difficulties as well as positive changes in their lives. Ogden et al.’s (2006) work on sensorimotor therapy shows they improved their “capacity to self-regulate,” which Ogden et al. identified as “the foundation upon which a functional sense of self develops” (p. 42).

Furthermore, this research suggests that the complex process of responding to experiences during WRAP required that Rey and his family modify their defense activation system. This was evident in the following examples of emotion regulation:

1. Using communal and external orientation systems: In their current immigrant context, Rey’s and his family’s traditional cultural values did not provide sufficient orientation. The gang culture most likely had normalized Rey and Joe’s activated defense responses and had provided orientation as well as a sense of group identity. This orientation system was not compatible with expectations and rules in the dominant Anglo culture. The study suggests that the dominant Anglo culture’s values slowly became more relevant to Rey during his experiences with WRAP and that Rey began developing his personal integrated cultural identity.
2. Interactive emotion regulation: On several occasions during this study, it appears that Rey responded to interactive regulation with different WRAP team members. The study suggests that he used the professional team members, and later his parents, to process, to receive emotional support and to remain within or return to the safety of his “window of tolerance” (Ogden et al., 2006, p. 40). According to the research, this required the following qualities of the people entrusted with Rey’s external regulatory function: availability, awareness of his defense reactions, and consistent supportive responsiveness.

3. Auto-regulation: This research suggests that Rey demonstrated with the HeartMath tool how he could affect his heart rhythm by breathing deeply and calling up a positive emotion. His ability to temporarily enter what Ogden et al. (2006) described as a “state of optimal arousal,” where the “self-witnessing function” was in place, “access to cognitive, emotional, and sensorimotor levels of information were maintained” and his “integrative capacity increased” (p. 40). The study suggests that entering such a state in stressful life circumstances, for example, by replacing the use of drugs and alcohol for self-regulation with alternative techniques or engaging in intercultural communication with strangers (Matsumoto et al., 2007), requires awareness, self-motivation, and consistent practice.

Another aspect that stood out as the study unfolded was the wide spectrum of possible interventions to support Rey’s and his family’s process. The holistic integration of different approaches from individual and family therapy as well as community psychology within the WRAP process contributed to this variety. Instead of an “either-
or” choice, I suggest visualizing the different theoretical orientations on a continuum: (a) traditional psychotherapy to treat specific symptom-oriented, behavioral issues on one end and community psychology’s focus on well-being through social support and personal empowerment on the other; (b) strategic interventions, such as behavior planning with consequences, on one end and experiential learning and modeling on the other end; and (c) the clarity of professional boundaries on one end and the priority of the alliance with the participant on the other.

This study suggests that during WRAP, the quality of interventions depended on how the mixed team of professionals, community members, and family managed the above facets of the complex spectrum according to their own best ability and understanding and on their capacity to coordinate, learn, and work with each other.

The WRAP team made clinical choices as to what issues to address. As in any therapeutic process, multiple therapeutic opportunities were presented and some inconsistencies were present. At times the focus of the meetings got hijacked by a team member’s own agenda, frustrations between team members were not addressed, and occasionally the process was complicated by the sibling relationship between Leo and me. The professional team members did not always encourage family voice and choice when planning the next steps, and they were not present consistently. Family therapy interventions were not used on a regular basis to help Rey with the shift in the family roles when his brother returned or to empower the parents. Substance abuse issues remained largely unaddressed during the data collection period, and Rey’s complex trauma issues and emotional dysregulation were not treated explicitly. Important topics,
such as criminal or inappropriate behavior, were not always addressed and additional necessary community resources could not be found.

This case study revealed not only detailed insights into Rey and his family’s experiences but also described those of the treatment professionals. The result is an honest, realistic, on-the-ground account of what occurred in this specific WRAP team in the course of this research. There remain questions about how this process could have been facilitated differently, whether a more therapy-oriented treatment approach would have been more supportive, or whether Rey and his family would have attended external therapy services, with WRAP focusing only on the planning and community aspects. It took sustained efforts and time to find or create community resources, opportunities to practice job skills or make money, and to access activities in the community where Rey could explore his strengths and find ways to engage. Karl Dennis’s (as quoted in Kendziora, 1999) suggestion is still worth considering, “We miss the boat by thinking that mental health professionals are jacks of all trades. We need community developers to help us meet the needs of our community’s children” (para. 19).

Limitations of the Study

Case studies take place in a specific context, such as a particular economic, political, and social time. These may also be determining factors in the observed changes. Creswell (2007) argued that “qualitative researchers are reluctant to generalize from one case to another because the contexts of cases differ” (p. 74), and Stake (1995) wrote that “the real business of case study is particularization, not generalization” (p. 8). Hence, the
single case study design of this research limits the applicability of its findings. For example, not all youths involved with the legal system will have attachment issues or an extensive history of traumatic events in their background. Some might not respond well to approaches like WRAP, and others might be able to achieve their goals much faster.

