

## Practice of Epidemiology

# A Multidimensional Approach to Assessing Infectious Disease Risk: Identifying Risk Classes Based on Psychological Characteristics

Daphne A. van Wees\*, Janneke C. M. Heijne, Titia Heijman, Karlijn C. J. G. Kampman, Karin Westra, Anne de Vries, John de Wit, Mirjam E. E. Kretzschmar, and Chantal den Daas

\* Correspondence to Daphne A. van Wees, Epidemiology and Surveillance Unit, Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), 3720 BA Bilthoven, the Netherlands (e-mail: [daphne.van.wees@rivm.nl](mailto:daphne.van.wees@rivm.nl)).

Initially submitted October 20, 2018; accepted for publication May 24, 2019.

Prevention of infectious diseases depends on health-related behavior, which is often influenced by psychological characteristics. However, few studies assessing health-related behavior have examined psychological characteristics to identify risk groups, and this multidimensional approach might improve disease risk assessment. We aimed to characterize subgroups based on psychological characteristics and examine their influence on behavior and disease risk, using chlamydia as a case study. Selected participants (heterosexuals aged 18–24 years and females aged 18–24 years who had sex with both men and women) in a Dutch longitudinal cohort study (the Mathematical Models Incorporating Psychological Determinants: Control of Chlamydia Transmission (iMPaCT) Study) filled out a questionnaire and were tested for chlamydia (2016–2017). Latent class analysis was performed to identify risk classes using psychological predictors of chlamydia diagnosis. Two classes were identified: class 1 ( $n = 488$ ; 9% chlamydia diagnosis) and class 2 ( $n = 325$ ; 13% chlamydia diagnosis). The proportion of participants with high shame, high impulsiveness, and lower perceived importance of health was higher in class 2 than in class 1. Furthermore, persons in class 2 were more likely to be male and to report condomless sex compared with class 1, but the number of recent partners was comparable. Thus, risk classes might be distinguished from each other by psychological characteristics beyond sexual behavior. Therefore, the impact of the same intervention could differ, and tailoring interventions based on psychological characteristics might be necessary to reduce chlamydia prevalence most effectively.

*Chlamydia trachomatis*; health behavior; infectious diseases; latent class analysis; psychological factors; risk behavior; risk factors

Abbreviations: iMPaCT, Mathematical Models Incorporating Psychological Determinants: Control of Chlamydia Transmission; LCA, latent class analysis; STI, sexually transmitted infection.

Infectious diseases are a major cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide (1). Prevention and control of infectious diseases depends on individuals' health-related behavior (2, 3), which in turn is influenced by many factors, including psychological characteristics, such as intentions, attitudes, and risk perception (4). The sexually transmitted infection (STI) *Chlamydia trachomatis* (chlamydia) can be used to illustrate the interplay between behavior and psychology in the transmission of infectious diseases. Chlamydia is the most commonly diagnosed bacterial STI among young heterosexuals in many Western countries, and its prevalence in the general population has remained unchanged over the past several years, even

in countries with chlamydia screening programs (5–7). Because most chlamydia infections are asymptomatic (8), psychological characteristics, such as low perceived importance of health or low perceived risk for chlamydia, could have a negative effect on health-related behavior, namely preventive (i.e., condom use) or health-care-seeking (i.e., chlamydia testing uptake) behavior, and therefore on chlamydia control efforts (9–12).

Sexual behavior, in terms of the number of partners, plays an important role in chlamydia transmission (13, 14). However, having many partners is not necessarily risky when people view themselves as being at risk for acquiring chlamydia and use condoms consistently. Therefore, a single

behavioral factor might not be sufficient to characterize the risk of chlamydia (15, 16). The importance of a multidimensional approach to characterize chlamydia risk has been underlined by previous research (16–20). These studies identified risk classes based on multiple behavioral risk factors for STIs or human immunodeficiency virus infection, resulting in subgroups of persons with risky behavior. Most of these studies, however, did not examine psychological characteristics (16–19) or were not able to link risk classes to laboratory-confirmed chlamydia diagnoses (hereinafter referred to as “chlamydia diagnoses”) (20). Psychological and behavioral variables are related to each other; however, the direction of this link is not self-evident. For example, in impulsive individuals, salient information could steer behavior towards more or less risk, depending on the evaluative value of the information (21, 22). Thus, consideration of underlying psychological mechanisms of behavior that could be targeted in individual-oriented interventions to reduce risk behavior might improve the risk characterization and prevention of chlamydia.

To explore the link between multiple psychological and behavioral characteristics and relate them to chlamydia diagnoses, a longitudinal cohort study entitled iMPaCT (Mathematical Models Incorporating Psychological Determinants: Control of Chlamydia Transmission) was initiated among persons being tested for chlamydia at STI clinics in the Netherlands (23). In the current study, we aimed to characterize risk classes based on psychological predictors of chlamydia diagnosis identified in the iMPaCT data. We explored how these risk classes differed with respect to demographic factors, psychological characteristics, sexual behavior, and sexual health, such as chlamydia diagnosis.

