

Factors Associated with Cigarette Smoking in Homeless Adults: Findings From an Outpatient Counseling Clinic

Benjamin Wrucke, BS; Lauren Bauer, MD; Rebecca Bernstein, MD

ABSTRACT

Background: Those who are homeless are 4 times more likely to smoke cigarettes than the general population in the United States. Though research has investigated smoking risk factors among homeless individuals, further investigation is needed to understand factors that can be addressed by smoking cessation programs. This study seeks to understand characteristics associated with cigarette use in clients of the counseling clinic at a Midwest homeless shelter, including whether homeless individuals who smoke demonstrate lower self-efficacy, greater social isolation, poorer perception of therapy, and greater levels of chronic homelessness than nonsmokers.

Methods: From 2014 through 2019, clients of the counseling clinic were invited to contribute to a data bank. Logistic regression was performed to determine predictors of smoking status.

Results: No association was identified between smoking status and self-efficacy, social isolation, perception of therapy, or chronic homelessness. Compared to those without a high school degree, odds of being a smoker were 95% lower for those with a high school degree or equivalent and 93% lower for those with more than a high school education. Those with 3 or more episodes of prior substance abuse treatment were more likely to be smokers.

Conclusion: This study demonstrates that cigarette use among the homeless population is associated with low education level and prior substance abuse treatment. Smoking cessation programs would benefit from tailoring information to the education level of their audience. Further study could determine whether use of other substances may contribute to cigarette use in the homeless population and how this may be addressed by smoking cessation programs.

motherhood, and minority status,² as well as lower educational attainment³⁻⁶ and past-year illicit substance abuse.³ Factors associated with tobacco use in homeless adults include “out-of-home placement in childhood, victimization while homeless, past-year employment, prior illicit drug use, and problem alcohol use.”⁷

Smoking cessation programs are valuable for reducing smoking prevalence, and such programs must not ignore how the homeless community is disproportionately affected by cigarette use.¹ Though some research has been done to investigate smoking risk factors among individuals who are homeless, further investigation is needed to understand factors that can be addressed by smoking cessation programs. This study sought to understand personal and health characteristics associated with smoking in clients of the counseling clinic at a Midwest homeless shelter.

INTRODUCTION

Those who are homeless are 4 times more likely to smoke than the general US population.¹ Factors associated with tobacco use in the general population include male gender, low socioeconomic status, unemployment, mental illness, immigrant status, single

• • •

Author Affiliations: Medical College of Wisconsin (MCW), Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Wrucke); Department of Family and Community Medicine, MCW, Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Bauer, Bernstein).

Corresponding Author: Benjamin Wrucke, BS, email bwrucke@mcw.edu, ORCID ID 0000-0002-0619-8455.

Community Partnership

In 2014, researchers at a medical college joined with a local homeless shelter and service agency to assess client information and outcomes of the agency’s counseling clinic. The data were obtained for purposes of quality improvement and clinical reporting, and all clients were offered the opportunity to also include their information in a data bank for research purposes. In addition, medical students conducted smoking cessation education sessions at the agency. Small groups of medical students facilitated conversations with individuals about their experiences with cigarette use and cessation. They provided education about the risks associated with cigarette use and information about smok-

ing cessation resources. Understanding the factors affecting cigarette use in this homeless population could inform improvements to these classes.

Objectives

The objective of this study is to investigate the factors associated with cigarette use in homeless adults, including whether homeless individuals who smoke demonstrate lower self-efficacy, greater social isolation, poorer perception of therapy, and greater levels of chronic homelessness when compared with homeless individuals who do not smoke. The hope is to increase outreach for tobacco use prevention and cessation to homeless populations and inform improvements to smoking cessation programs.