We cannot know from the present moment of this study, what the long-term impact in Rey’s life will be. Some changes are internal, and cannot be observed; to know them depends on reflective self-reports by the participant.

By choosing to focus on Rey as an intensive case rather than on multiple WRAP clients as the unit of analysis eliminated the possibility exploring comparisons, contrasts, similarities, and differences. Experiences of different approaches and applications within WRAP, or in different contexts, or by other teams, were not addressed.

Because the case study is qualitative in nature, there is no quantitative evidence that correlates the shifts that occurred in Rey’s responses to the WRAP interventions. As Rey himself suggested, he could have matured or responded to outside events which the team and I were not aware of.

My double role of researcher and facilitator directly affected and influenced the process, increasing the likelihood for researcher bias. Babbie (2010) affirmed that “anything the participant-observer does or does not do will have some effect on what’s being observed; it’s simply inevitable” (p. 300). During data collection, I wondered at times if I were pushing for more team involvement to achieve a better outcome and noticed my increasing frustration when Rey engaged less with WRAP and the community.
but more with his friends. I tried to increase the time the team spent with Rey and his family.

My own characteristics as immigrant, clinician, and team member as well as working with my own brother on the same team most likely affected what I saw and how I interpreted it. All interpretations were based on my views and conclusions.

Furthermore, the individualized services provided by WRAP were designed by a specific team together with a specific client in a specific context. The team members’ skills and background varied from those of other teams. In the absence of overarching similarities even in the approaches of individual providers, agencies, and communities, a thorough comparison became difficult to achieve.

Despite efforts to include elements from other cultural regions and pointing out cultural differences, the multiple theoretical approaches applied in this study remain culture bound, and cultural assumptions are present on all levels of theory. For example, in this study the functioning of the parental unit between Alonso and Monica was seen through the lens of family therapy, where “the quality of the marital relationship to be key to overall family functioning” (Rothbaum, Rosen, Ujiie, & Uchida, 2002, p. 330). Attachment theory and family systems theory assign “pejorative labels [such as] ‘over-involved’, ‘enmeshed’, ‘undifferentiated’, ‘overly dependent’, and ‘symbiotic’” (p. 330).

In regard to Ogden et al.’s (2006) and van der Kolk and his many colleagues’ lifetime work, in his call for papers for the Modern Language Association convention in 2006, Craps (2005) wrote that “despite a stated commitment to the promotion of cross-cultural solidarity, trauma studies . . . retain a firmly Eurocentric perspective” (para. 2).
Implications for International Psychology

The risks to the mental health of children and adolescents are currently a “concern of global significance” (Stevens, 2007, p. 11). Stevens pointed at the drastic worldwide mental health consequences stemming from children’s and adolescents’ experience and/or witnessing of “extreme violence” and “acculturative stress” (p. 26-27). He affirmed that “there is much need for social policies and actions that rescue children and adolescents from lives geared toward survival, and harness their potential” (p. 21). Further, he emphasized the relevance of international psychology in assisting children and adolescents with the “healing of psychological wounds . . . in becoming reintegrated within mainstream society” (p. 26) as well as in supporting migrant and refugee populations in decreasing “acculturative stress” (p. 27).

This case study on the impact of WRAP on an immigrant probation youth provides a detailed account and analysis of individualized, community based, on-the-ground interventions. It contains elements that can be explored, expanded, and adapted to a wider global context, with the goal of increasing well-being in the area of mental health as well as fostering positive intergroup interactions. Some areas of global concern include the following:

- The connection between trauma and defense activation
- The inhibiting effect of a perceived lack of safety on nondefensive reactions to experiences
- The connection between trauma and criminal/violent behavior
- Factors in the participant’s life that further his engagement in a criminal gang, leading to potential violence and ensuring continuously activated defenses
• Discrimination and “pseudo racism” (Hall, 2002) in their function as mobilization defenses against stigmatization and outsider status

• The capacity to establish the sense of safety and well-being necessary to engage in responses appropriate for every-day nonthreatening life in the context of family, culture, and community, with the support of holistic interventions

• The importance of emotion regulation in order to achieve a sense of safety, control, and functioning within a specific social context

• Approaching culture as an external orientation system which contributes on a collective level to emotion regulation

This study demonstrated that the themes of defense, receiving support, connectedness, participation, exploration, and emotion regulation apply to the spheres of the individual youth, family, culture, community, and global community. Suggested topics for further research related to these themes and spheres as they apply to international psychology include the following:

• How might they be incorporated into the development of an assessment tool for the well-being of a person, family, group, or micro-culture?

• How might they contribute to holistically integrated community planning with focus on increasing safety?

• How might they assist in the development of more individualized and indigenized, on-the-ground interventions?

