Core Processes:

How to Use Evidence, Theories and Research in Planning Behavior Change Interventions

Robert A.C. Ruiter*

Rik Crutzen*

Author note:

Robert A.C. Ruiter, Department of Work & Social Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience, Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands;

Rik Crutzen, Department of Health Promotion, Maastricht University/CAPHRI, Maastricht, The Netherlands.

*Joint first authors

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rik Crutzen, Department of Health Promotion, Maastricht University, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht, The Netherlands. E-mail: rik.crutzen@maastrichtuniversity.nl

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

CORE PROCESSES

Abstract

Psychology is not only a basic behavioral science but also an applied discipline that is used to solve societal problems. In a problem-driven context, the search for existing literature, the correct application of appropriate theories, and the collection of additional research data are basic tools essential for the systematic development of any intervention. These ‘Core Processes’ can be used in different phases/steps of intervention planning and within different planning frameworks. However, in practice intervention planners often do not systematically follow all necessary steps. In this paper, ‘Core Processes’ are presented in order to provide empirical and theoretical guidance to planners from problem definition to problem solution. Specific emphasis is put on finding theories that are potentially useful within the parameters that the theory describes using a combination of approaches (i.e., the topic, concept and general theories approaches).

Keywords: Core Processes, Applying theories, Applied psychology, Behavior change, Problem-driven approach

CORE PROCESSES

Core Processes:

How to Use Evidence, Theories and Research in Planning Behavior Change Interventions

Within social and health psychology teaching programs at institutes of higher education, we train students to become experts in the understanding and promotion of behaviors that contribute to better population health, public safety, and sustainable environments. Graduates of such programs are seen as experts on behavior change. They are expected to make informed decisions when it comes to identifying targets for behavior change interventions, selecting appropriate change methods to reach these targets, and translating these methods into practical applications, while making sure these measures can be implemented and their effectiveness can be assessed. Expertise in intervention planning implies that planners not only know about information sources that could help them in finding answers to the above questions, but also are able to translate the information gained from these sources in such ways that the final answers are indeed informed by expert opinion, empirical research, and theory, thus increasing the likelihood of designing effective behavior change interventions.

In the Netherlands, and many other countries, most of the psychology programs include a practical training on applying psychological theory. In such practical trainings, students find theory- and evidence-based explanations for practically relevant problems in which behavior plays a prominent role. These problems often concern health problems, such as in the prevention of infectious diseases (e.g., HIV infection) and the promotion of healthy lifestyles (e.g., sufficient exercise), the early detection of life-threatening diseases (e.g., cancer, diabetes), and promoting adherence to therapy and medical regimes to prevent disease episodes (e.g., asthma) or even death (e.g., AIDS). Other problems are related to sustainability (e.g., energy conservation) or other pro-social behaviors (e.g., safety). These explanations are found through a

CORE PROCESSES

systematic process of asking a question, brainstorming possible answers, looking for empirical evidence and theoretical support, conducting new research, and coming to a final list of answers to the question. This working method is originally described by Veen (1984) and in later years has been transformed into the PATH protocol (Buunk & Van Vugt, 2008; 2013). However, this systematic process to finding answers to questions – here referred to as Core Processes – is not limited to the understanding of problematic behaviors, but extends to the full process of intervention planning from analyzing the problem at hand, to selecting methods of change, to designing implementable and evaluable interventions (Ruiter et al., 2013).

In intervention planning, there are different frameworks available, such as PRECEDE-PROCEED (Green & Kreuter, 2005) and Intervention Mapping (Bartholomew Eldredge et al., 2016), that provide guidance to planners from problem definition to problem solution. Across all these planning frameworks, applied psychologists may encounter the difficulty of using empirical evidence and theory in order to analyze the problem and inform behavior change interventions. Reviewing existing literature, applying appropriate theories, and collecting additional research data are basic tools in different phases/steps of planning frameworks, but often it is unclear exactly how and when these tools should be used in problem analysis and solving (Buunk & van Vugt, 2008; 2013; Ruiter et al., 2013).

