Published in final edited form as:

Addict Behav. 2012 July ; 37(7): 871–874. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2012.03.002.

DIMENSIONS OF IMPULSIVITY AMONG HEAVY DRINKERS, SMOKERS, AND HEAVY DRINKING SMOKERS: SINGULAR AND COMBINED EFFECTS

Nathasha R. Moallem, M.A. and Lara A. Ray, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles

Abstract

Alcohol use and cigarette smoking commonly co-occur. The role impulsivity may play as a common underlying mechanism in alcohol use and cigarette smoking is of particular interest due to emerging evidence of it being a critical component across multiple forms of addiction. Impulsivity can be examined through several constructs including, risky decision-making, response inhibition, and delay reward discounting. Impulsivity and each of these specific constructs play significant roles in the initiation of drug use, continued use despite negative consequences, and potential to relapse. This study used three behavioral tasks to measure risky decision-making (Balloon Analog Risk Test; BART), response inhibition (Stop Signal Task (SST), and delay reward discounting (Delay Discounting Task; DDT). This study advances research on impulsivity and substance use by parsing out the various components of impulsivity and examining them across three groups, heavy drinkers only (HD) (N=107), smokers only (S) (N=67), and heavy drinking smokers (HDS) (N=213). Participants completed questionnaires, interviews, and neurocognitive tasks including the SST, BART, and DDT. Analyses supported an additive effect of alcohol and nicotine use in delay reward discounting. Heavy drinking smokers displayed steeper delay discounting of small rewards than did smokers only ($p < .05$) and heavy drinkers only ($p < .05$). This additive effect of smoking and drinking was not observed for risky decision-making and response inhibition, suggesting specificity of the effects for delay reward discounting. These findings indicate that those who both drink heavily and smoke cigarettes daily have increased delay reward discounting, than those in the S and HD groups. Future studies should examine these constructs longitudinally, as well as incorporate genetic and/or a neuroimaging component to these group comparisons in order to ascertain the biological bases of these behavioral findings.

Keywords

impulsivity; alcohol; nicotine; delay reward discounting

1. Introduction

Alcohol use and cigarette smoking commonly co-occur (Dawson, 2000). Impulsivity has been studied as a common mechanism across addictive disorders, including alcohol and nicotine use (Aragues, Jurado, Quinto, & Rubio, 2011; Doran, Cook, McChargue, & Spring, 2009; Goldstein & Volkow, 2002; Harrison, Coppola, & McKee, 2009; Jentsch & Taylor, 1999; Rubio, et al., 2008). Therefore it is critical to study how impulsivity affects alcohol

use and cigarette smoking, both separately and co-occurring. Impulsivity is traditionally defined as acting suddenly and without plan to satisfy an immediate desire (Kreek, Nielsen, Butelman, & LaForge, 2005) and consists of multiple facets including risky decision-making, response inhibition, and delay reward discounting (De Wit, 2009; Fernie, Cole, Goudie, & Field, 2010).

Alcohol use has been associated with risky decision-making (Fernie, et al., 2010) and studies found that the Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART) differentiated between smokers and nonsmokers (Lejuez, et al., 2003). There has been much evidence that heavy drinkers (e.g., Boettiger, et al., 2007; Courtney, et al., 2011; Field, Christiansen, Cole, & Goudie, 2007; Lejuez, et al., 2010) and smokers (Baker, Johnson, & Bickel, 2003) have increased delay reward discounting, that is, impulsively choosing a smaller, immediate reward over a larger, delayed reward (Kirby, Petry, & Bickel, 1999). Response inhibition concerns an individual's ability to inhibit his/her thoughts or behaviors and poor response inhibition has been associated with alcohol use among social drinkers (Easdon & Vogel-Sprott, 2000; Lejuez, et al., 2010). Nicotine may enhance response inhibition, such that smokers were found to perform worse on a response inhibition task following abstinence (Powell, Dawkins, & Davis, 2002), though some have argued that nicotine may simply improve attention (Bekker, Bocker, Van Hunsel, van den Berg, & Kenemans, 2005).