The areas of global concern mentioned above as well as further studies like this one, could make a contribution to international psychology in its capacity as “a new psychology with an expanded vision and horizon—a psychology respectful of differences in ideas, methods, and practices—a psychology tolerant of change, excited by challenge, and open to opportunity and responsibility” (Marsella, 2007, p. 358).
Conclusions

Although this single case study focused on Rey as a specific WRAP participant, it introduced ideas for further explorations and research in different national and international settings. Many of the issues that Rey faced are common for youths with immigrant background in the criminal justice systems worldwide, including but not limited to: dealing with social injustice, violence, poverty in the immigrant community, the quest for cultural identity, the vulnerability to trauma due to decreased caretaker availability to protect and parent, lack of access to services due to bicultural illiteracy and racism as well as lack of options to engage in the main stream culture and community.

Guided by the research question, “How does WRAP impact the experience of a probation youth with immigrant background in Santa Cruz County?” and the secondary questions presented at the outset, this study addressed the complex variety of experiences that shaped the participant. Rey’s life was impacted by many issues, such as his family’s immigration to the U.S., the family’s socioeconomic situation in their new community, the specific community’s stance toward immigrants, and the gang culture as well as the traumatic and distressing events that he faced. This study paid attention to the people involved in Rey’s life, which included his family, his friends, and such community members as teachers and project coordinators as well as the probation officer and mental health professionals in the WRAP team.

Theoretical constructs that helped understand Rey’s responses included the following: community psychology (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2006), the wraparound model (Burns et. al, 2000; Rauso & Vermillion, 2012; VanDenBerg et al., 2008), trauma and
sensorimotor psychotherapeutic approaches (Fisher, 2009; Herman, 1993; Ogden et al., 2006; van der Kolk, McFarlane, & Weisaeth, 2007), the Tonal model of connectedness (Arredondo, 2010), the HeartMath theory of coherence (Thurber, 2008), and UN-Habitat’s (2012) work on youth participation. However, each single theory proved too limited when examining the systemic context of a youth like Rey. Therefore, I developed a holistic theoretical framework for this research.

In the course analyzing the data collected about Rey and his family, six themes of WRAP’s impact on Rey emerged: defense, receiving support, connectedness, participation, exploration, and emotion regulation.

Rey’s reflections on the WRAP process at the end of data collection conveyed an overall impression on how he was impacted by the application of the holistic lens. His statements included his account of a personal turning point during WRAP, which involved being supported in the community, and that he loved and felt loved by the team members.

The holistic WRAP model combined with the themes of influence developed in this study offer a broad understanding of the wraparound process. For the reader unfamiliar with wraparound, this research may be relevant for gaining an overview of the model and the complex systemic manner in which it can be used to serve a specific client population. The spheres and themes simplify the complex context in which consumers and their families live.

For other wraparound projects and agencies, the holistic lens with the spheres and themes of impact may provide theoretical grounding for the wraparound process. Because
each person, team member, and context is different, this flexible holistic model, rather than a fixed, curriculum-based approach, can be pertinent to best serving the participating youths and families.

This study may be significant for supervisors in creating team constellations with a broad range of skills throughout the spheres and in providing training focused on increasing impact in the different themes addressed. The spheres and themes may be relevant in assessing the needs of youths and families and may be helpful with the planning of interventions.

For the professional team members this research may be pertinent for exploring the vast possibilities of interventions and for determining with the participant in which of the spheres more engagement is needed. Noticing the impact of wraparound interventions on the participant through the themes and spheres may be significant in processing, tracking, and celebrating the team’s success.

For the participants in the wraparound process, this research may serve as an account of the wraparound experience, how the team members can work together, and how wraparound can be a safe place for youths and family members to express their own views on how they want to grow and change.

Communities like the one where this study took place often harbor a history of violent intercultural encounters reaching back as far as global colonization. Public opinion stigmatizing and blaming immigrants, racism, riots, socioeconomic inequality as well as national immigration policies and laws affect how violence has been normalized within expectations of cultural adaptation. In addition, criminal gangs are influential
across borders and target youths needing social solidarity. Understanding the experiences of a single youth who has been impacted by these issues offers a level of insight and personal awareness that can lead to better methods of treatment, promotion of community-based projects, and influence international psychology.

Community psychology emphasizes a critical look at the researcher’s own process, in order to create more equality in the working relationship between participant and researcher (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2006). During this study, my relationship with Rey and my research committee became an intensive process of shared learning. While I was writing about the events during the data collection period, my use of a clinical orientation system initially limited my awareness of my own value-based interpretations. During the interactive process with the committee, I realized I needed to let go of my approach, and I experienced some anxiety and resistance to the sudden sense of not knowing. Once I fully embraced not knowing, the themes emerged, the process became clear, and the work moved toward a deeper level of understanding. Just as I had observed when Rey’s responses shifted, I myself had to create and tolerate a space between making an observation and immediately interpreting the event, in order to be open for new insights.