Here, *Core Processes* are presented as a helpful and systematic way to answer questions raised in different phases/steps of planning frameworks. We would like to stress that although these Core Processes are described within Intervention Mapping (Bartholomew Eldredge et al., 2016), they can be applied in any planning framework. Therefore, Core Processes are not a planning framework on their own, but a helpful and systematic way to address questions relevant to problem definition and solution using theory and evidence. This is essential within problem-

CORE PROCESSES

driven psychology. The reasons we want to present these Core Processes separately are that (1) too often planners claim to have reviewed literature, applied theories and collected data, but in fact have done these tasks incompletely and selectively; (2) most planners indicate finding it quite difficult in practice to apply these processes correctly and sufficiently.

Theory-Driven and Problem-Driven Psychology

Within applied (health and social) psychology, a distinction can be made between two approaches: theory-driven and problem-driven applied psychology (Kok, Schaalma, De Vries, Parcel, & Paulussen, 1996). Theory-driven applied psychology involves testing a theory in an applied setting, primarily in order to gain insight into the external validity of the theory. Problem-driven applied psychology refers to scientific activities that focus on changing or reducing a practical problem. In problem-driven applied psychology, theories are used, but problem solving is the primary focus of this approach, and the criteria for success are formulated in terms of problem reduction, with contributions to theory seen as a useful by-product. Problem-driven applied psychology is an important field, because it provides an ultimate test for the usefulness of psychology both as a discipline and as a profession.

Behavior change is a subfield within applied (health and social) psychology that is very much problem-driven. The problems that are addressed are often complex and require a multidisciplinary approach. For example, the Focus on Strength project combined existing ideas, evidence and theory from biological and psychological perspectives and introduced strength exercises to counter the negative health consequences associated with obesity (Ten Hoor et al., 2017). Also, behavior change is difficult by definition: If it was easy, we would not need experts in change. So, although the required expertise within multidisciplinary planning groups may vary

CORE PROCESSES

based on the problem that is addressed, expertise in behavior change (e.g., an applied psychologist) is always required.

Core Processes for Using Theory and Evidence

Processes involved in answering a question using empirical data and theory can be complex and time-consuming; sometimes planners do not persevere in working through these difficulties. Consequently, the understanding of a problem is often incomplete, and attempts to solve the problem may be based on faulty premises/assumptions. Using Core Processes minimizes the likelihood of incomplete understanding and selecting ineffective solutions. These Core Processes include the following six steps as depicted in Figure 1 and described below.

Core Processes	Tasks
1. Pose questions	Initial questions are usually asked in order to ascertain causes of the health problem. Subsequent questions are asked in order to identify determinants of behavior and environmental conditions, and to help develop interventions and anticipate implementation.
2. Brainstorm possible answers	Planning group members brainstorm to create an (unedited) list of possible answers. In this way, the group members can ascertain their current knowledge and practice wisdom and can make a list of provisional answers.
3. Review empirical findings from published research	Support or refute provisional answers to the questions based on a review of available empirical findings.
4. Finding theoretical support using the topic, concept and general theories approaches	Find theories or combinations of theoretical constructs, first to understand, and then to solve the problem at hand, by applying the following approaches: (1) <i>Topic approach</i> : refine, add to, and discard provisional answers based on theoretical concepts from the empirical literature; (2) <i>Concept approach</i> : access theories through concepts generated during brainstorming; (3) <i>General theories approach</i> : consider potentially useful general theories.
5. Identify and address the need for new research	Use a combination of qualitative and quantitative techniques to suggest changes to – or add to – the provisional answers.
6. Complete and assess the list of possible answers	Complete the provisional list of answers and summarize into a working list for which the evidence is sufficient. Assess the answers in terms of relevance and changeability.

Figure 1: *Core Processes for Using Theory and Evidence.*

CORE PROCESSES

Step 1. Pose Questions

The first step when following the Core Processes is to pose (the right) questions. The first questions are often asked as a means of analyzing possible causes of the health problem (e.g., what are important risk behaviors?). Later questions are used to identify determinants of behavior and environmental conditions, and help to both develop interventions and plan intervention implementation. It is crucial that the planning group is on the same page regarding *which* question needs to be answered at *what* moment (e.g., problem analysis, identifying determinants, selecting change methods), before continuing with the second step of the Core Processes. Lack of clarity about the questions that have to be answered might lead to a feeling of being lost in translation during subsequent steps.