Because impulsivity is so commonly associated with substance use, it is critical to further delineate its role on substance use co-occurrence. To that end, this study parsed out various dimensions of impulsivity and examined them across groups of heavy drinkers only (HD), smokers only (S), and heavy drinking smokers (HDS). While substance-using samples reliably differ from controls on multiple measures of impulsivity, this study compares across substance using groups to examine unique and additive effects of impulsivity.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

Participant groups consisted of heavy drinkers only (HD; N=107), smokers only (S; N=67), and heavy drinking smokers (HDS; N=213). Inclusion criteria for all three groups were: (1) age between 21 and 55; (2) current heavy drinker and/or daily smoker. Exclusion criteria for all three groups were: (1) serious medical illness within the past six months; (2) use of illicit drugs (other than marijuana) in the previous 60 days (verified by toxicology screen); (3) lifetime psychotic disorders, bipolar disorders, or major depression with suicidal ideation. Inclusion criteria for both smoking groups were: (1) daily smoker (10 cigarettes/day); (2) 3 months of smoking abstinence in the past year. Those in the heavy drinking groups must be currently drinking heavily according to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA): >14 drinks per week (>7 for women) or 5 drinks (4 for women) per occasion at least once per month over the past year. Non-smokers in the HD group were defined as having smoked <50 cigarettes in their lifetime. Non-heavy drinkers in the S group fell below the NIAAA guidelines for heavy drinking.

2.2. Procedures and Measures

The three groups were recruited from the Los Angeles community as part of three large-scale studies involving either alcohol administration or pharmacotherapy. Following a phone screen, participants were invited for an in-person visit in which they signed the consent form and completed the following study assessments.

2.2.1—The Fagerstrom Test of Nicotine Dependence (FTND; Heatherton, Kozlowski, Frecker, & Fagerstrom, 1991) and the 30-day Timeline Follow Back (TLFB; Sobell &

Sobell, 1980) were used to assess nicotine dependence and quantity and frequency of alcohol and cigarette use over the past 30-days.

2.2.2—The Delay Discounting Task (DDT) (Kirby, et al., 1999) required participants to choose between 27 hypothetical monetary situations in which they must decide between smaller immediate rewards and larger delayed rewards. Patterns of choice were analyzed to estimate hyperbolic discounting functions (Mazur, 1987). k scores were derived and index the preference for smaller immediate rewards relative to larger delayed rewards.

2.2.3—In the Stop Signal Task (SST), participants were shown a series of arrows and were instructed to respond as quickly and accurately as possible to the corresponding arrow; however if presented with an audible beep, they were instructed to withhold their response to that arrow (as described in Moallem & Ray, 2012). An average Stop Signal Delay (mSSD) indexed the time delay the participant needed in order to inhibit their response 50% of the time. The Stop-Signal Reaction Time (SSRT), a sensitive measure of response inhibition, was calculated by subtracting mSSD from median go reaction time (MGRT; Aron, Fletcher, Bullmore, Sahakian, & Robbins, 2003).

2.2.4—In the Balloon Analog Risk Task (BART) (Lejuez, et al., 2002), participants were instructed to pump up a balloon to earn money. If the balloon explodes, the participant loses the earnings for that trial and a new balloon will be presented. This study utilized two versions of the BART in which the risk of balloon explosion followed a uniform or normal distribution. To allow comparisons between groups, a z -score was calculated for each variable to standardize across versions (Lejuez, Aklin, Bornoalova, & Moolchan, 2005). Since the inclusion of pumps made in trials that resulted in explosions may negatively bias the mean, adjusted mean pumps (AMP) were used as a variable of risky-decision making (Lejuez, et al., 2002) and the variance in adjusted mean pumps was also examined (VAMP).

2.3. Statistical Analysis

A series of ANCOVAs were conducted in SAS Statistical Software, using the general linear model (PROC GLM). An initial omnibus test was conducted across the three groups (HD, S, and HDS) and significant results were followed-up with two-group planned comparisons. Final models also include significant demographic covariates. The dependent variables of delay reward discounting as measured by the DDT include: (a) k Small, (b) k Medium, and (c) k Large scores. The dependent variables of response inhibition as captured by the SST include: (a) MGRT, (b) mSSD, and (c) SSRT. The dependent variables of risky decision-making indexed by the BART were (a) AMP and (b) VAMP.

