<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Location</th>
<th>Reported Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>Treatment/Comparison Conditions</th>
<th>Follow-up Period</th>
<th>Treatment Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alexander, 1971 Salt Lake City, UT | Delinquent youth arrested and detained for run away, unguovernable, or habitually truant n=40 13-16 years old | Random assignment:  
a. FFT only, n=10  
b. individual therapy only (IT), n=10  
c. FFT+IT, n=10  
d. no treatment control, minimal probation supervision | Post-treatment | Risk/protective process: Family therapy plus individual therapy produced significantly greater improvements in communication style than other conditions |
| Alexander & Parsons, 1973 Salt Lake City, UT | Delinquent youth arrested and detained for run away, declared unguovernable, or habitually truant n=99 13-16 years old | Random assignment (a-d):  
a. FFT, n=46;  
b. client-centered family groups, n=19  
c. psychodynamic family therapy, n=11  
d. no treatment control, n=10  
e. post hoc selected controls, n=46  
f. national sample controls, n=2800 | 6-18 months | Recidivism: FFT recidivism was 26%, compared to 50% for no treatment control, 47% for client-centered family groups, and 73% for psychodynamic family therapy  
Risk/protective process: FFT produced significant improvements in family interactions compared to all other comparison conditions |
| Parsons & Alexander, 1973; Alexander & Barton, 1976; 1980 Salt Lake City, UT | Delinquent youth arrested and detained for run away, unguovernable, or truant n=40  
Mean age=15.1 years | Random assignment:  
a. FFT, n=20  
b. client centered family therapy, n=10  
c. no treatment control, n=10 | Post-treatment | Risk/protective process: FFT families displayed significant changes in interactions. No improvements in controls. |
| Barton, Alexander, Waldron, Turner, & Warburton, 1985-Study 1 Salt Lake City, UT | Delinquent youth referred for 3-6 status offenses (e.g., shoplifting, unguovernable) n=27 | Non-random assignment:  
a. FFT, n=27  
b. district juvenile justice base rates | 13 months | Recidivism: 26% for the FFT group, compared to the 51% population base rate  
Risk/protective process: Significant reductions in family defensiveness |
| Barton, Alexander, Waldron, Turner, & Warburton, 1985-Study 2 Salt Lake City, UT | Status offender delinquent youth at risk for out-of-home placement n=325 | Non-random assignment:  
a. FFT with trained therapists, n=109  
b. community-based social workers with limited FFT training , n=216 | Post-treatment | Foster placements: Reduction in foster care placement referrals FFT (11%) versus non-FFT (49%)  
Treatment services: Reduction in units of service per family to less than half (14.7-6.2) |
| Barton, Alexander, Waldron, Turner, & Warburton, 1985; Study 3 Salt Lake City, UT | Seriously delinquent youth, post incarceration for severe, chronic offenses (Mean=20) n=74 | Non-random assignment:  
a. FFT, n=30  
b. alternative treatment, n=44 | 15 months | Recidivism: 60% for the FFT group; 93% for those who receive regular services. Those in the FFT group who did reoffend did so at a lower rate/frequency than those in the regular services group (.202 vs .474) |
| Klein, Alexander, & Parsons, 1977 Salt Lake City, UT | Siblings in 99 families of delinquent youth (see Alexander & Parsons, 1973) n=99 13-16 years old | Random assignment:  
a. FFT, n=46  
b. client centered family therapy, n=19  
c. psychodynamic family therapy, n=11  
d. no treatment control, n=10 | 30-40 months | Recidivism: 20% in siblings of those who had received FFT, compared to 40% for no-treatment controls, 59% for client-centered family treatment, and 63% for eclectic-dynamic family treatment |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Location</th>
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</table>
| Friedman, 1989; Stanton & Shaddish, 1997 Philadelphia, PA | Drug-abusing adolescents n=135 14-21 years old (Mean=17.8) 89% nonHispanic white, 11% other | Random assignment:  
a. FFT, n=91  
b. parenting group intervention, n=75 | > 15 months | Substance use; Significant pre-post reductions at all follow-up points, with greater reductions in FFT, compared to parenting intervention (see Stanton & Shaddish, 1997)  
Risk/protective process: FFT produced greater involvement of parents, lower family dropout rate, improved psychiatric and family functioning in both conditions |
| Lewis, Piercy, Sprenkle, & Trepper, 1990 Lafayette, IN | Youth reporting regular substance use n=136 | Random assignment:  
a. Purdue Brief Family Therapy  
b. Family Drug Education | Post-treatment | Substance use; Reductions in substance use only for family therapy condition involving an adaptation of FFT, not education group |
| Regas & Sprenkle, 1982 Lafayette, IN | Youth with ADHD diagnosis referred to child protective services n=55 | Random assignment:  
a. FFT  
b. group therapy  
c. no treatment control group, n=10 | Post-treatment | ADHD: FFT and group therapy produced significant improvements in ADHD behaviors at home and at school, but only FFT also led to significantly more positive perceptions of the family |
| Gordon, Arbuthnot, Gustofson, & McGreen, 1988; Gustofson, Gordon, & Arbuthnot, 1985; Gordon, Graves, & Arbuthnot, 1995; Gordon, 1995-Study 1 Southeastern Ohio | Rural, lower SES delinquent youth; juvenile offenses: status, misdemeanor, felony n=54 Mean age: 15.4 years 100% nonHispanic White | Matched assignment, with more severe cases assigned to family therapy:  
a. FFT, n=27  
b. probation services as usual, n=27 | 30 months; 60-month follow-up of adult convictions | Recidivism: FFT group had 11% recidivism compared to 67% in the regular services group at 30-month follow-up and 8.7% recidivism compared to 41% in the regular services group at 60-month follow-up.  