**Future Research**

Quantitative research could explore the WRAP process to advance the evidence of its effectiveness. This study, which reviewed the experience from the perspective of the participant and his family, may help future researchers guide their research questions.
The research design of this single case study invites conducting comparison studies including different WRAP teams and different participants to explore further, which aspects were specific to Rey, and which could be generalized to wraparound as a whole.

The use of the qualitative case study model may offer suggested pathways for quantitative research to confirm or reject thematic interpretations developed in this study. More and different measures associated with anxiety and somatic reactivity as well as others linked to indicators for receiving support, connectedness, participation, exploration, and emotion regulation could be applied in such a research structure. Additionally, pre- and postmeasures for the treatment professionals in areas such as worldview, preferences of interventions, ratings of self-disclosure, or experience with youth, families, culture, and community, could provide insights into the complex experiences during WRAP.

Both qualitative and quantitative measures for wraparound’s impact could be developed and applied in each of the themes. Assessment tools, such as structured questionnaires, could measure the impact of wraparound teams in the areas of defense, receiving support, connectedness, participation, exploration, and emotion regulation. An unanswered question exists as to which of the themes discussed in this study have the greatest impact on wraparound participants. Future studies could focus more closely on fewer factors, such as indicators of emotion regulation, parental warmth, or trauma and anxiety across individuals, families, cultures, and communities.

The scope of this study did not allow for the exploration of the impact of the outer environment on the participant and his family, which could yield an interesting field for
further research. In his lecture on adult and juvenile prison populations, the researcher Dr. Craig Haney (personal communication via Spring lecture, 2011, in Santa Cruz) pointed out the need for further research on the connection between criminal behavior and the amount of moving during childhood and adolescence in the lives of inmates. Such research could shed further light on the impact of immigration, which often not only implies moving between different countries but also during the attempts to settle in a new community.

During this study, the team dynamics shifted on several occasion. Frustrations, fears, and reactivity that emerged between team members show that the team itself is a vital variable and could be the subject of research to yield valuable insight into how to improve and maximize the collaboration and effectiveness of a wraparound team. The team culture, team cohesiveness, cultural affiliations of the team members, team interactions, team constellations, and how those factors influence wraparound service provision, also provide important areas of further research, because “best practices for implementing and administering wraparound” are continuously evolving (Bickman et al., 2003, p. 137).

Although it was not possible in the framework of this study, a case study designed to follow a participant from the beginning to the end of treatment would provide a more complete picture of a wraparound process’ impact on the participant during the treatment process. Further reaching longitudinal studies could enhance our understanding of the lasting impact of wraparound by researching the attitudes and responses to the
interventions over several developmental stages of the participants as well as sequences in the lifespan of their families.

Examining how programs such as wraparound could increase a youth’s and family’s influence on local policies would also prove a necessary field for further exploration because creating a supportive community is part of providing an affirming and protective context for clients and families, which cannot be substituted by individual institutions or providers. UN-Habitat’s (2012) work, which emphasizes the need to learn how to engage the concerned populations in participating in the creation of projects that improve their well-being, yields a vast and necessary field for future research.

International comparison studies could further inform the field of psychology how culturally different communities respond to holistic participatory treatment approaches with focus on the needs of young people at their fringe. Applications could include more methodologies developed in cooperation with native populations as well as with those who have to adjust as the result of migration.
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INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

October 21, 2011

To: Barbara Lutz

From: Alicia Cook, IRB Coordinator

RE: Non-Human Subjects Research

Per 45 CFR 46.102(d), an activity is considered to be “research” if it involves a “systematic investigation designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.” Activities not systematic, not designed to contribute to general knowledge, or done only for personal use (i.e. not shared with anyone else, including other members of the labor department) do not meet this definition.

Per 45 CFR 46.102(f), research is considered to involve “human subjects” if it entails obtaining information about living individuals, either through intervention or interaction with the individuals or if the research involves the use or receipt of individually identifiable information originally obtained in a context in which the individuals could reasonably expect privacy.

In order for a project to require IRB review it must be both “research” and involve “human subjects.” As your study does not involve a systematic investigation designed to contribute generalizable knowledge, your study does not meet the definition of human subjects and therefore does not require IRB review.

Cc: Leslie Wolowitz
APPENDIX B: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR PROJECT

County of Santa Cruz Mental Health, 
Health Services Agency
Comprehensive Children's Services

Address: P.O. Box 962, Santa Cruz CA 95061
Phone: 831-454-1950
Fax: 831-454-4916

January 24, 2011

Institutional Review Board 
TCS Education System 
325 North Wells Street, Room 1021 
Chicago, IL 60654

Dear IRB,

This is a letter of support for Barbara Lutz's proposed research project involving the intrinsic case study to better understand traumatized and conduct disordered probation youth with low emotional regulation skills. It is our agency's practice to allow staff members who are pursuing higher educational degrees to have access to both clinical populations and archival data pertaining to their research, conditional upon the successful IRB acceptance from their institution of higher learning. I will serve as our agency's liaison of Ms. Lutz's research, insuring that the conditions of your IRB approval are maintained in relationship to our client population and data resources.