3. Results

3.1. Power Analysis and Baseline Comparisons

Statistical power was estimated using the program G*Power 3.1.2. Power was estimated for the required ANOVA omnibus test with 3 groups and a total sample size of 387 participants and at an alpha level of $p < 0.05$. Results indicated that the sample size was adequately powered (.80) to detect a small to medium effect size ($f = .16$ or larger). Demographic characteristics and group differences are presented in Table 1.

3.2. Analyses of Study Aims

3.2.1. Delay Discounting—Initial omnibus tests revealed a significant main effect of Group on k value, Small ($F(2, 370) = 10.64, p < .01$), after controlling for Gender and Ethnicity ($p < .01$), as they differed across groups (see Figure 1). Follow-up comparisons

revealed a significant difference between HD and HDS on k small ($F(1, 304)=21.82, p<.01$), such that HDS displayed steeper discounting for small rewards, as compared to HD. Likewise, there was a significant difference between S and HDS on k small ($F(1, 264)=3.84, p<.05$), such that HDS displayed steeper discounting for small rewards, as compared to S. There was no main effect of Group on k Medium ($F(2, 368)=1.30, p=.27$) but a trend level effect on k Large ($F(2, 379)=2.21, p=.09$). Follow-up comparison revealed a significant difference between HD and HDS on k Large ($F(1, 309)=5.17, p<.05$), after controlling for Education ($p<.01$), such that HDS displayed steeper discounting for large rewards, as compared to HD.

3.2.2. Response Inhibition—Initial omnibus tests revealed no significant main effect of Group on SSRT ($F(2, 376)=1.42, p=.24$) or MGRT ($F(2, 379)=2.43, p=.09$), after controlling for Age ($p<.01$). However, there was a significant difference between HDS and S on MGRT ($F(1, 273)=4.66, p<.05$), such that HDS had slower MGRT as compared to S. Omnibus tests revealed no significant main effect of Group on mSSD ($F(2, 380)=1.14, p=.32$). None of the remaining planned comparisons reached statistical significance ($ps>.10$).

3.2.3. Risky Decision-Making—Omnibus tests revealed no significant main effect of Group on AMP ($F(2,375)=1.32, p=.27$), after controlling for Gender ($p<.05$) and Age ($p<.01$). There was no significant main effect of Group on VAMP ($F(2, 376)=2.00, p=.14$), while controlling for Age ($p<.01$). No planned comparisons reached statistical significance ($ps>.10$).

4. Discussion

By comparing singular and combined effects of smoking and drinking on various constructs of impulsivity, this study sought to elucidate the additive effects of these substances of abuse. This is the first study to investigate the combined effects of smoking and drinking on impulsivity. Analyses revealed a significant additive effect of the two substances in delay reward discounting. HDS displayed steeper delay discounting of small rewards than did both S and HD groups. This additive effect of smoking and drinking was not observed with medium and large rewards, suggesting specificity of the effects for small rewards.

This initial evidence lends support to the idea that impairments in delay reward discounting may be a predictor of future substance use (Dom, D'Haene, Hulstijn, & Sabbe, 2006; Kollins, 2003). This is consistent with previous studies suggesting that higher delay reward discounting functions as a predisposing risk factor for alcohol and nicotine use (e.g., Anker, Zlebnik, Gliddon, & Carroll, 2009; Audrain-McGovern, et al., 2004; Perry, Nelson, Anderson, Morgan, & Carroll, 2007). It is plausible that those exhibiting higher delay reward discounting will not only be more likely to drink or smoke, but may also have a higher probability of concurrent use.

The absence of significant additive effects on risky decision-making and response inhibition demonstrates the importance of comparing multiple dimensions of impulsivity. Although some studies on the acute effects of alcohol and nicotine suggest an effect of these substances on response inhibition (e.g., Abroms, Fillmore, & Marcinski, 2003), results of the present study do not support these findings. The present study measured the effects of chronic substance use on response inhibition whereas the previous literature focused on acute effects, which may explain the difference between findings. In addition, although previous research has found support for the association between risky decision-making and smoking (Lejuez, et al., 2003) and alcohol use (Ferne, et al., 2010) the current study suggests that singular and combined effects of alcohol and nicotine use do not differ on this dimension of impulsivity.