## METHODS

### Setting

The protocol of the iMPaCT Study has been described in detail elsewhere (23). Briefly, selected individuals (heterosexuals aged 18–24 years and females aged 18–24 years who had sex with both men and women) who made an appointment at the STI clinic of Amsterdam, Kennemerland, Hollands Noorden, or Twente in the Netherlands between November 2016 and June 2017 were eligible to participate. People were invited to participate after the online intake assessment for an STI test, if they met the inclusion criteria based on sexual behavior in the past 6 months, as indicated during triage. Since it was not possible to make an appointment online at the STI clinic in Twente, people were invited to participate while making an appointment by telephone. Persons who agreed to participate provided informed consent and were followed for 1 year. Participants were asked to complete an online baseline questionnaire before their STI clinic visit, because the STI clinic consultation might have influenced reporting of psychological and behavioral characteristics (24).

This study was approved by the Medical Ethical Committee of the University Medical Centre Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

### Data collection

In this study, demographic, sexual health-related, behavioral, and psychological data collected at baseline were used. Behavioral and psychological data were collected in the online questionnaire. This questionnaire was based on several validated questionnaires, which has been described elsewhere (23). Sexual behavior questions included number of sexual partners (lifetime/past 6 months/past 4 weeks) and age at first sexual activity.

The following psychological characteristics were included in the questionnaire: risk perception, intentions regarding condom use and STI testing, attitudes regarding prevention of chlamydia, perceived importance of health (hereinafter called “health goals”), knowledge regarding sexual health, prevention of chlamydia and consequences of chlamydia, stigma, anticipated shame with regard to a chlamydia diagnosis, self-efficacy with regard to condom use, expected social support after a chlamydia diagnosis, subjective and social norms regarding condom use and STI testing, self-esteem, and impulsiveness. All psychological variables were measured using multiple-item scales (series of questions or prompts), and each multiple-item scale represented 1 psychological variable, with the exception of impulsiveness. Impulsiveness is a multifaceted concept and was therefore divided into 4 subscales: negative urgency (tendency to engage in impulsive behavior in reaction to negative emotions), lack of perseverance (experiencing difficulty with continued efforts), lack of premeditation (tendency to engage in impulsive behavior without contemplation), and sensation-seeking (tendency to pursue novel, exciting, and intense sensations and experiences) (25). Each item in the multiple-item scales was measured on a 5-point Likert scale, with the exception of the variables risk perception and knowledge. Risk perception was assessed by asking participants to estimate their own risk of acquiring chlamydia and the risk for their peers (in the coming year/in a lifetime), on scales ranging from 0 to 100. Knowledge regarding sexual health, prevention of chlamydia, and consequences of chlamydia was measured by means of 6 true/false items.

Demographic and sexual health information as registered by the STI clinics in the electronic patient dossier, such as chlamydia test results from the current visit at baseline and from previous visits (nucleic acid amplification tests), was obtained from national STI surveillance data. An iMPaCT Study number was assigned to each participant, which was linked to their identification number in the national STI surveillance database. Demographic information collected included age, sex (female/male), educational level (low/medium (no education, primary education only, lower general secondary education, or vocational education) or high (all other levels of education)) migration background (ethnic Dutch/non-Dutch migration background (26)), and sexual health-related information. Sexual health-related information included STI test results at the current visit (positive at any anatomical location/negative), type of STI test at baseline visit (regular consultation/self-test kit), prior chlamydia/gonorrhea/syphilis diagnosis in the past year (yes/no), relationship status with the most recent partner (steady/casual), number of partners in the past 6 months, having had an STI test in the past year,

STI-related symptoms, having received a partner notification, having a partner in a risk group (having a partner who was a first-generation migrant from an STI-endemic region or being the female partner of a man who had sex with men), and condom use with the most recent partner (all yes/no).

### Statistical analyses

All participants who completed the baseline questionnaire before the STI clinic visit were included in the statistical analyses. The proportion chlamydia-positive is usually higher among persons who are notified by their partner than in persons who are not notified (27), and the decision to visit the STI clinic among persons who have been notified by infected partners is more likely to be based on external reasons and not on psychological characteristics, such as risk perception. Since this might distort the association between psychological characteristics and chlamydia diagnosis, participants who received partner notifications were excluded.

A mean score for each psychological variable was calculated by dividing the total score of all the items in the multiple-item scale by the number of items in that scale. Scores ranged from 1 (i.e., low level of the determinant) to 5 (i.e., high level of the determinant). Perception of one's own risk of chlamydia infection and of peers' risk were both defined as the mean of 2 estimates (in the coming year/in a lifetime). Knowledge regarding sexual health, prevention of chlamydia, and consequences of chlamydia was included as the sum score of 6 items, based on the number of correct answers (0–6).