Since our agency does not maintain an independent IRB, we rely upon the IRB of the institution in which the staff member is enrolled. We require that the staff member provide us with a copy of the IRB approval from their school prior to the initiation of any client contact related to a proposed study.

Access to agency demographic data, or other evaluation material produced by our agency or its organizational partners may be granted prior to IRB approval. This information may be used for the purposes of clarification of study parameters and literature review, in so much as it does not include identifiable client information.

I look forward to working with Ms. Lutz and your institution in the advancement of research-based exploration in this area of adolescent development.

Sincerely,

Stan Einhorn, Ph.D.
Program Manager, Children's Mental Health 
1400 Emeline Avenue, Bldg. K 
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
stanley.einhorn@health.co.santa-cruz.ca.us
831-454-4147 Fax: 831-454-4916
APPENDIX C: MINOR’S ASSENT AND CAREGIVER’S CONSENT

The Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Assent for Adolescent Participant

Study Title: Experiencing Wraparound Santa Cruz

Researcher: Barbara Lutz, MA, MFT 38000, Phone: ----------

I am asking you to participate in a research study. Please read the information below and feel free to ask any questions before signing the document.

Participating in this study is completely voluntary. Should you participate, you and I will be doing the same things we always do in Wraparound, with the difference that I will analyze the records and the notes of our meetings more closely. Should you choose not to participate, our relationship will stay the same.

The purpose of this project is to more fully understand how an adolescent like you goes through the Wraparound program. I look at your background, your cultural environment, what works and what doesn’t work for you, your personal response to the program, and what you experience while you are going through the program.

Your Wraparound treatment will be the same as usual, which includes regular family-, team-, and individual meetings, according what you and your family and your Wraparound team have come up with in your family plan. I will look at your process through the Wraparound program for 3 months. You will help us understand, how you respond to the program, and what youths in your situation might find helpful or not helpful about the Wraparound process. All the information (progress notes, my field
diary, and your case file) will be kept confidential, just like the information of anyone else who does not participate in the study.

The Wraparound program does not work for everyone, and you might not benefit from the treatment, whether you participate in the study or not. I am a mandated reporter, and need to make sure you get help when I hear you disclose things that are dangerous to yourself or others, whether you participate in this study or not.

Just like with everyone else in the program, I will ensure that what happens during Wraparound is confidential, and only disclose information with your—and your caregiver’s written consent. To make sure no one can identify who you are should they read this study, I will not use your real name. In case that you have lived through an event that might make it easy for a potential reader of my dissertation to know who you are, I will change the facts so that you cannot be identified. My notes and materials will be kept with your chart at the locked file cabinet of the county office.

Taking part in the study will not change your relationship to me or anyone else in your Wraparound team, and should you want to discontinue the study, you can do so at any time without any penalty. Your Wraparound team will stay the same. You will not gain any privileges by participating, but you will help us understand better how the program works for youths in your situation.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at *******-****. If you are uncomfortable talking to me directly, you can talk to my supervisor Holly Heath (831-763-8234), or any person you trust and who will let me know about your concerns. You can also call or write to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the Chicago School of
Professional Psychology, which is concerned about protecting your rights. You may reach the IRB office Monday-Friday by calling 312-467-2343 or write to the Institutional Review Board, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, 325 N. Wells, Chicago, Illinois 60654.

Assent:

I have read this form, understand the study, and agree to participate. My participation is voluntary and I do not have to sign this form if I don’t want to be part of this project. I will receive a copy of this form.

Signature:

Date:

Signature of Researcher:

Date:

Parent/Guardian/Legally Authorized Representative Consent:

I give my permission for my son/daughter/relative to participate in this research project.

Signature of Parent/Guardian/Legally Authorized Representative:

Date:

Signature of Researcher:

Date:

Consent Revised 9/19/2011
APPENDIX D: SPANISH MINOR’S ASSENT AND CAREGIVER’S CONSENT

The Chicago School of Professional Psychology (La Escuela de Chicago de Psicología Profesional)

Asentimiento para Participante Adolescente

Título del estudio: La Experiencia Wraparound Santa Cruz

Investigadora: Barbara Lutz, MA, MFT 38000, Teléfono: """

Te pido que participes en un estudio de investigación. Lee la información siguiente y no dudes en hacer cualquier pregunta antes de firmar el documento.

Tu participación en este estudio es completamente voluntaria. En el caso de que participes, tú y yo haremos lo mismo que siempre hacemos en Wraparound, con la diferencia de que yo analizaré los archivos y las notas de nuestras juntas más atentamente. En el caso de que decidas no participar, nuestra relación seguirá siendo la misma.