Step 2. Brainstorm Possible Answers

The second step concerns “brainstorming” about possible answers and using “free association.” This is a creative process that primarily involves free association with the aim of generating as many explanations as possible in response to a question. The planners can later disregard explanations that are poorly supported in the literature. In formulating these provisional explanations, applied behavioral scientists typically draw on theoretical and empirical knowledge, whether consciously or not. Doing so is unavoidable at this stage, but the brainstorming should be as open as possible and should not be limited to data- or theory-informed. Only in the next steps, empirical findings (of existing research in step 3 and new research in step 5) and theoretical support (step 4) are incorporated to avoid haphazard decisions based on a brainstorm only. Also, the planning group should then bear in mind that: (1) an explanation should describe a process (an explanation of causation), and (2) an explanation should be plausible. For example, socioeconomic status may be an important contextual factor –

CORE PROCESSES

or even a root cause – of certain behaviors, but it may need to be explored further in order to better describe a process that explains behavior. It may be useful to represent the explanation in a process model that shows causation (Buunk & Van Vugt, 2013), also known as logic model (Ruiter et al., 2013).

Step 3. Review Empirical Findings from Published Research

The next step is to support or refute provisional answers to the questions that the planning group has asked with empirical and theoretical evidence, starting with reviewing findings from published research. The idea behind this is to disregard explanations that are poorly supported in the literature. We suggest to start searching for reviews that have already been conducted. There are many sources available in the burgeoning field of systematic reviews and evidence-based public health that are worthwhile to consult before looking for individual studies. When appraising available reviews, or conducting a new one (see Peters, 2014 for basic how-to guidance), it is warranted to at least understand the nature of the numerator (what studies are used in the evidence summary) in terms of the denominator (what studies were conducted or reported), and to be aware of the variation that exists in the quality of evidence. Of course, the later also applies when assessing individual studies.

Step 4. Find Theoretical Support Using the Topic, Concepts and General Theories

Approaches

The search of the literature is focused, for example, on a specific behavior, or target group or culture. However, it might be that there is limited literature available (e.g., regarding a certain behavior or target group) or that the literature is limited in scope (e.g., focusing on a limited number of explanations). The next step, therefore, is to find theoretical support for the

CORE PROCESSES

provisional explanations and to make the provisional list of answers as extensive as possible before conducting new research (i.e., step 5) and making decisions (i.e., step 6).

Theories can be defined as formal and abstract statements about a selected aspect of reality (Kok & Ruiter, 2014). As a consequence of their very nature, theories are always a reduction of reality. This is not a shortcoming, but rather a definition, which is important to keep in mind when using theory in addressing problem-driven problems. Real-life problems are – by definition – complex; otherwise, they would already have been solved without the need to involve researchers. It follows, then, that a multi-theory approach is required (Bartholomew Eldredge et al., 2016; pp. 25) in order to further understand and solve real-life problems. This is also why intervention studies do not necessarily lead to improvements of a single theory (Prestwich, Webb, & Connor, 2015). From this perspective, applying theory to real life problems can be likened to completing a jigsaw puzzle with various theories fitting together to provide an explanation or answer to a planning question (Peters & Crutzen, 2017). The argument that one theory – for example, the Reasoned Action Approach – cannot explain all the possible variances in behavior or behavior change is therefore no reason to discard the theory altogether (Kok & Ruiter, 2014). Not being able to explain all variance in behavior could only be held against a ‘Theory of Everything’, and there are good reasons why such a theory is undesirable (Peters & Crutzen, 2017).

In a problem-driven context, all theories, theoretical models, and concepts are potentially useful within the parameters that the theory describes (Buunk & Van Vugt, 2013). Moreover, there are common and unique elements regarding each theory (Noar, 2005; Sniehotta, Presseau, & Araújo-Soares, 2014). Limiting the pool of candidate theories too soon may lead to inadequate answers or, worse, it may lead to conclusions being drawn that are counterproductive. There are

CORE PROCESSES

three approaches to finding theories: the topic, concept and general theories approaches; these should be utilized in combination but also in that order.

The topic approach: Going back to the literature review, the planning group needs to look specifically for theoretical concepts and frameworks that have been used to design the reported empirical studies and/or explain the findings. They then assess these theories in terms of how useful they are for providing additional answers to the formulated question.