METHODS

Participants and Data Collection

Data were collected at the agency's counseling clinic from July 17, 2014, through June 25, 2019. Clients completed 3 routine assessments – client characteristics, intake demographics, and monthly outcomes – and each was obtained by counselor interview. A total of 117 out of 198 individuals consented for their assessment data to be included in the data bank for future research. The study population (n = 97) consisted of those who indicated a history of homelessness. The 20 individuals excluded represented community referrals who had not experienced homelessness. Approval to analyze the data was granted by the Medical College of Wisconsin/ Froedtert Hospital Institutional Review Board (Protocol Number PRO00037089).

Variables and Measurements

The list of the independent variables included in this study with corresponding questions and answer options as they appeared in the forms provided by the counseling clinic is provided in Appendix 1. Variables include information related to demographics, housing, employment, health care, and personal perceptions. Chronic homelessness was defined as being either homeless continuously for at least the last 12 months or homeless 4 or more times in the past 3 months. Perception of therapy refers to seeing the value in therapy. Mental health stage of change and substance use stage of change were assessed by the treating counselor and

Table 1. Variables Assessed Via Interviews of Individuals With History of Homelessness in a US Midwestern City

Variable	n (%)	Variable	n (%)
Median Age (n=97)	48.3	Currently smoke (n=97)	
Sex (n=97)		Yes	71 (73)
Male	91 (94)	No	26 (27)
Female	6 (6)	Psychiatric hospitalization (n=97)	
Ethnicity (n=96)		Yes	11 (11)
Hispanic	10 (10)	No	86 (89)
Non-Hispanic	86 (90)	Emergency department visits (n=97)	
Race (n=97)		Yes	25 (26)
Black/African American	45 (46)	No	72 (74)
White/Caucasian	36 (37)	Previous substance abuse treatment (n=97)	
Other/no response	16 (16)	No prior treatment	29 (30)
Highest education level (n=97)		1–2	28 (29)
Some high school or less	23 (24)	3+	40 (41)
High school, GED, HSED	35 (36)	Previous mental health treatment (n=97)	
Technical training, some college or greater	39 (40)	No prior treatment	38 (39)
Housing (n=97)		1–2	37 (38)
Yes	28 (29)	3+	22 (23)
No	69 (71)	Time since last substance use (median in days) (n=89)	36
Chronic homelessness (n=97)		Substance use stage of change (n=90)	
Yes	51 (53)	Precontemplation or contemplation	25 (28)
No	46 (47)	Preparation	19 (21)
Employment (n=97)		Action or maintenance	34 (38)
Yes	33 (34)	Not currently being addressed	12 (13)
No	64 (66)	Mental health stage of change (n=96)	
Employment schedule (n=33)		Precontemplation or contemplation	40 (42)
Full-time	14 (42)	Preparation	23 (24)
Part-time	13 (39)	Action or maintenance	18 (19)
Temporary (not an ongoing thing)	6 (18)	Not currently being addressed	15 (16)
Employment status behavior (n=62)		Perception of therapy (n=95)	
Looking for work	21 (34)	Strongly agree	52 (55)
Focusing on treatment	15 (24)	Agree	29 (31)
Applying for disability benefits	9 (15)	Neutral	14 (15)
Receiving disability benefits	13 (21)	Disagree	0 (0)
Not looking for another reason or don't want to work	4 (6)	Strongly disagree	0 (0)
Health insurance (n=97)		Mean social isolation score (n=97)	56.97
Yes	85 (88)	Mean self-efficacy score (n=97)	4.05
No	12 (12)		

Abbreviations: GED, general education development; HSED, high school equivalency diploma.

refer to behavior changes made as part of mental health or substance use treatment in the counseling clinic. Stages of change are described by the Transtheoretical Model of Behavior Change. For purposes of analysis, some variable categories were regrouped so that at least 10 participants fell into each variable category. Appendix 2 indicates how the categories were regrouped.