El objetivo de este proyecto es entender más completamente cómo un adolescente como tú participa en el programa Wraparound. Yo miro de dónde vienes, tu entorno cultural, lo que te ayuda y lo que no te ayuda, cómo respondes personalmente al programa, y lo que experimentas mientras pasas por el programa.

Tu tratamiento Wraparound será el mismo que el que reciben las personas que no participan en el estudio, incluyendo juntas regulares de familia, equipo e individuales, de acuerdo con lo que tú, tu familia y tu equipo Wraparound hayan decidido en tu plan familiar. Yo observaré tu proceso en el programa Wraparound durante 3 meses. Tú nos ayudarás a entender cómo respondes al programa y lo que a los jóvenes en tu situación les ayudaría o no en el proceso Wraparound. Toda la información (notas de progreso, mi
diario de campo y el archivo de tu caso) se mantendrá confidencial, igual que la
información de cualquier otra persona que no participe en el estudio.

El programa Wraparound no funciona para todo el mundo, y es posible que no te
beneficies del tratamiento, participes en el estudio o no. Yo, como persona bajo mandato
legal de reportar, necesito asegurarme de que tú recibas ayuda si yo te escucho hablar de
cosas peligrosas para ti o para otras personas, participes en este estudio o no.

Al igual que harán todos en el programa, me aseguraré de que todo lo que pasa
durante Wraparound es confidencial, y sólo revelaré información con tu consentimiento
escrito—o el de tu cuidador. Para asegurarme de que nadie pueda identificar quién eres si
leen este estudio, no usaré tu nombre verdadero. Si has vivido una experiencia que haga
más fácil que un posible lector de mi tesis pudiera saber quién eres, cambiaré los hechos
para que no puedas ser identificado. Mis notas y materiales se guardarán en tu archivo
en el archivador cerrado con llave de la oficina del condado.

Tomar parte en el estudio no cambiará tu relación conmigo ni con ningún otro
miembro de tu equipo Wraparound, y en el caso de que quieras dejar el estudio, puedes
hacerlo en cualquier momento sin ninguna consecuencia. Tu equipo Wraparound seguirá
siendo el mismo. Tú no recibirás ningún privilegio con tu participación, pero nos
ayudarás a entender mejor cómo funciona el programa para jóvenes en tu situación.

Si tienes alguna pregunta o preocupación, llámame al -----------. Si te sientes
incómodo/a hablando conmigo directamente, puedes hablar con mi supervisora Holly
Heath (831 763 8234), o con cualquier persona de confianza que pueda explicarme tus
preocupaciones. También puedes llamar o escribir al Institutional Review Board (Comité
de Revisión Institucional, o IRB, por sus siglas en inglés) de la Escuela de Chicago de Psicología Profesional, que se ocupa de la protección de tus derechos. Puedes comunicarte con la oficina del IRB de lunes a viernes llamando al 312 467 2343 o por correo: Institutional Review Board, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, 325 N. Wells, Chicago, Illinois, 60654.

Asentimiento:

He leído este documento, entiendo el estudio y estoy de acuerdo en participar. Mi participación es voluntaria y no necesito firmar este documento si no deseo tomar parte en este proyecto. Recibiré una copia de este documento.

Firma:
Fecha:
Firma de la Investigadora:
Fecha:
Consentimiento del Padre/Tutor/Representante Legalmente Autorizado:
Doy permiso para que mi hijo/hija/pariente participe en este proyecto de investigación.
Firma del Padre/Tutor/Representante Legalmente Autorizado:
Fecha:
Firma de la Investigadora:
Fecha:

Consentimiento Revisado 10/07/11
APPENDIX E: ADULT WRAP TEAM MEMBER CONSENT

The Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Adult Wraparound Team Member Consent for Participation in Research

Study Title: Experiencing Wraparound Santa Cruz

Researcher: Barbara Lutz, MA, MFT 38000, Phone: *******

You are being asked to participate in a research study. Please take your time to read the information below and feel free to ask any questions before signing this document.

The purpose of this project is to more fully understand how an adolescent experiences the Wraparound process in Santa Cruz County Children’s Mental Health, and what impact it has on an adolescent undergoing the program. I intend to show the adolescent’s personal response to the program, and to look at the youth’s response to the interventions. Since researcher, parents and youth are working as a team together, what we plan, do, and accomplish together in our team will be part of adolescent’s experience of the program.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Should you participate, you will be part of the regular Wraparound project with all the same modalities, with the difference that I will be analyzing the records and the notes of our meetings more closely. If you choose not to participate, any of your input in the Wraparound process will be excluded from the research. Should you decide to withdraw from the process at a later point, there will be no penalties or changes to the course of treatment.
The Wraparound treatment will include regular family-, team-, and individual meetings, according to what the youth, family, and team determine in the family plan. If you agree to participate, the data collection process will continue for the period of 3 months. Data will consist of the progress notes of our meetings and conversations, a field diary, and the case file. If you chose to participate in this study, the Wraparound treatment will start and follow its course without any alterations that are caused by the research.