Predictors of chlamydia diagnosis (nucleic acid amplification test results at the current visit) were identified using univariable and multivariable logistic regression analyses ( $P < 0.1$ ). All behavioral and psychological variables, obtained from the online questionnaire, and demographic and sexual health-related variables, obtained from the national STI surveillance database, were included in the univariable and multivariable analyses. To define cutoff values that are easily applicable in daily clinical practice, we divided data on continuous behavioral and psychological variables (if normally distributed) into 2 categories at the median value. The multivariable model was constructed with a backward elimination procedure, using the Akaike Information Criterion score. Missing values were included as a separate category if more than 5% of the observations were missing.

Latent class analysis (LCA) was performed to characterize distinct risk classes that could be targeted with behavioral interventions. The univariable analysis of predictors of chlamydia diagnosis was used as a preselection method to identify the psychological variables to be included in the LCA. In the LCA, underlying dimensions (latent classes) of the dependent variables were inferred on the basis of patterns in the observed data. The number of latent classes was determined by a combination of fit indices, including the Akaike Information Criterion score and the Bayesian Information Criterion value (lower values indicating a better fit), entropy ( $>0.8$  indicating good classification), the degrees of freedom (negative degrees of freedom indicating a lower number of latent classes needed), and interpretability of the classes (17). The uncertainty of the results was tested by comparing the LCA including the identified psychological predictors of

chlamydia diagnosis to 1) an LCA with behavioral and psychological predictors of chlamydia diagnosis, 2) an LCA including behavioral variables that were not identified as predictors of chlamydia diagnosis, and 3) an LCA including psychological and behavioral variables selected using a swap-stepwise (backward) preselection method (28, 29).

Demographic, behavioral, and sexual health-related variables, obtained from the national STI surveillance database and the online questionnaire, were compared between the latent classes. If the entropy value of the LCA was 0.80 or more, participants were hard-classified to their most likely latent class membership (30) and compared with univariable and multivariable logistic regression analysis. Again, the multivariable model was constructed with a backward elimination procedure, using the Akaike Information Criterion score, and missing values were included as a separate category if more than 5% of the observations were missing. If the entropy value of the LCA was less than 0.8, comparisons were done using a weighted multiple-group analysis (31). The proportions of chlamydia-positive persons were compared between the risk classes using a  $\chi^2$  test. All statistical analyses were conducted using R, version 3.4.0 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) (32).

## RESULTS

### Study population

In total, 933 heterosexual men and women and females who had sex with both men and women completed the baseline questionnaire (response rate = 7%). Participants who completed the questionnaire after their STI clinic visit were excluded ( $n = 14$ ). Furthermore, 106 participants were excluded because they were notified by their partner. Of the 813 remaining participants included in the analyses, the majority were female (81%), highly educated (89%), and ethnic Dutch (81%), and the median age was 22 years (interquartile range, 21–23). Chlamydia was diagnosed in 84 participants (10%).

### Latent class analysis

The psychological variables health goals, anticipated shame, and impulsiveness (negative urgency) were predictors of chlamydia diagnosis in the univariable analyses (Table 1; also see Web Table 1, available at <https://academic.oup.com/aje>). In the multivariable analysis, participants were more likely to be diagnosed with chlamydia if they had a low/medium level of education, were ethnic Dutch, and reported having had 2 or more sexual partners in the past 4 weeks (Table 1). In addition, persons with high anticipated shame were less likely to be infected with chlamydia than persons with low/medium anticipated shame.

The psychological predictors of chlamydia diagnosis identified in the univariable logistic regression analysis, including health goals, anticipated shame, and impulsiveness (negative urgency), were examined in the LCA. After assessing the model fit of 1–6 classes to the observed data, we selected the model with 2 classes based on a combination of the lowest Bayesian Information Criterion, the highest entropy value,

**Table 1.** Determinants of Receiving a Chlamydia Diagnosis (Univariable and Multivariable Logistic Regression Analysis) Among Participants in the iMPaCT Study, the Netherlands, 2016–2017