Social isolation was measured using the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) Short Form v2.0 – Social Isolation 4a.⁸ In this context, social isolation is defined as the “perceptions of being avoided, excluded, detached, disconnected from, or unknown by others.”⁹ This short form was developed for adults and was presented in English. It consisted of 4 questions each, with 5 responses rang-

Table 2. Results of Univariate Logistic Regression Analysis With Odds Ratios for Whether a Given Independent Variable is Associated With Current Cigarette Use

Variable	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P value	Variable	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P value
Age (n=97)	1.02 (0.98–1.06)	0.27	Health insurance (n=97)		
Sex (n=97)			Yes	0.22 (0.01–1.21)	0.16
Male			No		
Female	1.89 (0.29–37.24)	0.57	Psychiatric hospitalization (n=97)		
Ethnicity (n=96)			Yes	4.1 (0.73–77.19)	0.19
Hispanic			No		
Non-Hispanic	1.17 (0.24–4.62)	0.83	Emergency department visits (n=97)		
Race (n=97)			Yes	2.31 (0.77–8.62)	0.16
Black/African American			No		
White/Caucasian	0.95 (0.35–2.57)	0.91	Previous substance abuse treatment (n=97)		
Other/No Response	1.09 (0.31–4.49)	0.90	No prior treatment		
Highest level of education (n=97)			1–2	2.59 (0.83–8.78)	0.11
Some high school or less			3+	2.82 (0.98–8.52)	0.06
High school, GED, HSED	0.09 (0.004–0.5)	0.02 ^a	Previous mental health treatment (n=97)		
Technical training, some college or greater	0.09 (0.005–0.51)	0.03 ^a	No prior treatment		
Housing (n=97)			1–2	1.44 (0.52–4.06)	0.49
Yes			3+	1.57 (0.49–5.66)	0.47
No	1.13 (0.41–2.97)	0.8	Time since last substance use (n=89)	1 (1.0–1.0)	0.48
Chronic homelessness (n=97)			Substance use stage of change (n=90)		
Yes	1.76 (0.71–4.45)	0.22	Precontemplation or contemplation		
No			Preparation	0.41 (0.09–1.72)	0.23
Employment (n=97)			Action or maintenance	1.1 (0.25–4.67)	0.89
Yes	0.96 (0.38–2.56)	0.94	Not currently being addressed	0.19 (0.04–0.87)	0.04 ^a
No			Mental health stage of change (n=96)		
Employment schedule (n=33)			Precontemplation or contemplation		
Full-time			Preparation	1.53 (0.5–5.02)	0.47
Part-time	0.64 (0.12–3.21)	0.59	Action or maintenance	2.69 (0.73–13.05)	0.17
Employment status behavior (n=62)			Not currently being addressed	2.15 (0.57–10.61)	0.29
Looking for work			Perception of therapy (n=95)		
Focusing on treatment	1.1 (0.25–5.2)	0.9	Strongly agree		
Applying for disability benefits	3.2 (0.43–66.03)	0.32	Agree	1.06 (0.39–3.03)	0.9
Receiving disability benefits	1.33 (0.28–7.49)	0.72	Neutral	1.49 (0.4–7.25)	0.58
Not looking for another reason or don't want to work	0.4 (0.04–3.96)	0.41	Social isolation (n=97)	0.98 (0.92–1.03)	0.44
			Self-efficacy (n=97)	1.09 (0.54–2.16)	0.8

Abbreviations: GED, general education development; HSED, high school equivalency diploma.

^aIndicates significance level of $P < 0.05$.

ing from never to always. A raw score was calculated by summing the values associated with each response. Next, a scaled T-score was generated by using a conversion table provided in the PROMIS Social Isolation Scoring Manual. A T-score of 50 is equal to the mean of the US general population, with 10 being 1 standard deviation from the mean. A high T-score indicated a greater degree of social isolation. Forms were scored only if they included responses to all 4 questions.

Self-efficacy was measured by using the New General Self-Efficacy Scale.¹⁰ This scale has been used previously to compare self-efficacy between homeless and economically disadvantaged smokers.¹¹ General self-efficacy can be defined as “one’s estimate of one’s overall ability to perform successfully in a wide variety of achievement situations or how confident one is that she or he can perform effectively across different tasks and situations.”¹⁰ The scale consisted of 8 Likert-style questions, with responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. A score was cal-

culated by taking the average of the values associated with each response. A low score indicated low self-efficacy. Forms were scored only if they included responses to all 8 questions.

