JOURNAL OF MEDICINE, HUMANITY AND MEDIA
https://doi.org/10.62787/jmhm.v4i1.282

Julia C.M. van Weert's Health-Communication Research: Technology-Assisted Risk-Control Strategies for Risky Populations

Journal of Medicine, Humanity and Media
2026, Vol. 4(1)
© The Author(s) 2026
ISSN: 2817-5166
mhmjournal.net

Jingyi Wang

School of Journalism&Communication, Peking University , Beijing， China

Abstract

For almost three decades Professor Julia C.M. van Weert has advanced European health communication by focusing on "risky people." This article synthesises her major contributions. Anchored in "risk identification - intervention design - system integration," her research trajectory has moved from optimising information efficiency to supporting behaviour change and, ultimately, to fostering structural equity and ethical care. Throughout, she has pursued a dual-track methodology of original experiments plus systematic reviews to generate actionable, evidence-based knowledge.

Keywords

Risky people , Provider–patient communication , Geriatric health communication , Technology empowerment

---

CONTACT Jingyi Wang wjylucienne@aliyun.com

Introduction

As Chair of Communication Science and founding director of the Amsterdam Centre for Health Communication, Professor van Weert is internationally recognised for her sustained examination of high-risk populations. She treats "risk groups" and "risk control" as mutually constitutive problems, iteratively evaluating communication technologies and strategies to attenuate risk at both micro and macro levels.

This essay periodises her scholarly evolution into three decade-long phases. By reconstructing the theoretical premises, methodological repertoires, and empirical foci of each phase, we chart the intellectual currents that animate her lifework and comment on the organising motifs of her scholarship.

Signature Contribution: An Integrative Risk-Control Architecture

1. Risk Identification: Barriers to Information Access and Processing

Van Weert was among the first to systematically locate critical failure points along the health-information chain for high-risk groups, thereby laying the evidentiary groundwork for subsequent interventions. She demonstrated that so-called immutable risk factors (e.g., age, comorbidity) do not predetermine communication failure. Among older cancer patients, for instance, recall was more strongly influenced by health literacy, message load, design congruence with cognitive schemata, and linguistic appropriateness than by chronological age alone—evidence that risk can be engineered downward.

Her programme further catalogued multilevel impediments: patient-level (low decisional confidence, distorted risk perception); provider-level (time pressure, sub-optimal communication skills); system-level (information fragmentation, weak multidisciplinary coordination); and macro-level (shifting media repertoires). These nested barriers interact to escalate treatment-deviation risk.

2. Intervention Design: Technology-Strategy Synergy for Risk Mitigation

Grounded in the above diagnostics, van Weert's team has validated multiple targeted interventions, advancing a dual architecture of "technological artefacts + communicative strategies."

In dementia care, multi-sensory stimulation (snoezelen) significantly reduced depression, aggression, and apathy, and outperformed single-modality psychosocial interventions when combined with cognitive-behavioural techniques and music therapy.

In adherence management, her systematic review showed that personalised e-reminders (visualising drug benefits) delivered through multi-channel push (SMS + app) markedly improved chronic-disease adherence, with larger effect sizes among low-literacy patients.

In message transmission, her experiments optimised flagship tools: (a) Question Prompt Lists (QPLs) in oncology consultations increased patient question-asking, improved recall, and lowered anxiety; (b) tiered health animations outperformed text leaflets in comprehension for low-literacy viewers.

Van Weert iteratively refines both strategy and technology, recognising that in real-world implementation the two are inseparable.

3. System Integration: A Cross-Context Framework for Risk Governance

Moving beyond single interventions, van Weert has built a multidimensional risk-governance framework. Design principles now encompass multilingual, culturally adapted, visual-first formats; audience segmentation strategies for older adults, seriously ill patients, healthy adults, and clinicians; and knowledge-integration platforms that blend patient experiential narratives with clinical evidence.

Large-scale experimental datasets and exhaustive systematic reviews converge into population- and context-specific communication models (e.g., risk-blocking mechanisms in provider–patient talk; layered precision messaging for divergent e-health literacy profiles). The cumulative result is an iterative, system-level architecture for risk governance across health-care ecologies.

Intellectual Trajectory

1. 2000–2010: Ideal-Typical Identification of Traditional Groups—Risk-Point Mapping and First-Generation Interventions

This decade concentrated on identifying baseline risks and testing preliminary interventions among “classical” high-risk cohorts—older adults, cancer patients, and persons with dementia. Quasi-experimental pre-/post designs were the workhorse: comparing dementia wards with and without multi-sensory stimulation (snoezelen), her team produced the first field evidence that non-pharmacological communication interventions significantly reduce apathy, aggression, and depression. Survey and structured-phone-interview studies with newly diagnosed cancer patients overturned the “age-as-determinist” thesis by showing that message design–cognition fit predicted recall better than chronological age.