Cost analyses: Cost-benefit analysis on these groups indicated that FFT had significantly lower direct costs than treatment as usual |
| Gordon & Arbuthnot, 1990; Gordon, 1995-Study 2 Southeastern Ohio | Chronic offenders, average of 3 to 4 prior institutional commitments n=49 17-18 years old | Non-random assignment:  
a. FFT, n=49  
b. statistical control: empirically derived risk of recidivating based on age, age of onset, number of offenses | 12-18 months | Recidivism: FFT group had 30% with a new conviction after treatment, compared to 60-75% average expected for statistical control group, and 12% with a new institutional commitment, compared to 50-60% average expected for statistical controls |
| Gordon, 1995-Study 3 Ohio | Delinquent youth released from incarceration 16-17 years old n=25 | Matched assignment:  
a. FFT, n=27  
b. probation services as usual, n=25 | 16 months | Recidivism: FFT group showed a 33% recidivism rate, compared to 64% in the services as usual group. |
| Lantz, 1982 Salt Lake City, UT | Delinquent adolescents n=46 | Random assignment:  
a. FFT, n=22  
b. alternative treatment, n=24 | Post-treatment | Recidivism: 50% in the FFT group and 88% in the control group.  
Foster placement: 18% in the FFT group were placed outside the home, compared to 72% in the control group |
| Hansson, Cederblad, & Hook, 2000; Harrison, 1998; Lund, Sweden | Youth referred following arrest for serious offenses n=89 | Random assignment:  
a. FFT, n=40  
b. treatment as usual, n=49 | 24 months | Recidivism: 41% in the FFT group, 82% in the "as usual" group  
Externalizing: FFT group associated with greater reductions in youth and parent reports of youth externalizing |
a. FFT, n=45  
b. social work services as usual, n=50 | 18 months | Recidivism: 41% in the FFT group, 82% in the "as usual" group  
Youth symptoms: FFT group associated with greater reductions in youth and parent reports of externalizing and internalizing symptoms  
Risk/protective process: Improved family functioning, and reduced maternal depression, somatization, and anxiety in FFT group |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study/Location</th>
<th>Reported Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>Treatment/Comparison Conditions</th>
<th>Follow-up Period</th>
<th>Treatment Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waldron, Slesnick, Brody, Turner, &amp; Peterson, 2001; Waldron, Ozechowski, Turner, &amp; Brody, 2012a; French, M. T., Zavala, S. K., McCollister, K. E., Waldron, H. B., Turner, C. W., &amp; Ozechowski, T. J., 2008 Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>Substance-abusing youth, moderate/heavy use n=120; 13-18 years (Mean=15.6) 38% nonHispanic White, 47% Hispanic, 8% Native American, 7% other</td>
<td>Random assignment: a. FFT b. individual CBT (IT) c. group CBT (GT) d. integrated FFT+CBT</td>
<td>19 months</td>
<td>Substance use; FFT, GT, and FFT+CBT all showed significant reductions in substance use from pre- to post-treatment or follow-up; FFT and IBFT superior to IT Delinquency: Risk/protective process: Improvements in family functioning associated with substance use reductions in the FFT conditions, but not GT, supporting family improvement as a mechanism of change in FFT Cost analyses: FFT and FFT+CBT were more cost effective than IT or GT at post-treatment due to lack of post-treatment effects for these conditions. GT was more cost effective than the other treatment conditions at follow-up, albeit with delayed benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnoski, 2002; Aos, Phipps, Barnoski, &amp; Lieb, 2001; Aos, Lieb, Mayfield, Miller, &amp; Pennucci, 2004</td>
<td>Delinquent youth n=750</td>
<td>Assignment (nonrandom) based on caseload capacity: a. FFT, n=427 b. wait-list controls, n=323</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Recidivism: Youth with competent/adherent FFT therapists had significantly lower recidivism (34%) and felony recidivism (13%), compared to controls (43% and 19%, respectively) Cost analyses: Financial benefits of the dissemination were estimated at $7.50 for each dollar of program cost for adherent therapists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flicker, Waldron, &amp; Turner, Brody, &amp; Hops, 2008 Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>Youth with substance use disorders, moderate-heavy use n=88; 13-19 years (Mean age=15.7) 50% Anglo, 50% Hispanic</td>
<td>Random assignment: a. FFT b. integrated FFT+CBT</td>
<td>Post-treatment</td>
<td>Substance use: Significant pre-post reductions in substance use for all youth in FFT and FFT+CBT. Hispanic youth with Hispanic therapists showed greater decreases in substance use compared to Hispanic youth with Anglo therapists. Ethnic match was not related to treatment outcome for Anglo youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slesnick &amp; Prestopnik, 2009 Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>Alcohol-abusing runaway youth n=119; 12-17 years (Mean=15.1) 29% Anglo, 44% Hispanic, 11% Native American, 5% African American, 11% Other</td>
<td>Random assignment: a. home-based ecological family therapy, n=37 b. office-based FFT, n=40 c. services as usual, n=42</td>
<td>15 months</td>