Statistical Methods

Logistic regression was performed in RStudio using a generalized linear model. The independent predictor variables were the study variables provided in Appendix 1. The binary dependent variable was smoking status (meaning current smoker or non-smoker). Univariate logistic regression was first performed with each predictor, and then a multivariate model was created to adjust for confounding. Per convention, a P value cutoff was used to determine variables that should be included in the multivariate model.¹² Variables were included in the multivariate model if they were explicitly associated with the study objective or had a P value of less than or equal to 0.2 and an odds ratio of less than 0.5 or greater than 2. Two variables – emergency department visits in the

past month and psychiatric hospitalizations – were then removed to avoid overfitting the model.¹³

RESULTS

Participant Characteristics

Demographic and participant characteristics are reported in Table 1. Participants who indicated that they belong to both Black/African American and Caucasian race categories were categorized as Other/No Response. The population was mostly male, mostly non-Hispanic, and had diverse racial and educational backgrounds. Twenty-nine percent of responders were currently housed. Seventy-three percent of the study population were current smokers.

Predictors of Smoking

Univariate and multivariate logistic regression results are included in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. Multivariate analysis demonstrated that the odds of being a current smoker decreased as education level increased, with the odds of being a smoker 95% lower for those with a high school degree or equivalent (OR 0.05; 95% CI, 0.002-0.39; $P=0.01$) and 93% lower for those with more than a high school education (OR 0.07; 95% CI, 0.003-0.49; $P=0.02$). Other demographic characteristics, including age, sex, race, and ethnicity were not found to have significant association with smoking status in this sample and were not included in multivariate analysis. Those with 3 or more episodes of prior substance abuse treatment were more likely to be current smokers (OR 4.17; 95% CI, 1.19-15.81; $P=0.03$). No significant association was identified between chronic homelessness, perception of therapy, social isolation, or self-efficacy and smoking status. The multivariate model had an Akaike information criterion of 108.41.

DISCUSSION

Logistic regression analysis suggests that factors associated with cigarette use in homeless adults include having less than a high school diploma and receiving prior substance abuse treatment. Chronic homelessness, health insurance, perception of therapy, social isolation, and general self-efficacy were not significantly associated with cigarette use in this study. Seventy-three percent of study participants were current smokers, which is consistent with the prevalence of smoking in the homeless population. Previous studies suggest a range of 57% to 80%.^{7,14,15}

Education

This study found that the odds of being a smoker was greatest for those with a low level of education, and these results support findings from previous studies conducted in the general population.^{3-6,14} Thus, smoking cessation programming for homeless populations should strongly consider health literacy in order to deliver content in an accessible manner for the audience.

Substance Abuse Treatment

The results of this study demonstrate that cigarette use is asso-

Table 3. Results of Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis With Odds Ratios for Whether a Given Independent Variable is Associated With Current Cigarette Use

Variable	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P value
Highest level of education (n=97)		
Some high school or less		
High school, GED, HSED	0.05 (0.002 – 0.39)	0.01 ^a
Technical training, some college or greater	0.07 (0.003 – 0.49)	0.02 ^a
Chronic homelessness (n=97)		
Yes	2.46 (0.79 – 8.02)	0.12
No		
Health insurance (n=97)		
Yes	0.11 (0.005 – 0.91)	0.07
No		
Previous substance abuse treatment (n=97)		
No prior treatment		
1–2	3.54 (0.90 – 15.27)	0.08
3+	4.17 (1.19 – 15.81)	0.03 ^a
Perception of therapy (n = 95)		
Strongly agree		
Agree	1.38 (0.43-4.76)	0.59
Neutral	2.18 (0.41 – 16.28)	0.40
Social isolation (n=97)		
	1.02 (0.95 – 1.10)	0.56
Self-efficacy (n=97)		
	1.41 (0.53 – 3.87)	0.49