It is possible that these participant groups are simply not different in regards to response inhibition and risky decision-making; however an alternative explanation is that the SST and BART are not as sensitive as the DDT. Although both measures have reliably differentiated substance users from controls (e.g., Lejuez, et al., 2003; Li, Luo, Yan, Bergquist, & Sinha, 2009) it may be the case that these measures cannot distinguish between substance using groups. Interestingly, functional neuroimaging studies have found associations between smoking (Galvan, Poldrack, Baker, McGlennen, & London, 2011) and drinking (Courtney & Ray, In Review; Schuckit, et al., 2011) variables and patterns of neural activation during performance of the SST in the scanner. This suggests neuroimaging paradigms may detect meaningful variation that differentiates within-group substance use severity, while behavioral measures may not be as sensitive.

These results should be interpreted in the context of the study's strengths and limitations. Strengths include the use of behavioral measures, which allowed for an objective measure of these facets of impulsivity. A limitation is the lack of a control group; however, the literature has convincingly established that substance users and non-users are different across these constructs of impulsivity (MacKillop, et al., 2011). Future research should expand on the current study by incorporating a genetic and/or neuroimaging component to these comparisons, as biological measures may be more sensitive than behavioral assays. Further research should also examine these dimensions of impulsivity longitudinally, in order to ascertain their causal role in the co-occurrence of alcohol and tobacco use.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Katy Lunny, Eliza Hart, Andia Heydari, Pauline Chin, Jessica Webb, James Ashenhurst, Kelly Courtney, Spencer Bujarski, Molly Tartter, Ellen Chang Belinda De La Torre, Zenova Williams, Ana Heydari, Taylor Rohrbach, Anna Sheng, Ryan Arellano, Marlina Mansour, and Ryan Tsuchida for their contribution to data collection and data management for this project.

This study was supported by grants from ABMRF, the Foundation for Alcohol Research, from the Pfizer Global Award for Nicotine Dependence (GRAND), the Tobacco Related Disease Research Program of California (TRDRP), and the UCLA Clinical and Translational Science Institute, National Institutes of Health (M01-RR00865), awarded to Dr. Lara Ray.

References

- Abrams BD, Fillmore MT, Marcinski CA. Alcohol-induced impairment of behavioral control: effects on the alteration and suppression of prepotent responses. *J Stud Alcohol*. 2003; 64(5):687–695. [PubMed: 14572191]
- Anker JJ, Zlebnik NE, Gliddon LA, Carroll ME. Performance under a Go/No-go task in rats selected for high and low impulsivity with a delay-discounting procedure. *Behav Pharmacol*. 2009; 20(5–6): 406–414. [PubMed: 19696658]
- Aragues M, Jurado R, Quinto R, Rubio G. Laboratory paradigms of impulsivity and alcohol dependence: a review. *Eur Addict Res*. 2011; 17(2):64–71. [PubMed: 21150205]
- Aron AR, Fletcher PC, Bullmore ET, Sahakian BJ, Robbins TW. Stop-signal inhibition disrupted by damage to right inferior frontal gyrus in humans. *Nat Neurosci*. 2003; 6(2):115–116. [PubMed: 12536210]
- Audrain-McGovern J, Rodriguez D, Tercyak KP, Epstein LH, Goldman P, Wileyto EP. Applying a behavioral economic framework to understanding adolescent smoking. *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2004; 18(1):64–73. [PubMed: 15008687]
- Baker F, Johnson MW, Bickel WK. Delay discounting in current and never-before cigarette smokers: similarities and differences across commodity, sign, and magnitude. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 2003; 112(3):382–392. [PubMed: 12943017]