The concept approach: A second approach to find theory-informed answers to the question being asked is to examine concepts that are generated during brainstorming sessions in the second step. It is likely that the ideas resulting from these brainstorming sessions are initially stated in lay terms, but there may be advantages to relabeling them with their theoretical labels. The information that can be garnered about a theoretical construct can be more precise than that related to a simple lay concept (e.g., lack of confidence could also be labeled as the theoretical construct self-efficacy). One person cannot be familiar with all potentially useful theories. This is why it is advisable to include individuals from various disciplines in the planning group and it stresses once again that expertise in behavior change (e.g., an applied psychologist) is always required. It is also worth noting that reading comprehensive overviews of theories may aid this process (Bartholomew Eldredge et al., 2016, Chapters 2 and 3; Conner & Norman, 2015; DiClemente, Salazar, & Crosby, 2013; Glanz, Rimer, & Viswanath, 2015; Simons-Morton, McLeroy, & Wendel, 2012).

The general theories approach: After the topic and concept approaches, a general theories approach involves exploring a theory that may offer additional insight into the question at hand. At this stage, it may be fruitful to consider alternative frameworks that have not been accessed through the other two approaches but that could provide valuable information for

CORE PROCESSES

further extending and refining the list of explanations. For example, dual process models of human behavior that differentiate between impulsive or automatic decision making and more reasoned routes of planning (e.g. Strack & Deutsch, 2004), or theories of self-regulation and self-management (e.g., Mann, de Ridder, & Fujita, 2013) may be informative. The general theories approach should be seen as a last resort to prevent falling back in a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach in tackling societal problems. When there is tension between generalizability and utility of theories, utility should be given preference given the applied nature of the problem-driven approach (Head & Noar, 2014).

Step 5. Identify and Address the Need for New Research

It is important that the planning group completes the previously described steps instead of jumping straight into research. A very practical reason is that conducting new research requires a lot of resources (in terms of time, expertise and money). More important, all evidence and insights that are available should be used before conducting new research. In fact, going through steps 2-4 might actually result in better research: if new research needs to be conducted, then it should be clear what questions to ask and address in the research. For example, the planning group may want to know whether certain theoretical constructs that look promising are actually explanatory in relation to their population of interest.

Step 6. Complete and assess the list of possible answers

At this point, the planning group is ready to summarize and complete the provisional list of answers into a working list of items for which the theoretical and empirical evidence is evaluated as sufficient. The planners will consider the criteria relevance and changeability of the evidence- and theory-based answers.

Example: Applying Core Processes

CORE PROCESSES

The following example nicely illustrates the use of the Core Processes (Bartholomew Eldredge et al., 2016, p. 21-28). In this example, a group of students in a health education class designed a project to prevent the transmission of HIV and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs) and pregnancy among urban adolescents.

Step 1. Pose Questions

Over the course of the project, they asked a number of questions, including: (1) *Health problem*. What are the health problems associated with HIV, STIs, and pregnancy in adolescents (ages 13–18) in the USA? (2) *Behaviors*. What are important risk behaviors for the transmission of HIV and STIs, and for pregnancy among adolescents? How do these risk behaviors vary, for example, between boys and girls? (3) *Determinants*. About the *risk* behavior: Why don't adolescent males use condoms when having sex with steady girlfriends? Why do girls have sex with boys who do not use condoms? About the *health-promoting* behavior: Why would girls carry condoms? Why would adolescents discuss condom use with their partners? (4) *Change methods*. What change methods relate to what determinants? How can change methods be translated into appropriate practical applications? (5) *Implementation*. How could such an intervention be implemented?

Step 2. Brainstorm Possible Answers

Using “free association,” planning group members generate as many explanations as possible that can later be dropped when poorly supported (Ruiter et al., 2013). Trained behavioral scientists already know a lot about determinants of behavior and barriers for change and this knowledge should be used. In Table 1, the first column represents the outcome of the brainstorm regarding determinants of condom use.