| Determinant   | CT–<br>(n = 729) |      | CT+<br>(n = 84) |      | Crude             |            | Adjusted <sup>a</sup> |            |
|---|------------------|------|-----------------|------|-------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|
|   | No. of Persons   | %    | No. of Persons  | %    | OR                | 95% CI     | OR                    | 95% CI     |
| Age, years  |                  |      |                 |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| 18–21   | 282              | 38.7 | 37              | 44.1 | 1.00              | Referent   |                       |            |
| 22–24   | 447              | 61.3 | 47              | 56.0 | 0.80              | 0.51, 1.27 |                       |            |
| Sex   |                  |      |                 |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| Female  | 600              | 82.3 | 71              | 84.5 | 1.00              | Referent   |                       |            |
| Male  | 129              | 17.7 | 13              | 15.5 | 0.85              | 0.44, 1.54 |                       |            |
| Educational level <sup>b</sup>                      |                  |      |                 |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| Low/medium  | 69               | 9.5  | 18              | 21.4 | 1.00              | Referent   | 1.00                  | Referent   |
| High  | 660              | 90.5 | 66              | 78.6 | 0.38 <sup>c</sup> | 0.22, 0.70 | 0.35 <sup>c</sup>     | 0.20, 0.66 |
| Migration background                                |                  |      |                 |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| Ethnic Dutch  | 579              | 79.4 | 78              | 92.9 | 1.00              | Referent   | 1.00                  | Referent   |
| Non-Dutch   | 150              | 20.6 | 6               | 7.1  | 0.30 <sup>c</sup> | 0.11, 0.64 | 0.28 <sup>c</sup>     | 0.10, 0.60 |
| No. of sexual partners in past 4 weeks <sup>d</sup> |                  |      |                 |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| 0–1   | 494              | 67.8 | 43              | 51.2 | 1.00              | Referent   | 1.00                  | Referent   |
| ≥2  | 235              | 32.2 | 41              | 48.8 | 2.00 <sup>c</sup> | 1.27, 3.16 | 2.03 <sup>c</sup>     | 1.27, 3.23 |
| Health goals <sup>d</sup>                           |                  |      |                 |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| Low/medium (score <4.00)                            | 329              | 45.1 | 48              | 57.1 | 1.00              | Referent   |                       |            |
| High (score ≥4.00)                                  | 400              | 54.9 | 36              | 42.9 | 0.62 <sup>c</sup> | 0.39, 0.97 |                       |            |
| Anticipated shame <sup>d</sup>                      |                  |      |                 |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| Low/medium (score <3.75)                            | 284              | 39.0 | 41              | 48.8 | 1.00              | Referent   | 1.00                  | Referent   |
| High (score ≥3.75)                                  | 445              | 61.0 | 43              | 51.2 | 0.67 <sup>e</sup> | 0.43, 1.05 | 0.61 <sup>c</sup>     | 0.38, 0.98 |
| Impulsiveness (NU) <sup>d</sup>                     |                  |      |                 |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| Low/medium (score <2.50)                            | 318              | 43.6 | 28              | 33.3 | 1.00              | Referent   | 1.00                  | Referent   |
| High (score ≥2.50)                                  | 411              | 56.4 | 56              | 66.7 | 1.55 <sup>e</sup> | 0.97, 2.52 | 1.62 <sup>e</sup>     | 0.99, 2.69 |

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; CT+, *Chlamydia trachomatis*–positive; CT–, *Chlamydia trachomatis*–negative; iMPaCT, Mathematical Models Incorporating Psychological Determinants: Control of Chlamydia Transmission; NU, negative urgency; OR, odds ratio.

<sup>a</sup> Adjusted for all other variables shown in the table.

<sup>b</sup> Educational level was defined as low/medium (no education, primary education only, lower general secondary education, or vocational education) or high (all other levels of education).

<sup>c</sup>  $P < 0.05$ .

<sup>d</sup> Behavioral and psychological variables were divided into 2 categories using a median split.

<sup>e</sup>  $P < 0.1$ .

and interpretability (Table 2). The item-response probabilities (the probability of a response to each item in a scale) by outcome variable for each latent class were used to characterize the psychological characteristics of the latent classes (Table 3). Based on the most likely membership classes estimated for each individual in the LCA, 60% of the study population was assigned to class 1 ( $n = 488$ ) and 40% to class 2 ( $n = 325$ ). A larger proportion of participants in class 2 were characterized by low/medium health goals, high anticipated shame, and high impulsiveness as compared with class 1.

The proportion of chlamydia-positive participants was higher ( $P = 0.1$ ) in class 2 ( $n = 41$ ; 13%) than in class 1 ( $n = 43$ ; 9%). In the multivariable model, persons in class 2 were more likely to be male and less likely to report having used a

condom with their most recent partner than persons in class 1 (Table 4). Numbers of partners in the past 4 weeks were comparable in classes 1 and 2.

The uncertainty analyses (i.e., adding number of partners in the past 4 weeks, adding condom use with the most recent partner, replacing number of partners in the past 4 weeks with number of partners in the past 6 months, and using a preselection method) yielded results similar to those of the LCA with the identified predictors of chlamydia diagnosis. A 2-class model was still the best-fitting model (Web Tables 2–5). Furthermore, the item-response probabilities for the psychological predictors in the two classes were exactly the same as the LCA with the chlamydia predictors (Web Tables 6–8) or were more difficult to interpret (Web Table 9).



**Table 2.** Fit Statistics for Latent Class Analysis With 1–6 Classes, Including Health Goals, Anticipated Shame, and Impulsiveness (Negative Urgency), Among Participants in the iMPaCT Study, the Netherlands, 2016–2017

| No. of Classes | AIC   | BIC   | Entropy Value |
|----------------|-------|-------|---------------|
| 1              | 3,332 | 3,346 | N/A           |
| 2              | 3,307 | 3,340 | 0.99          |
| 3 <sup>a</sup> | 3,300 | 3,352 | 0.52          |
| 4 <sup>a</sup> | 3,309 | 3,379 | 0.33          |
| 5 <sup>a</sup> | 3,317 | 3,406 | 0.26          |
| 6 <sup>a</sup> | 3,325 | 3,433 | 0.27          |

Abbreviations: AIC, Akaike Information Criterion; BIC, Bayesian Information Criterion; iMPaCT, Mathematical Models Incorporating Psychological Determinants: Control of Chlamydia Transmission; N/A, not applicable.