- Bekker EM, Bocker KB, Van Hunsel F, van den Berg MC, Kenemans JL. Acute effects of nicotine on attention and response inhibition. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav.* 2005; 82(3):539–548. [PubMed: 16360813]
- Boettiger CA, Mitchell JM, Tavares VC, Robertson M, Joslyn G, D'Esposito M, et al. Immediate reward bias in humans: fronto-parietal networks and a role for the catechol-O-methyltransferase 158(Val/Val) genotype. *J Neurosci.* 2007; 27(52):14383–14391. [PubMed: 18160646]
- Courtney KE, Arellano R, Barkley-Levenson E, Galvan A, Poldrack RA, Mackillop J, et al. The Relationship Between Measures of Impulsivity and Alcohol Misuse: An Integrative Structural Equation Modeling Approach. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 2011
- Courtney KE, Ray LA. Neural markers of response inhibition in alcohol dependence. *Biological Psychiatry.* (In Review).
- Dawson DA. Drinking as a risk factor for sustained smoking. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2000; 59(3):235–249. [PubMed: 10812284]
- De Wit H. Impulsivity as a determinant and consequence of drug use: a review of underlying processes. *Addiction Biology.* 2009; 14(1):22–31. [PubMed: 18855805]
- Dom G, D'Haene P, Hulstijn W, Sabbe B. Impulsivity in abstinent early- and late-onset alcoholics: differences in self-report measures and a discounting task. *Addiction.* 2006; 101(1):50–59. [PubMed: 16393191]
- Doran N, Cook J, McChargue D, Spring B. Impulsivity and cigarette craving: differences across subtypes. *Psychopharmacology (Berl).* 2009; 207(3):365–373. [PubMed: 19756522]
- Easdon CM, Vogel-Sprott M. Alcohol and behavioral control: impaired response inhibition and flexibility in social drinkers. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol.* 2000; 8(3):387–394. [PubMed: 10975630]
- Fernie G, Cole JC, Goudie AJ, Field M. Risk-taking but not response inhibition or delay discounting predict alcohol consumption in social drinkers. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2010; 112(1–2):54–61. [PubMed: 20580495]
- Field M, Christiansen P, Cole J, Goudie A. Delay discounting and the alcohol Stroop in heavy drinking adolescents. *Addiction.* 2007; 102(4):579–586. [PubMed: 17309540]
- Galvan A, Poldrack RA, Baker CM, McGlennen KM, London ED. Neural correlates of response inhibition and cigarette smoking in late adolescence. *Neuropsychopharmacology.* 2011; 36(5):970–978. [PubMed: 21270772]
- Goldstein RZ, Volkow ND. Drug addiction and its underlying neurobiological basis: neuroimaging evidence for the involvement of the frontal cortex. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2002; 159(10):1642–1652. [PubMed: 12359667]
- Harrison EL, Coppola S, McKee SA. Nicotine deprivation and trait impulsivity affect smokers' performance on cognitive tasks of inhibition and attention. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol.* 2009; 17(2):91–98. [PubMed: 19331485]
- Heatherton TF, Kozlowski LT, Frecker RC, Fagerstrom KO. The Fagerstrom Test for Nicotine Dependence: a revision of the Fagerstrom Tolerance Questionnaire. *Br J Addict.* 1991; 86(9):1119–1127. [PubMed: 1932883]
- Jentsch JD, Taylor JR. Impulsivity resulting from frontostriatal dysfunction in drug abuse: implications for the control of behavior by reward-related stimuli. *Psychopharmacology (Berl).* 1999; 146(4):373–390. [PubMed: 10550488]
- Kirby KN, Petry NM, Bickel WK. Heroin addicts have higher discount rates for delayed rewards than non-drug-using controls. *J Exp Psychol Gen.* 1999; 128(1):78–87. [PubMed: 10100392]
- Kollins SH. Delay discounting is associated with substance use in college students. *Addict Behav.* 2003; 28(6):1167–1173. [PubMed: 12834659]
- Kreek MJ, Nielsen DA, Butelman ER, LaForge KS. Genetic influences on impulsivity, risk taking, stress responsivity and vulnerability to drug abuse and addiction. *Nat Neurosci.* 2005; 8(11):1450–1457. [PubMed: 16251987]
- Lejuez CW, Aklin W, Bornovalova M, Moolchan ET. Differences in risk-taking propensity across inner-city adolescent ever- and never-smokers. *Nicotine Tob Res.* 2005; 7(1):71–79. [PubMed: 15804679]