CORE PROCESSES

Table 1: *List of Answers Regarding Condom Use Among Adolescents (Bartholomew Eldredge et al., 2016, pp. 21-28).*

Step 1: Pose Questions			
Step 2: Provisional list resulting from brainstorming	Step 3: Additions from empirical literature	Step 4: Theoretical additions	Step 5: Additions from new research
Lack of knowledge about HIV transmission	Do not perceive condoms as means of pregnancy prevention	Intention to use condoms	Lack of knowledge about HIV or STIs disconfirmed
Lack of knowledge about STIs	Perceive condoms as embarrassing	Subjective norms	Argument that condoms don't work is an excuse, not a belief
Peers don't use condoms	Did not express personal responsibility for having condoms	Perceived norms	Experience with condoms associated with embarrassment
Perception that condoms don't work	Lower family connectedness	Self-efficacy for negotiating and discussing condom use with partner	Teens wanted to be more skillful
Attitudes toward condom use	Parents' permissive attitudes towards sex	Skills	Girls and boys both expressed that condoms were the responsibility of the other gender
Experience with condom use; don't like condoms	Community perceptions of gender inequality in sex	Outcome expectations	Perception of no risk of HIV with only one partner (mistook "serial monogamy" for monogamy)
Gender; males do not want to use condoms	Closed communication style		
Lack of salience - not knowing someone with AIDS	Neighborhood characteristics, such as high unemployment		
Lack of confidence in using condoms	Lack of access to family planning services		
	Lack of parental supervision		
	Parental trust		
Step 6: Complete and assess the list of possible answers			

CORE PROCESSES

Step 3. Review Empirical Findings from Published Research

The second column in Table 1 presents the outcomes of the review on the evidence supporting the results of the brainstorm. The intervention planners identified empirical evidence for some issues related to unprotected sex that were not already brainstormed, for example not perceiving condoms as a means of pregnancy prevention (Bobrova, Sergeev, Grechukhina, & Kapiga, 2005) or perceiving condoms as embarrassing (Bell, 2009; Brüll et al., 2018). The planning group also identified a number of studies that reported the relationship between unsafe sex and various theoretical constructs (listed in the third column): intention to use condoms and perceived norms (Bobrova et al., 2005; Villarruel, Jemmott, Jemmott, & Ronis, 2007) and self-efficacy in terms of negotiating and discussing condom use with partners (Bell, 2009; Black, Sun, Rohrbach, & Sussman, 2011). Ideally, those concepts (as depicted in Table 1) should be specified at the level of beliefs, for example the specific beliefs that underlie an attitude or self-efficacy (Ajzen, 2015). The planning group also became interested in information on the wider social context. For example, community characteristics—such as a high proportion of families living below the poverty line, a low level of education, and high unemployment—were found to be strongly related to teenage pregnancies (Penman-Aguilar, Carter, Snead, & Kourtis, 2013).

Step 4. Find Theoretical Support Using the Topic, Concepts and General Theories

Approaches

Topic approach: The literature review identified a meta-analysis study on the psychosocial determinants of condom use in heterosexual populations by Sheeran, Abraham, and Orbell (1999). In the introduction and discussion sections, these authors refer to different psychosocial theories of (health) behavior such as the Health Belief Model (Skinner, Tiro & Champion, 2015), the Theory of Planned Behavior (Montaño & Kasprzyk, 2015), and the Aids Risk Reduction

CORE PROCESSES

Model (Catania, Kegeles, & Coates, 1994). By studying these theories in detail, additional answers can be added to the list of potential explanations that are supported by theories of human behavior (Table 1, third column).

Concept approach: Lack of confidence appeared on the original list. This concept could also be labeled as the theoretical construct self-efficacy. By further exploring the construct of self-efficacy in the literature (Bandura, 1986; Mulvihill, 1996), the planning group may then also discover that self-efficacy is closely related to skills, perceived norms, and outcome expectations. As a result, they could add perceived norms and skills for negotiating condom use and applying a condom to the list (Table 1, third column). In this additional exploration of the theoretical literature, the group may encounter methods for influencing self-efficacy and think ahead in terms of how to apply this in the intervention. None of this useful information would have been available if the group had not related confidence to the concept of self-efficacy and studied the underlying theoretical framework.

General theories approach: The planning group could have used the general theories approach to access Social Cognitive Theory (Kelder, Hoelscher, & Perry, 2015), but of course the topic and concept approaches would most likely also have led the planning group to this theory.