<sup>a</sup> Negative degrees of freedom (model not identifiable).

## DISCUSSION

This study demonstrated that multiple psychological characteristics should be taken into account in the assessment of chlamydia risk. Two distinct risk classes were identified based on psychological predictors of chlamydia diagnosis. High impulsiveness, high anticipated shame, and low/medium health goals were observed more often in the risk class with less condom use and a higher proportion of chlamydia-positive persons but comparable numbers of partners in the past 4 weeks. Thus, risk classes might be differentiated from each other by psychological characteristics that go beyond sexual behavior, and this could influence the impact of interventions in each risk class on sexual behavior and the transmission of chlamydia.

The main strength of this study was the comprehensive collection of data on multiple demographic, behavioral, and psychological risk factors in a relatively large study population,

which to our knowledge has not been combined in a study to this extent before. We were able to combine these risk factors and identify 2 risk groups for chlamydia diagnosis that are easily interpretable. Furthermore, because all behavioral and psychological determinants were measured right before the participants visited the STI clinic, the study design allowed us to exclude the possibility that STI test results or information obtained during the consultation influenced behavioral and psychological determinants.

There were also a few limitations of this study. STI clinic visitors tend to be more high-risk than the general population, which means that the predictors of chlamydia diagnosis identified in this study might not be generalizable to the general population (27, 33). However, the study population was rather homogeneous in terms of number of partners, which allowed for uncovering underlying psychological indicators of behavior that could be targeted in interventions to reduce risk behavior. Another limitation is that behavioral and psychological variables were self-reported, which could have led to reporting bias or recall bias. In order to minimize this bias, we used several strategies, such as using specified recall periods (e.g., the past 4 weeks) and implementing error warnings in the online questionnaire (e.g., the number of partners in the past 4 weeks could not be higher than the number of partners in the past 6 months) (34). Furthermore, dichotomizing a variable into low and high categories might lead to loss of information (35). However, binary variables are more easily applicable in daily clinical practice than a continuous measure, as it defines a clear threshold at which point one might need to take action (36), and it improved the interpretability of the latent classes. Finally, psychological variables that were not predictors of chlamydia diagnosis were not considered in the LCA as latent variables or covariates, which may have produced biased results. However, the uncertainty analysis showed that including more variables worsened the classification performance and hampered the interpretability of the latent classes.

Our results showed that although psychological characteristics can be different between latent classes, the number of partners might be similar. This finding is in line with those of Thorsen (20), who found that adolescents in different latent classes engaged in similar sexual behavior but varied in terms of psychological characteristics. This study supports evidence from previous studies on the (indirect) association of impulsiveness with risky sexual behavior, such as non-condom use, and higher chlamydia risk (37, 38). Furthermore, in our study, high anticipated shame was associated with lower risk of chlamydia diagnosis; this is in accordance with findings of Sales et al. (39), which showed that, although STI diagnosis was not examined as an outcome, a higher level of STI-related shame was a predictor of preventive behavior, such as condom use, which would decrease STI risk. In contrast, the results of our LCA showed that the proportion of persons with high anticipated shame was slightly higher among people in class 2, who were less likely to have used a condom with their most recent partner than people in class 1. A possible explanation for this contradictory finding might be that whereas in our study participants reflected on their condom use in the past and on current shame, in the study by Sales et al. (39) shame was identified as a predictor of prospective

**Table 3.** Probability of Response for Each Category of Outcome Variables, Including Health Goals, Anticipated Shame, and Impulsiveness (Negative Urgency), Among Participants in the iMPaCT Study, the Netherlands, 2016–2017

| Outcome Variable   | Latent Class      |                   |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                    | Class 1 (n = 488) | Class 2 (n = 325) |
| Health goals       |                   |                   |
| Low/medium         | 0.39              | 0.52              |
| High               | 0.61              | 0.48              |
| Anticipated shame  |                   |                   |
| Low/medium         | 0.49              | 0.33              |
| High               | 0.51              | 0.67              |
| Impulsiveness (NU) |                   |                   |
| Low/medium         | 1.00              | 0.00              |
| High               | 0.00              | 1.00              |

Abbreviations: iMPaCT, Mathematical Models Incorporating Psychological Determinants: Control of Chlamydia Transmission; NU, negative urgency.