Abbreviations: GED, general education development; HSED, high school equivalency diploma.
^aIndicates significance level of $P<0.05$.

ciated with prior substance abuse treatment. Tobacco use in the homeless population is associated with prior substance use,⁷ and cigarette smoking has been associated with substance use disorder relapse.¹⁶ Future studies should investigate how cigarette smoking may be a barrier to successful substance use treatment. Further study also is needed to determine whether use of other substances may contribute to cigarette use in the homeless population and how this information may be addressed by smoking cessation programs. If a causative relationship is found, smoking cessation programs for homeless adults could benefit from highlighting how smoking cessation may improve one's ability to quit using other substances. Similarly, treatment for nicotine dependence could be offered alongside treatment for other substance use disorders.

Perception of Therapy

This study population may have had a strong/positive perception of therapy because they were clients at a counseling clinic. However, it is encouraging that smoking status did not affect attitudes towards counseling in this population. Smoking cessation sessions could promote counseling as an important aspect of treatment, but these attitudes may not be a barrier to cessation.

Self-Efficacy and Social Isolation

The study population had a high mean general self-efficacy score of 4.05 out of 5. Although the mean social isolation score was 56.97, which is above the mean of the general US population score of 50, it is still within 1 standard deviation. The fact that self-efficacy

and social isolation were comparable for smokers and nonsmokers suggests that these characteristics are not major barriers to smoking cessation in this population. In fact, these results could suggest that these individuals may have strong readiness to quit¹⁷ and may, therefore, be responsive to smoking cessation intervention. It is important to note that this study measured general self-efficacy, which—though positively influences specific self-efficacy¹⁰—is not specific to smoking cessation. Overall, these results can encourage implementation of smoking cessation initiatives targeting homeless smokers engaged in outpatient counseling programs.

A 2013 study conducted on both homeless and non-homeless smokers in Dallas, Texas found homeless smokers to have similar levels of general self-efficacy when compared with non-homeless smokers but lower motivation to quit and lower self-efficacy for quitting than non-homeless smokers.¹¹ Based on this current study and previous research, general self-efficacy may not differ based on homelessness or smoking status. Though homeless smokers may not lack general self-efficacy, more research is needed to understand how to support motivation to quit smoking in the homeless population.

Limitations and Generalizability

Social desirability bias may have affected respondents, particularly because their interviewers were also their behavioral health counselors. The results of this research can only be generalized to populations similar to that of this study. This research specifically studies homeless individuals engaged in outpatient counseling. A significant portion of the homeless population is not connected with these services, and this study cannot be generalized to those individuals. As such, this study includes a convenience sample of the homeless population. Participants were mostly male, English-speaking clients of a counseling clinic at a homeless shelter, and not all were currently homeless. Additionally, the sample size was modest, which contributed to less precise confidence intervals. Lastly, though this study was cross-sectional in its design, it combines data collected over a 6-year period. Changes that may have occurred over this time period are not captured.

Future Directions

To develop a deeper understanding of the factors that influence cigarette use and cessation in this population, next steps could include interviews of clients of the homeless shelter to investigate personal experiences with cigarette use and cessation and link quantitative and qualitative information. The results of a qualitative study may support results from this study and provide greater insight about how smoking cessation programs may be improved.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that cigarette use among the homeless population is associated with low education level and prior substance abuse treatment. Smoking cessation programs would benefit from tailoring information to the education level of their

audience. Further study could determine whether use of other substances may contribute to cigarette use in the homeless population and how this may be addressed by smoking cessation programs.

Funding/Support: This research received no direct funding. Funding for the Medical Student Summer Research Program fellowship was contributed by the Department of Family and Community Medicine at the Medical College of Wisconsin.

Financial Disclosures: None declared.