Step 5. Identify and Address the Need for New Research

In the next step, the planning group needed more information from their priority population about the items on the provisional list in order to determine whether these proposed factors were relevant to their particular population. To this end, the group conducted focus groups with seventh- and eighth-grade students from the priority population. The new data called into question the notion of a lack of knowledge about HIV or STIs in the adolescent population.

CORE PROCESSES

Interestingly, the adolescents also felt that the argument ‘condoms don’t work’ is more of an excuse and less of a belief about their effectiveness. The adolescents who had tried condoms expressed some embarrassment with the process of using condoms and a need for a greater level of skills and self-efficacy. With this new information (Table 1, fourth column), the planning group was able to proceed to the final step.

Step 6. Complete and assess the list of possible answers

In the final step, the planning group completes the provisional list of answers and summarizes it into a working list for which the evidence is sufficient. The provisional list of answers from the brainstorm is thus followed up by a list of answers for which theoretical and empirical support has been sought. In step 6, the planning group then decides whether the evidence is sufficient by assessing the answers in terms of relevance *and* changeability. *Relevance* refers to the strength of the evidence for the association between the determinant and the behavior. Crutzen, Peters, and Noijen (2017) provide a practical approach to select determinants based on visualization of confidence intervals for the means and correlation coefficients for all determinants simultaneously. *Changeability* refers to the strength of the evidence suggesting that the proposed change can be realized by an intervention. Whenever possible, judgments regarding changeability should be based on evidence from the research literature (Ashford et al., 2010). However, when data regarding changeability are scarce, such judgments have to rely on a theoretical or conceptual basis. Behavior change expertise is then needed to make judgments regarding changeability. See Figure 2 for a logic model concerning the overarching project from which this example was derived.

CORE PROCESSES

Figure 2: *Logic Model with Relevant and Changeable Determinants (adapted from Bartholomew Eldredge et al. 2016, Page 259).*

Core Processes for Selecting Change Methods

For brevity and consistency reasons, the example used above to illustrate the Core Processes in answering questions with empirical and theoretical support mainly concern selection of determinants (i.e., addressing ‘why’ questions). We would like to stress that Core Processes also need to be used to select change methods for behavior change or to systematically plan implementation and evaluation of interventions (Bartholomew Eldredge et. al., 2016). In other words, to also address ‘how’ questions. The focus of the questions then shifts to potential solutions or theory- and evidence-based change methods, for example: How can we encourage specific subgroups of adolescents to use condoms? How can change methods be translated into appropriate practical applications? In relation to a solutions or methods question, answers that remain on the list after engaging in all Core Processes will be methods that have been shown to produce significant change in similar situations. Kok et al. (2016), for example, provides tables with theoretical methods (and their limiting conditions) for every major determinant and for all higher environmental levels, i.e. interpersonal, organizational, community, and policy levels. It is important to bear in mind that theory-based methods are only effective under certain limiting conditions, i.e. the parameters for effectiveness (Schaalma and Kok, 2009). When these

CORE PROCESSES

parameters are ignored – or lost in translation from behavior change method to practical application – effective behavior change is undermined and the intervention may even result in unintended or counterproductive effects (Peters, de Bruin, & Crutzen, 2015). Parameters for effectiveness are another example stressing that although the required expertise within multidisciplinary planning groups may vary based on the problem that is addressed, expertise in behavior change (e.g., an applied psychologist) is always required.

Conclusion

Health and social psychology is an applied discipline in which all kinds of societal problems and issues are addressed. The search for existing literature, the correct application of appropriate theories, and the collection of additional research data are basic tools essential for the systematic development of any intervention. It is, however, often unclear exactly how and when these tools should be used in problem analysis and solving. Core Processes are presented as a helpful and systematic way to answer questions raised in different phases/steps of planning frameworks. So, Core Processes are not a planning framework on their own, but a way to address questions relevant to problem definition and solution using theory and evidence.