**Table 4.** Demographic and Behavioral Characteristics Associated With Latent Class Membership (Univariable and Multivariable Logistic Regression Analysis) Among Participants in the iMPaCT Study, the Netherlands, 2016–2017<sup>a</sup>

| Characteristic                         | Latent Class         |      |                      |      | Crude             |            | Adjusted <sup>b</sup> |            |
|--|----------------------|------|----------------------|------|-------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|
|  | Class 1<br>(n = 488) |      | Class 2<br>(n = 325) |      | OR                | 95% CI     | OR                    | 95% CI     |
|  | No. of Persons       | %    | No. of Persons       | %    |                   |            |                       |            |
| Age, years                             |                      |      |                      |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| 18–21                                  | 188                  | 38.5 | 131                  | 40.3 | 1.00              | Referent   |                       |            |
| 22–24                                  | 300                  | 61.5 | 194                  | 59.7 | 0.93              | 0.70, 1.24 |                       |            |
| Sex                                    |                      |      |                      |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| Female                                 | 424                  | 86.9 | 247                  | 76.0 | 1.00              | Referent   | 1.00                  | Referent   |
| Male                                   | 64                   | 13.1 | 78                   | 24.0 | 2.09 <sup>c</sup> | 1.45, 3.02 | 2.13 <sup>c</sup>     | 1.47, 3.09 |
| Educational level <sup>d</sup>         |                      |      |                      |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| Low/medium                             | 56                   | 11.5 | 31                   | 9.5  | 1.00              | Referent   |                       |            |
| High                                   | 432                  | 88.5 | 294                  | 90.5 | 1.23              | 0.78, 1.97 |                       |            |
| Migration background                   |                      |      |                      |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| Ethnic Dutch                           | 390                  | 79.9 | 267                  | 82.2 | 1.00              | Referent   |                       |            |
| Non-Dutch                              | 98                   | 20.1 | 58                   | 17.9 | 0.86              | 0.60, 1.24 |                       |            |
| No. of sexual partners in past 4 weeks |                      |      |                      |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| 0–1                                    | 332                  | 68.0 | 205                  | 63.1 | 1.00              | Referent   | 1.00                  | Referent   |
| ≥2                                     | 156                  | 32.0 | 120                  | 36.9 | 1.25              | 0.93, 1.67 | 1.25                  | 0.92, 1.68 |
| Condom use with most recent partner    |                      |      |                      |      |                   |            |                       |            |
| No                                     | 358                  | 73.4 | 262                  | 80.6 | 1.00              | Referent   | 1.00                  | Referent   |
| Yes                                    | 130                  | 26.6 | 62                   | 19.1 | 0.66 <sup>c</sup> | 0.47, 0.93 | 0.63 <sup>c</sup>     | 0.44, 0.89 |

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; CT, *Chlamydia trachomatis*; iMPaCT, Mathematical Models Incorporating Psychological Determinants: Control of Chlamydia Transmission; OR, odds ratio.

<sup>a</sup> Numbers may not sum to totals because of missing data.

<sup>b</sup> Adjusted for all other variables shown in the table.

<sup>c</sup>  $P < 0.05$ .

<sup>d</sup> Educational level was defined as low/medium (no education, primary education only, lower general secondary education, or vocational education) or high (all other levels of education).

condom use (at the 6-month follow-up compared with baseline). Thus, high anticipated shame regarding an STI diagnosis might be associated with infrequent condom use in the past and could lead to increased condom use in the future. This suggests that STI-related shame could be used in clinical interventions by using it as a motivator, in a supportive manner, to increase condom use and chlamydia testing in the future (39, 40).

The LCA resulted in the identification of 2 distinct risk classes with differences in impulsiveness, anticipated shame, and health goals. These differences suggest that the response to interventions might be different in each latent class. For example, even though an intervention, such as motivational interviewing, is effective in increasing intentions to use condoms (24), it might not influence sexual risk decisions that impulsive individuals with low health goals make in real-life situations, when the temptations are stronger and overpower intentions (11). These findings highlight the need for a multi-dimensional approach, taking comprehensive information on demographic, behavioral, and psychological characteristics

into account, which might improve assessment of the impact of interventions on chlamydia transmission.

Future research should focus on comparing the impact of interventions on the prevalence of chlamydia between risk classes with different psychological characteristics and identifying the most effective intervention for each risk class. In practice, this study might contribute to tailoring interventions to persons visiting STI clinics. For assessment of level of risk when people make an appointment for an STI test at STI clinics in the Netherlands, individuals provide information for triage, such as demographic characteristics and sexual behavior. Psychological variables, such as impulsivity or STI-related shame, can be measured with a few simple questions, and these questions could be added to the triage process.

An intervention strategy that could be used for impulsive individuals are time-based interventions, which are focused on an individual's preference to choose either smaller-sooner or larger-later rewards. Previous research taking individual differences in impulsive behavior into account has shown that time-based interventions effectively increase self-control

and reduce impulsive decisions among persons prone to impulsivity (41, 42). Another example is using STI-related shame to assess openness to behavior change or motivation to change behavior (39, 40). For instance, shame could be used to form implementation intentions. Implementation intentions are simple plans, in the form of statements such as “If I encounter situation X, then I will perform behavior Y.” This could be implemented at STI clinics after self-evaluation during the consultation, tailored to characteristics of the individual, to increase condom use and chlamydia testing in the future. Furthermore, the multidimensional approach to identification of risk classes described in this study could be applied to other infectious diseases as well, since psychological characteristics also play a major role in the transmission of, for example, vaccine-preventable diseases (43) (e.g., opinions toward vaccination) and vector-borne diseases (44) (e.g., perceived risk of exposure).