The procedures to be followed during this research resemble the standard Wraparound process. Notes are taken after each session, and interactions are documented. All the information gathered will be confidential and placed in a locked file cabinet and in the locked file room at Santa Cruz County Children’s Mental Health. You have a right to privacy, and all information identifying you will remain anonymous and confidential. In the written research study no identifying information will appear without your permission, and a different name will be used referring to you and the youth. Events that might lead to your identification will be carefully changed. The results of this study may be published in scientific journals or be presented at psychological meetings as long as you are not identified and cannot reasonably be identified from it.

There are no rewards for participation in this research, but you will contribute to further the understanding of how adolescents in the Santa Cruz Children’s Mental Health Wraparound program respond to the specific interventions, and what they find helpful or not helpful about the Wraparound process.
Because the goal of research is to document the youth’s experience of Wraparound, it is anticipated that there is minimal to no risks for your participation in this study outside of your standard clinical involvement in Wraparound. The Wraparound program does not work for everyone and our team efforts might not improve the situation of the adolescent. Participation in this study does not influence the outcome of the treatment.

I need to remind you that I am a mandated reporter who is obligated to contact the authorities should there be evidence of a person being a danger to self or others.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at -----------. Should you feel uncomfortable talking with me about the issue, you can talk to my supervisor Holly Heath (831 763 8234), or anyone you trust and who will let me know about the concerns. You can also call or write to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the Chicago School of Professional Psychology, which is concerned with the protection of subjects in research projects. You may reach the IRB office Monday-Friday by calling 312 467 2343 or writing: Institutional Review Board, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, 325 N. Wells, Chicago, Illinois, 60654.

Consent:

Subject: The research project and the procedures have been explained to me. I agree to participate in this study. My participation is voluntary and I do not have to sign this form if I do not want to be part of this research project. I will receive a copy of this consent form for my records.

Signature:
Date:

Signature of Researcher:

Date:

Consent Revised 9/20/11
Se solicita su participación en un estudio de investigación. Tómese su tiempo para leer la información siguiente y no dude en hacer cualquier pregunta antes de firmar este documento.

El objetivo de este proyecto es entender más completamente cómo experimenta un adolescente el proceso Wraparound en el Departamento de Salud Mental Infantil del Condado de Santa Cruz, y qué impacto tiene en un adolescente participante en el programa. Mi intención es demostrar cómo responde personalmente un adolescente al programa, y examinar la respuesta del joven a las intervenciones. Puesto que la investigadora, los padres y el joven trabajan juntos como equipo, lo que planificamos, hacemos, y logramos juntos en nuestro equipo formará parte de la experiencia que tiene el adolescente en el programa.

Su participación en este estudio es completamente voluntaria. En el caso de que usted participe, formará parte del proyecto Wraparound normal, incluyendo todas las mismas modalidades, con la diferencia de que yo analizaré los archivos y las notas de nuestras juntas más atentamente. Si decide no participar, todas sus contribuciones al proceso Wraparound se excluirán de la investigación. En el caso de que decidiera
retirarse del proceso más adelante, no habría ninguna desventaja ni ningún cambio en el curso del tratamiento.

El tratamiento Wraparound incluirá juntas regulares de familia, equipo e individuales, de acuerdo con lo determinado por el joven, la familia y el equipo en el plan familiar. Si está de acuerdo en participar, el proceso de recogida de datos continuará durante un periodo de 3 meses. Los datos consistirán en las notas de progreso de nuestras juntas y conversaciones, un diario de campo, y el archivo del caso. Si decide participar en este estudio, el tratamiento Wraparound comenzará y seguirá su curso sin que la investigación cause ninguna alteración.

Los procedimientos a seguir durante esta investigación se asemejan al proceso Wraparound normal. Se tomarán notas después de cada sesión, y se documentarán las interacciones. Toda la información recogida será confidencial y se mantendrá en un archivador bajo llave, en la sala de archivos cerrada con llave del Departamento de Salud Mental Infantil del Condado de Santa Cruz. Usted tiene derecho a la privacidad, y toda la información que le identifique se mantendrá anónima y confidencial. En el estudio de investigación escrito no aparecerá ninguna información identificativa sin su permiso, y se utilizarán nombres diferentes para referirse a usted y al joven. Los eventos que pudieran causar su identificación se modificarán cuidadosamente. Los resultados de este estudio pueden ser publicados en revistas científicas o presentados en reuniones psicológicas, siempre y cuando usted no sea identificado y no pueda ser identificado razonablemente como resultado.
No se ofrecen recompensas por participar en esta investigación, pero usted contribuirá a promover el entendimiento de cómo los adolescentes del programa Wraparound del Departamento de Salud Mental Infantil de Santa Cruz responden a las intervenciones específicas, y lo que consideran útil o no sobre el proceso Wraparound.