CORE PROCESSES

References

Ajzen, I. (2015). The theory of planned behaviour is alive and well, and not ready to retire: A commentary on Sniehotta, Priesseu, and Araújo-Soares. *Health Psychology Review*, 9(2), 131-137. DOI: 10.1080/17437199.2014.883474

Ashford, S., Edmunds, J., & French, D. P. (2010). What is the best way to change self-efficacy to promote lifestyle and recreational physical activity? A systematic review with meta-analysis. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 15, 265–88. DOI:10.1348/135910709X461752

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bartholomew Eldredge, L. K., Markham, C. M., Ruiter, R. A. C., Fernández, M. E., Kok, G., & Parcel, G. S. (2016). *Planning health promotion programs: An Intervention Mapping approach, 4th edition*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. ISBN-13: 978-1119035497

Bell, J. (2009). Why embarrassment inhibits the acquisition and use of condoms: A qualitative approach to understanding risky sexual behaviour. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32(2), 379–391. DOI: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.01.002

Black, D. S., Sun, P., Rohrbach, L. A., & Sussman, S. (2011). Decision-making style and gender moderation of the self-efficacy–condom use link among adolescents and young adults: Informing targeted STI/HIV prevention programs. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 165(4), 320–325. DOI:10.1001/archpediatrics.2011.17

Bobrova, N., Sergeev, O., Grechukhina, T., & Kapiga, S. (2005). Social-cognitive predictors of consistent condom use among young people in Moscow. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 37(4), 174–178. DOI: 10.1363/3717405

CORE PROCESSES

Brüll, P., Kessels, L.T.E., Repetto, L., Dirkson, A., & Ruiter, R.A.C. (2018). ERPs reveal disengagement processes related to condom use embarrassment in intention-behavior inconsistent young adults. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, DOI: 10.1007/s10508-018-1217-4

Buunk B. P., Van Vugt M. (2008). *Applying social psychology: From problems to solutions*. London: Sage.

Buunk, A. P., & Van Vugt, M. (2013). *Applying social psychology: From problems to solutions (2nd Ed.)*. London: Sage. ISBN 1446294161, 9781446294161

Catania, J. A., Coates, T. J., & Kegeles, S. (1994). A test of the AIDS Risk Reduction Model: Psychosocial correlates of condom use in the AMEN cohort survey. *Health Psychology*, 13, 548-555. DOI: 10.1037/0278-6133.13.6.548

Conner, M., & Norman, P. (2015). *Predicting and changing health behaviour: Research and practice with social cognition models (3rd Ed.)*. London: Open University Press. ISBN-10: 033526378X

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.)*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage. ISBN 1483321479, 9781483321479

Crutzen, R., Peters, G-J. Y., & Noijen, J. (2017). Using confidence interval-based estimation of relevance to select social-cognitive determinants for behavior change interventions. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 5, 165. DOI: 10.3389/fpubh.2017.00165

DiClemente, R. J., Salazar, L. F., & Crosby, R. A. (2013). *Health behavior theory for public health*. Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett. ISBN-10: 0763797537

Glanz, K., Rimer, B. K., & Viswanath, K., Eds. (2015). *Health behavior: Theory, research, and practice (5th ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. ISBN: 978-1-118-62898-0

CORE PROCESSES

Green, L.W., & Kreuter, M.W. (2005). *Health program planning: An educational and ecological approach (4th ed.)*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Professional. ISBN-13: 978-0072556834

Head, K., J. & Noar, S. M. (2014). Facilitating progress in health behaviour theory development and modification: The reasoned action approach as a case study. *Health Psychology Review*, 8, 34-52.

Kelder, S., Hoelscher, D., & Perry, C. L. (2015). How individuals, environments and health behaviors interact: Social cognitive theory. In K. Glanz, B. K. Rimer, & K. Viswanath (Eds.), *Health behavior: Theory, research, and practice (5th ed., pp. 159–182)*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons. ISBN: 978-1-118-62898-0

Kok, G., Gottlieb, N. H., Peters, G.-J. Y., Mullen, P. D., Parcel, G. S., Ruiter, R. A. C., Fernández, M. E., ... Bartholomew, L. K. (2016). A taxonomy of behavior change methods; an Intervention Mapping approach. *Health Psychology Review*, 10(3), 297-312.

DOI:10.1080/17437199.2015.1077155

Kok, G., & Ruiter, R. A. C., 2014. Who has the authority to change a theory? Everyone! A commentary on Head and Noar. *Health Psychology Review*, 8(1), 61-64 DOI: 10.1080/17437199.2013.840955

Kok, G. Schaalma, H., De Vries, H., Parcel, G., & Paulussen, Th. (1996). Social psychology and health education. In: W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.). *European review of social psychology. volume 7* (pp. 241-282). London: Wiley.