<td>Substance use: Significant pre- to post-treatment reductions in alcohol and drug use for all three conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexton &amp; Turner, 2010 Washington State</td>
<td>Youth referred to community agencies</td>
<td>Random assignment: a. FFT b. probation services as usual</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Recidivism: Overall, no differences were found between FFT and services as usual. However, when therapist adherence to the model was high, FFT showed significantly greater reductions in felonies (35%) and violent crimes (30%), with a marginally significant reduction in misdemeanors (21%), compared to services as usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldron, Brody, Turner, &amp; Ozechowski, 2012b Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>Youth problem-drinking, other substance use disorders, moderate-heavy use n=140 13-19 years old (Mean=16.3) 45% nonHispanic White, 44% Hispanic, 7% Native American, 4% other</td>
<td>Random assignment: a. FFT b. individual CBT (IT) c. group CBT (GT) d. integrated FFT+CBT</td>
<td>19 months</td>
<td>Substance use: All four conditions showed significant reductions in alcohol use and FFT, IT, and GT (but not FFT+CBT) showed significant reductions in marijuana and other illicit drug use from pre- to post-treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hops, Ozechowski, Waldron, Davis, Brody, J. L., &amp; Barrera, M. (2011)</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM and Salem/Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>n=245 13-19 years old (Mean=15.8) 49% Anglo (nonHispanic White), 51% Hispanic</td>
<td>Random assignment to treatment conditions: a. individual CBT (IT) b. integrated FFT+CBT</td>
<td>13-19 years</td>
<td>Marijuana use for Hispanics in FFT+CBT, compared to IT use. Significant pre- to post-treatment reductions in HIV-risk behaviors for high-risk youth in both treatment conditions, with greater reductions in IT than FFT+CBT and greater reductions for high risk Anglos, compared to Hispanics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldron, Ozechowski, Brody, Turner, Hops, &amp; Scherer, 2012</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>Youth with substance use disorders, moderate-heavy use n=74 13-18 yrs old (Mean=16.4) 40% nonHispanic White, 54% Hispanic, 6% other</td>
<td>Random assignment to post-FFT aftercare condition: a. FFT + home aftercare (FFT-HA) b. FFT + group CBT aftercare (FFT-G) c. FFT + telephone aftercare (FFT-TA)</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Substance use: FFT showed significant reductions in substance use, with changes maintained in FFT-HA and FFT-TA, but not FFT-G. FFT-HA was superior to FFT-G at 12-months. Delinquency: FFT showed significant reductions in delinquency, with reductions maintained in FFT-HA and FFT-TA, but not FFT-G. FFT-HA and FFT-TA were superior to FFT-G at 12-months. Risk/protective process: Improvements in depression, anxiety, withdrawn behavior, and family functioning found for all FFT conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohde, Waldron, Turner, Brody, &amp; Jorgensen, 2012</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM and Portland, OR</td>
<td>Dually diagnosed depressed and substance-abusing youth, moderate-heavy use n=170 13-19 years old (Mean =16.4) 54% nonHispanic White, 32% Hispanic, 4% African American, 10% other</td>
<td>Random assignment to treatment sequence: a. FFT, followed by group CBT (FFT-GT) b. Group CBT, followed by FFT (GT-FFT) c. Integrated FFT+GT</td>
<td>19 months</td>
<td>Substance use: Preliminary findings show significant reductions in substance use from pre- to post-treatment and follow-up for treatment completers in all conditions, with superior retention and greater improvements in depression and substance use across all youth in the integrated FFT+GT condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldron, Brody, Turner, Ozechowski, &amp; Hops, 2008</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
<td>Substance use disordered youth, moderate-heavy use n=140 13-19 years old (Mean=16.5) 40% nonHispanic White, 41% Hispanic, 19% other</td>
<td>Random assignment to treatment sequence: a. group CBT, then FFT if needed (GT-FFT) b. group CBT, then individual CBT if needed (GT-IT)</td>
<td>6-11 months</td>
<td>Substance use: Preliminary findings show significant reductions in substance use from pre- to post-treatment and follow-up for treatment completers in both conditions, with superior retention and greater improvements in substance use across all youth in the GT-FFT condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins, Waldron, Hops, Turner, Ozechowski, Brody, &amp; Alexander, 2011</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Youth referred to community agencies for behavioral disturbances, at-risk for or diagnosed with substance use disorder Projected n=288 13-17 years old</td>
<td>Random assignment to supervision: a. FFT, supervision as usual + observation-based feedback to therapists b. FFT, supervision as usual (no observation-based feedback)</td>
<td>16 months</td>
<td>Study in progressing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>