Puesto que el objetivo de la investigación es documentar la experiencia que tiene el joven en Wraparound, se anticipa que no existirán riesgos por participar en este estudio, o que los riesgos serán mínimos aparte de su participación clínica habitual en Wraparound. El programa Wraparound no funciona para todo el mundo, y es posible que nuestros esfuerzos de equipo no mejoren la situación del adolescente. La participación en este estudio no afecta el resultado del tratamiento.

Necesito recordarle que como persona bajo mandato legal de reportar, tengo la obligación de ponerme en contacto con las autoridades si hay indicios de que alguien representa un peligro para sí mismo o para otras personas.

Si tiene alguna pregunta o preocupación, llámeme al ----------. Si se siente incómodo/a hablando conmigo directamente, puede hablar con mi supervisora Holly Heath (831 763 8234), o con cualquier persona de confianza que pueda explicarme sus preocupaciones. También puede llamar o escribir al Institutional Review Board (Comité de Revisión Institucional, o IRB, por sus siglas en inglés) de la Escuela de Chicago de Psicología Profesional, que se ocupa de la protección de sujetos en proyectos de investigación. Puede comunicarse con la oficina del IRB de lunes a viernes llamando al 312 467 2343 ó por correo: Institutional Review Board, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, 325 N. Wells, Chicago, Illinois, 60654.
Consentimiento:

Sujeto: Se me han explicado el proyecto de investigación y los procedimientos. Consiento en participar en este estudio. Mi participación es voluntaria y no necesito firmar este documento si no deseo tomar parte en este proyecto de investigación. Recibiré una copia de este consentimiento para mis archivos.

Firma:
Fecha:

Firma de la investigadora:
Fecha:

Consentimiento revisado 10/07/11
APPENDIX G: WRAP FIDELITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Before you had your first team meeting, did someone fully explain the wraparound process? When you first met your wraparound facilitator, were you given time to talk about your family strengths, beliefs, and traditions? Did this process help you appreciate what is special about your family? At the beginning of the wraparound process, did you have a chance to tell your wraparound facilitator what things have worked in the past for your child and family? Is it difficult to get team members to attend team meetings when they are needed? At your first wraparound team meeting, did you go through a process of identifying what leads to dangerous situations for your child and your family and develop a plan that specifies what everyone will do to respond to the crisis? Did you and your team plan and create a written family plan that describes what you want to accomplish for your youth and family in the wraparound process? Do you have a written copy of the plan? Did the family create a vision statement that describes what the family’s vision of itself in the future? Does the wraparound plan include strategies for helping your child get involved with activities in his or her community? If so, what are some examples? Are there members of your wraparound team who do NOT have a role in implementing your plan? Does your team brainstorm many strategies to address your family’s need before selecting one? Do you feel like other people on your team have higher priority than you in designing your wraparound plan? Are important decisions made about your youth or family when you are not there? Does the team find
ways to increase the support you get from your friends and family? Do the members of your team hold one another responsible for doing their part of the wraparound plan?

Does your team come up with new ideas for your wraparound plan when things are not working? Does the team assign specific tasks to all team members at the end of each meeting? Does the team review each team member’s follow-through on their tasks at the next meeting? Does your team go out of its way to make sure that all team members—including friends, family, and natural supports—present ideas and participate in decision making? Do all the members of your team demonstrate respect for you and your family?

Does your child have the opportunity to communicate his or her own ideas when the time comes to make decisions? Has your team discussed a plan for how the wraparound process will end? Does your team have a plan for when this will occur? Has the wraparound process helped your child to solve her or his own problems? Has the wraparound process helped your family to develop or strengthen relationships that will support you when wraparound is finished? Do you feel like you and your family will be able to succeed without the formal wraparound process?
APPENDIX H: QUESTIONS ADAPTED FROM CHRISTINE ARTELLO’S (2010) WRAPAROUND ASSESSMENT

1. Briefly describe how things are going in your life.
2. What kind of things do you like to do?
3. What are your friends like?
4. Describe your best friend and a typical activity you would do together.
5. What do you like about your school/job?
6. What do you do for fun?
7. How do you get along with your family?
8. What is a typical day like for you?
9. Do you remember how you felt before wraparound? Do you feel you are the same person now as before?
10. What kind of things did wraparound do for you?
11. What did wraparound do for your family?
12. Could you refuse to do something and felt you had an option?
13. How do you think the team members thought of you? How did they perceive your family?
14. Do you think they were accurate? Was it helpful?
15. What do you think was the turning point for you at wraparound?
16. Do you feel you have made different choices as a result of wraparound?
17. How do you imagine your life will be like in 10 years from now?
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