Appendices: Available online at www.wmjonline.org

REFERENCES

1. Fazel S, Geddes JR, Kushel M. The health of homeless people in high-income countries: descriptive epidemiology, health consequences, and clinical and policy recommendations. *Lancet*. 2014;384(9953):1529-1540. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61132-6
2. Blas E, Kurup AS, eds. Equity, Social Determinants, and Public Health Programmes. World Health Organization; 2010. Accessed April 23, 2020. https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/44289/9789241563970_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
3. Higgins ST, Kurti AN, Redner R, et al. Co-occurring risk factors for current cigarette smoking in a U.S. nationally representative sample. *Prev Med*. 2016;92:110-117. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.02.025
4. Huisman M, Kunst AE, Mackenbach JP. Inequalities in the prevalence of smoking in the European Union: comparing education and income. *Prev Med*. 2005;40(6):756-764. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2004.09.022
5. Jamal A, King BA, Neff LJ, Whitmill J, Babb SD, Graffunder CM. Current cigarette smoking among adults - United States, 2005-2015. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2016;65(44):1205-1211. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6544a2
6. Villanti AC, Johnson AL, Rath JM. Beyond education and income: identifying novel socioeconomic correlates of cigarette use in U.S. young adults. *Prev Med*. 2017;104:63-70. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2017.06.019
7. Baggett TP, Rigotti NA. Cigarette smoking and advice to quit in a national sample of homeless adults. *Am J Prev Med*. 2010;39(2):164-172. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2010.03.024
8. Hahn EA, DeWalt DA, Bode RK, et al. New English and Spanish social health measures will facilitate evaluating health determinants. *Health Psychol*. 2014;33(5):490-499. doi:10.1037/hea0000055
9. HealthMeasures: list of adult measures. Northwestern University. Accessed July 17, 2020. <https://www.healthmeasures.net/explore-measurement-systems/promis/intro-to-promis/list-of-adult-measures>
10. Chen G, Gully SM, Eden D. Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organ Res Methods*. 2001;4(1):62-83. doi:10.1177/109442810141004
11. Businelle MS, Cuate EL, Kesh A, Poonawalla IB, Kendzor DE. Comparing homeless smokers to economically disadvantaged domiciled smokers. *Am J Public Health*. 2013;103 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S218-S220. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2013.301336
12. Ranganathan P, Pramesh CS, Aggarwal R. Common pitfalls in statistical analysis: logistic regression. *Perspect Clin Res*. 2017;8(3):148-151. doi:10.4103/picr.PICR_87_17
13. Peduzzi P, Concato J, Kemper E, Holford TR, Feinstein AR. A simulation study of the number of events per variable in logistic regression analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1996;49(12):1373-1379. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(96)00236-3
14. Baggett TP, Lebrun-Harris LA, Rigotti NA. Homelessness, cigarette smoking and desire to quit: results from a US national study. *Addiction*. 2013;108(11):2009-2018. doi:10.1111/add.12292
15. Tsai J, Rosenheck RA. Smoking among chronically homeless adults: prevalence and correlates. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2012;63(6):569-576. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.201100398
16. Weinberger AH, Platt J, Esan H, Galea S, Erlich D, Goodwin RD. Cigarette smoking is associated with increased risk of substance use disorder relapse: a nationally representative, prospective longitudinal investigation. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2017;78(2):e152-e160. doi:10.4088/JCP.15m10062
17. Arnsten JH, Reid K, Bierer M, Rigotti N. Smoking behavior and interest in quitting among homeless smokers. *Addict Behav*. 2004;29(6):1155-1161. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2004.03.010

advancing the art & science of medicine in the midwest

WMJ

WMJ (ISSN 1098-1861) is published through a collaboration between The Medical College of Wisconsin and The University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health. The mission of *WMJ* is to provide an opportunity to publish original research, case reports, review articles, and essays about current medical and public health issues.

© 2022 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System and The Medical College of Wisconsin, Inc.

Visit www.wmjonline.org to learn more.