In conclusion, people who belong to different chlamydia risk classes can be differentiated from each other by psychological characteristics that go beyond sexual behavior. Identifying characteristics of these specific risk classes in the population might provide valuable information on which interventions should be prioritized for each risk class in order to reduce the prevalence of chlamydia most effectively.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Author affiliations: Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, Bilthoven, the Netherlands (Daphne A. van Wees, Janneke C. M. Heijne, Mirjam E. E. Kretzschmar, Chantal den Daas); Public Health Service Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands (Titia Heijman); Public Health Service Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands (Karlijn C. J. G. Kampman); Public Health Service Hollands Noorden, Alkmaar, the Netherlands (Karin Westra); Public Health Service Kennemerland, Haarlem, the Netherlands (Anne de Vries); Department of Interdisciplinary Social Science, Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands (John de Wit, Chantal den Daas); and Julius Centre for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Centre Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands (Mirjam E. E. Kretzschmar).

All authors contributed equally to this work.

This project was supported by the Strategic Programme of the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (project S/113004/01/IP).

We are grateful to the staff at the sexually transmitted infection (STI) clinics in Amsterdam, Kennemerland, Hollands Noorden, and Twente, who were involved in the recruitment of participants and data collection. We also thank the staff of the STI department at the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, especially Birgit van Benthem.

Preliminary results of this study were presented in a poster session at the 14th International Symposium on Human Chlamydial Infections, Woudschoten, the Netherlands, July 1–6, 2018.

Conflict of interest: none declared.

## REFERENCES

1. Global Burden of Disease Study 2015 Collaborators, Vos T, Barber RM, et al. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 310 diseases and injuries, 1990–2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10053):1545–1602.
2. Funk S, Salathé M, Jansen VA. Modelling the influence of human behaviour on the spread of infectious diseases: a review. *J R Soc Interface*. 2010;7(50):1247–1256.
3. Weston D, Hauck K, Amlôt R. Infection prevention behaviour and infectious disease modelling: a review of the literature and recommendations for the future. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18:Article 336.
4. Noar SM, Zimmerman RS. Health behavior theory and cumulative knowledge regarding health behaviors: are we moving in the right direction? *Health Educ Res*. 2005;20(3):275–290.
5. Unemo M, Bradshaw CS, Hocking JS, et al. Sexually transmitted infections: challenges ahead. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2017;17(8):e235–e279.
6. Sonnenberg P, Clifton S, Beddows S, et al. Prevalence, risk factors, and uptake of interventions for sexually transmitted infections in Britain: findings from the National Surveys of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (Natsal). *Lancet*. 2013;382(9907):1795–1806.
7. Datta SD, Torrone E, Kruszon-Moran D, et al. *Chlamydia trachomatis* trends in the United States among persons 14 to 39 years of age, 1999–2008. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2012;39(2):92–96.
8. Gottlieb SL, Martin DH, Xu F, et al. Summary: the natural history and immunobiology of *Chlamydia trachomatis* genital infection and implications for chlamydia control. *J Infect Dis*. 2010;201(suppl 2):S190–S204.
9. Abel G, Brunton C. Young people’s use of condoms and their perceived vulnerability to sexually transmitted infections. *Aust N Z J Public Health*. 2005;29(3):254–260.
10. Ten Hoor GA, Ruiter RAC, van Bergen JEAM, et al. Predictors of *Chlamydia trachomatis* testing: perceived norms, susceptibility, changes in partner status, and underestimation of own risk. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16:Article 55.
11. den Daas C, Häfner M, de Wit J. The impact of long-term health goals on sexual risk decisions in impulsive and reflective cognitive states. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2014;43(4):659–667.
12. van Wees DA, den Daas C, Kretzschmar MEE, et al. Double trouble: modelling the impact of low risk perception and high-risk sexual behaviour on chlamydia transmission. *J R Soc Interface*. 2018;15(141):20170847.
13. Veličko I, Ploner A, Sparén P, et al. Sexual and testing behaviour associated with *Chlamydia trachomatis* infection: a cohort study in an STI clinic in Sweden. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(8):e011312.
14. Harder E, Thomsen LT, Frederiksen K, et al. Risk factors for incident and redetected *Chlamydia trachomatis* infection in women: results of a population-based cohort study. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2016;43(2):113–119.
15. Coyle RM, Miltz AR, Lampe FC, et al. Ethnicity and sexual risk in heterosexual people attending sexual health clinics in England: a cross-sectional, self-administered questionnaire study. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2018;94(5):384–391.
16. Vasilenko SA, Kugler KC, Butera NM, et al. Patterns of adolescent sexual behavior predicting young adult sexually transmitted infections: a latent class analysis approach. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2015;44(3):705–715.