- Lejuez CW, Aklin WM, Jones HA, Richards JB, Strong DR, Kahler CW, et al. The Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART) differentiates smokers and nonsmokers. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2003; 11(1):26–33. [PubMed: 12622341]
- Lejuez CW, Magidson JF, Mitchell SH, Sinha R, Stevens MC, de Wit H. Behavioral and biological indicators of impulsivity in the development of alcohol use, problems, and disorders. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2010; 34(8):1334–1345. [PubMed: 20491733]
- Lejuez CW, Read JP, Kahler CW, Richards JB, Ramsey SE, Stuart GL, et al. Evaluation of a behavioral measure of risk taking: the Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART). *J Exp Psychol Appl*. 2002; 8(2):75–84. [PubMed: 12075692]
- Li CS, Luo X, Yan P, Bergquist K, Sinha R. Altered impulse control in alcohol dependence: neural measures of stop signal performance. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2009; 33(4):740–750. [PubMed: 19170662]
- MacKillop J, Amlung MT, Few LR, Ray LA, Sweet LH, Munafo MR. Delayed reward discounting and addictive behavior: a meta-analysis. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2011; 216(3):305–321. [PubMed: 21373791]
- Mazur. The Effect of Delay and Intervening Event on Reinforcement Value. Vol. Vol. 5. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc; 1987. An adjusting procedure for studying delayed reinforcement.
- Moallem N, Ray LA. Quetiapine improves response inhibition in alcohol dependent patients: a placebo-controlled pilot study. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 2012; 100(3):490–493. [PubMed: 22037407]
- Perry JL, Nelson SE, Anderson MM, Morgan AD, Carroll ME. Impulsivity (delay discounting) for food and cocaine in male and female rats selectively bred for high and low saccharin intake. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 2007; 86(4):822–837. [PubMed: 17498785]
- Powell J, Dawkins L, Davis RE. Smoking, reward responsiveness, and response inhibition: tests of an incentive motivational model. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2002; 51(2):151–163. [PubMed: 11822994]
- Rubio G, Jimenez M, Rodriguez-Jimenez R, Martinez I, Avila C, Ferre F, et al. The role of behavioral impulsivity in the development of alcohol dependence: a 4-year follow-up study. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2008; 32(9):1681–1687. [PubMed: 18631324]
- Schuckit MA, Tapert S, Matthews SC, Paulus MP, Tolentino NJ, Smith TL, et al. fMRI Differences Between Subjects with Low and High Responses to Alcohol During a Stop Signal Task. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2011
- Sobell, S.; Sobell, M. Evaluating alcohol and drug abuse treatment effectiveness: Recent advances. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press; 1980. Convergent validity: An approach to increasing confidence in treatment outcome conclusions with alcohol and drug abusers.

Figure 1. Mean ($\pm$ SE) k scores for small, medium, and large rewards across the three participant groups.
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 1

Baseline comparisons between the three participant groups

Variable	Heavy Drinkers (HD) (n=107)	Smokers (S) (n=67)	Heavy Drinking Smokers (HDS) (n=213)	Test of Differences F/ χ^2	p
Gender (% Male)	68 (63.55)	48 (71.64)	150 (70.42)	$\chi^2(2)=1.88$	.39
Ethnicity (% Caucasian)	54 (50.47) ^{ab}	19 (28.36)	61 (29.19)	$\chi^2(10)=30.22$	< .01
Age	27.81 $\pm$ 8.99 ^{ab}	38.64 $\pm$ 10.38	36.12 $\pm$ 10.54	$F(2, 384)=31.68$	< .01
Education	14.89 $\pm$ 1.99 ^b	14.24 $\pm$ 2.48	13.74 $\pm$ 2.12	$F(2, 384)=10.41$	< .01
Drinking Days in past 30 days	17.06 $\pm$ 6.09	--	21.91 $\pm$ 6.97	$F(2, 318)=37.46$	< .01
No. of drinks/drinking occasion	6.74 $\pm$ 4.38	--	7.30 $\pm$ 3.95	$F(1, 318)=1.39$	.24
No. of cigarettes/day	--	14.07 $\pm$ 5.62	14.53 $\pm$ 8.22	$F(1, 278)=.18$	.67
Fagerstrom Test of Nicotine Dependence	--	6.46 $\pm$ 2.14	6.23 $\pm$ 2.27	$F(1, 278)=.53$	.47

^aHD and HS significantly different at $p < .05$.^bHD and HDS are significantly different at $p < .05$.^cHS and HDS significantly different at $p < .01$.