Mann, T., de Ridder, D., & Fujita, K. (2013). Self-regulation of health behavior: Social psychological approaches to goal setting and goal striving. *Health Psychology*, 32(5), 487–98. DOI: 10.1037/a0028533

CORE PROCESSES

Montaño, D. E., & Kasprzyk, D. (2015). Theory of Reasoned Action, Theory of Planned Behavior, and the Integrated Behavioral Model. In K. Glanz, B. K. Rimer, & K. Viswanath (Eds.), *Health behavior: Theory, research, and practice* (5th ed., pp. 168–222). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. ISBN: 978-1-118-62898-0

Mulvihill, C. K. (1996). AIDS education for college students: Review and proposal for a research-based curriculum. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, 8(1), 11–25.

Noar, S.M. (2005). A health educator's guide to theories of health behavior. *International Quarterly of Community Health Education*, 24(1), 75-92.

Penman-Aguilar, A., Carter, M., Snead, M. C., & Kourtis, A. P. (2013). Socioeconomic disadvantage as a social determinant of teen childbearing in the U.S. *Public Health Reports*, 128(S1), 5–22. DOI: 10.1177/00333549131282S102

Peters, G-J. Y. (2014). A practical guide to effective behavior change: How to identify what to change in the first place. *European Health Psychologist*, 16(5), 142–155.

Peters, G-J. Y., de Bruin, M., & Crutzen, R. (2015). Everything should be as simple as possible, but no simpler: Towards a protocol for accumulating evidence regarding the active content of health behaviour change interventions. *Health Psychology Review*, 9, 1–14.
DOI:10.1080/17437199.2013.848409

Peters, G. J. Y., & Crutzen, R. (2017). Pragmatic nihilism: How a Theory of Nothing can help health psychology progress. *Health Psychology Review*, 11(2), 103-121.

Prestwich, A., Webb, T. L., & Conner, M. (2015). Using theory to develop and test interventions to promote changes in health behaviour: evidence, issues, and recommendations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 5, 1-5.

CORE PROCESSES

Ruiter, R. A. C., Massar, K., Van Vugt, M., & Kok, G. (2013). Applying social psychology to understanding social problems. In: A. Golec de Zavala, & A. Cichocka, Eds, *Social psychology of social problems: The intergroup context*, pp. 337-362. New York: Palgrave MacMillan. ISBN-13: 978-0230284753

Schaalma, H., & Kok, G. (2009). Decoding health education interventions: The times are a-changin' . *Psychology & Health*, 24, 5-9. DOI: 10.1080/08870440801995802

Sheeran, P., Abraham, C., & Orbell, S., (1999). Psychosocial correlates of heterosexual condom use. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 90-132. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.125.1.90

Simons-Morton, B., McLeroy, K. R., & Wendel, M. L. (2012). *Behavior theory in health promotion practice and research*. Jones & Bartlett Learning. Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett. ISBN-13: 9780763786793

Skinner, C. S., Tiro, J., & Champion, V. L. (2015). The Health Belief Model. In K. Glanz, B. K. Rimer, & K. Viswanath (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice (5th ed., pp. 131–167)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. ISBN: 978-1-118-62898-0

Sniehotta, F.F., Pesseau, J., Araújo-Soares, V. (2014). Time to retire the theory of planned behaviour. *Health Psychology Review*, 8, 1-7.

Strack, F., & Deutsch, R. (2004). Reflective and impulsive determinants of social behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8(3), 220–247. DOI: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0803_1

Ten Hoor, G.A., Plasqui, G., Schols, A.M.W.J. & Kok, G. (2017). Development, implementation and evaluation of an interdisciplinary theory- and evidence-based intervention to prevent childhood obesity: theoretical and methodological lessons learned. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 5, 352. DOI: 10.3389/fpubh.2017.00352

CORE PROCESSES

Veen, P. (1984). *Sociale psychologie toegepast: Van probleem naar oplossing*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Samson.

Villarruel, A. M., Jemmott, J. B., Jemmott, L. S., & Ronis, D. L. (2007). Predicting condom use among sexually experienced Latino adolescents. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 29(6), 724–738. DOI: 10.1177/0193945907303102