17. Basten M, Heijne JCM, Geskus R, et al. Sexual risk behaviour trajectories among MSM at risk for HIV in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. *AIDS*. 2018;32(9):1185–1192.
18. Stuart B, Hinde A. Identifying individuals engaging in risky sexual behaviour for chlamydia infection in the UK: a latent class approach. *J Biosoc Sci*. 2010;42(1):27–42.
19. Wilkinson AL, El-Hayek C, Fairley CK, et al. Measuring transitions in sexual risk among men who have sex with men: the novel use of latent class and latent transition analysis in HIV sentinel surveillance. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2017;185(8):627–635.
20. Thorsen ML. A latent class analysis of behavioral and psychosocial dimensions of adolescent sexuality: exploring race differences. *J Sex Res*. 2018;55(1):45–59.
21. den Daas C, Hafner M, de Wit J. Out of sight, out of mind: cognitive states alter the focus of attention. *Exp Psychol*. 2013;60(5):313–323.
22. Mann T, Ward A. To eat or not to eat: implications of the attentional myopia model for restrained eaters. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 2004;113(1):90–98.
23. van Wees DA, Heijne JCM, Heijman T, et al. Study protocol of the iMPaCT Study: a longitudinal cohort study assessing psychological determinants, sexual behaviour and chlamydia (re)infections in heterosexual STI clinic visitors. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2018;18:Article 559.
24. Kuypers L, de Wit J, Heijman T, et al. Influencing risk behavior of sexually transmitted infection clinic visitors: efficacy of a new methodology of motivational preventive counseling. *AIDS Patient Care STDs*. 2009;23(6):423–431.
25. Cyders MA, Littlefield AK, Coffey S, et al. Examination of a short English version of the UPPS-P Impulsive Behavior Scale. *Addict Behav*. 2014;39(9):1372–1376.
26. Statistics Netherlands (CBS). Definitions. <https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/our-services/methods/definitions?tab=m#id=migration-background>. Published October 25, 2016. Updated March 3, 2018. Accessed August 6, 2018.
27. Visser M, van Aar F, Op de Coul ELM, et al. *Sexually Transmitted Infections in the Netherlands in 2017*. Bilthoven, the Netherlands: Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment; 2018. <https://www.rivm.nl/bibliotheek/rapporten/2018-0012.pdf>. Published June 21, 2018. Accessed August 6, 2018.
28. Fop M, Smart KM, Murphy TB. Variable selection for latent class analysis with application to low back pain diagnosis. *Ann Appl Stat*. 2017;11(4):2080–2110.
29. Dean N, Raftery AE. Latent class analysis variable selection. *Ann Inst Stat Math*. 2010;62(1):11–35.
30. Clark SL, Muthén B. *Relating Latent Class Analysis Results to Variables Not Included in the Analysis*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles; 2009. <http://www.statmodel.com/download/relatinglca.pdf>. Published January 2009. Accessed March 6, 2019.
31. Asparouhov T, Muthén B. Auxiliary variables in mixture modeling: using the BCH method in Mplus to estimate a distal outcome model and an arbitrary secondary model. *Mplus Web Notes*. 2014;21(2):1–22.
32. R Development Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2017.
33. van den Broek IV, van Bergen JE, Brouwers EE, et al. Effectiveness of yearly register-based screening for chlamydia in the Netherlands: controlled trial with randomised stepped wedge implementation. *BMJ*. 2012;345:e4316.
34. DiClemente RJ. Validity of self-reported sexual behavior among adolescents: where do we go from here? *AIDS Behav*. 2016;20(suppl 1):215–217.
35. Rucker DD, McShane BB, Preacher KJ. A researcher's guide to regression, discretization, and median splits of continuous variables. *J Consum Psychol*. 2015;25(4):666–678.
36. Lopez R, Dauvilliers Y, Jaussent I, et al. A multidimensional approach of impulsivity in adult attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Psychiatry Res*. 2015;227(2–3):290–295.
37. Kahn JA, Kaplowitz RA, Goodman E, et al. The association between impulsiveness and sexual risk behaviors in adolescent and young adult women. *J Adolesc Health*. 2002;30(4):229–232.
38. Jardin C, Sharp C, Garey L, et al. The role of impulsivity in the relation between negative affect and risky sexual behaviors. *J Sex Marital Ther*. 2017;43(3):250–263.
39. Sales JM, DiClemente RJ, Rose ES, et al. Relationship of STD-related shame and stigma to female adolescents' condom-protected intercourse. *J Adolesc Health*. 2007;40(6):573.e1–573.e6.
40. Cunningham SD, Kerrigan DL, Jennings JM, et al. Relationships between perceived STD-related stigma, STD-related shame and STD screening among a household sample of adolescents. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2009;41(4):225–230.
41. Smith AP, Marshall AT, Kirkpatrick K. Mechanisms of impulsive choice: II. Time-based interventions to improve self-control. *Behav Processes*. 2015;112:29–42.
42. Peterson JR, Hill CC, Marshall AT, et al. I can't wait: methods for measuring and moderating individual differences in impulsive choice. *J Agric Food Ind Organ*. 2015;13(1):89–99.
43. Salathé M, Bonhoeffer S. The effect of opinion clustering on disease outbreaks. *J R Soc Interface*. 2008;5(29):1505–1508.
44. Flamand C, Fritzell C, Obale P, et al. The role of risk proximity in the beliefs and behaviors related to mosquito-borne diseases: the case of Chikungunya in French Guiana. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2017;97(2):344–355.