Original experiments were framed by formal efficacy-evaluation models. RCTs, pre–post quasi-experiments, and mixed-method triangulation (observation logs, semi-structured interviews) were common; multilevel or categorical models tested causal paths. Yet the period’s internalvalidity logic left gaps: key confounders (e.g., cognitive impairment) went unmeasured; recall was telephone-assessed, vulnerable to interviewer and timing effects; samples were convenience-based; and psychological mechanisms (denial, mood) were black-boxed. Systematic reviews suffered high clinical heterogeneity, scant metrical uniformity, and weak overall evidence strength, yielding cautious conclusions.

In short, the early van Weert portfolio established risk hotspots and proof-of-concept interventions, but its experimental-psychology DNA treated high-risk users as cognitively impaired input–output systems; health inequality was largely an efficiency problem awaiting better message engineering.

2. 2011–2020: Scaling Complexity—Intervention-Tool Deployment and Risk-Control Architecture

The second phase widened the risk portfolio to low-health-literacy groups, multicultural patients, and complex chronicity. Leveraging multi-study databases, she documented how limited literacy distorts online-information appraisal; time-series vector-autoregression personalised psychotherapy feedback networks; meta-analysis confirmed decision aids improve decision quality and cut decisional conflict among older adults; and pooled e-reminder studies distilled best-practice principles for multi-channel, tailored adherence prompts.

Experimentally, the "laboratory feel" of 2000–2010 gave way to hybrid designs embedding video-recording, interaction coding, focus groups, and longitudinal patient diaries to open the black box of mechanism. Still, most outcomes remained caregiver-reported, and follow-up rarely exceeded six months.

Review methodology matured in lockstep. The highly cited 2011 review on low health literacy and online-information evaluation adopted narrative synthesis stratified by four a-priori questions to tame heterogeneity. The 2016 decision-aid meta-analysis combined RevMan-quantitative pooling (mean differences, risk ratios) with qualitative meta-summary, mapping why efficacious tools stall in practice. Implementation science entered the lexicon: efficacy–effectiveness gaps were traced to missing organisational support, staff training, and reimbursement pathways. External validity and sustainability became the new gold standards; risk was re-theorised as a property of social interaction and institutional structure, not merely of individual cognition.

3. 2020–2025: Innovating Integration—System-Wide Risk Governance and Emerging Technologies

The current period foregrounds system-level risk governance and digital-health equity. Online experiments isolate immediate effects of voice-over animation for low-literacy users; qualitative needs assessments feed tool co-design; multi-centre prospective pre–post trials (e.g., OnVaCT) gauge longer-term effectiveness in routine oncology and palliative-care clinics. Big-data analytics and precision-intervention logics are imported from public-health informatics; study settings now span COVID-19 crisis communication and rare-disease decision making.

Longitudinal cohort designs overcome earlier cross-sectionalism: a 2.5-year dynamic-panel study tracked Dutch news-consumption patterns throughout the pandemic; PROCESS-mediation macros quantify psychological pathways; the QUOTE instrument converts perceived communication barriers into priority-weighted quality scores.

Empirically, the risk subject is no longer the frail elder alone but also the low-language-proficient migrant and the digitally excluded. Shared decision-making is recast as power-structure redesign rather than information symmetry. Yet limitations persist: mechanistic accounts of emotional support or long-term psychosocial sequelae remain thin; self-report dominance introduces social-desirability noise; and subgroup stratification (frailty, migration generation) could be finer.

Review conduct now features dual-independent screening, extraction, and deductive content analysis; software migration (RevMan → R → NVivo) mirrors computational-turn evolution. The 2021 SDM review for older adults with multimorbidity integrates patient, informal caregiver, and clinician standpoints, replacing single-angle health-literacy lenses with a social-model synthesis.

4. Meta-Narrative: From Cognitive Patchwork to System Reconfiguration

Van Weert's intellectual arc travels from cognitive-psychological experimentation to implementation science and, finally, to structural-equity engagement. High-risk populations evolve from "older and sicker" to "multimorbid, multilingual, resource-scarce" intersectional cohorts. The scholarly gaze shifts from message efficiency → behaviour maintenance → ethical governance of health-communication systems.

Three engines propel the shift:

(1) Disciplinary maturation—health communication's paradigm drift from "effects" to "implementation" to "social determinants and justice," abetted by journals and funders demanding real-world impact;

(2) Sociodemographic pressure—European ageing, migration, and multimorbidity expand and complicate the very definition of "risky people";

(3) Technological ambivalence—digital tools simultaneously enable novel interventions and generate new inequalities (digital divide, e-health literacy), prompting a critical stance that harnesses yet interrogates technology.

Experimentally, she migrates from clean causal models to messy, multi-factorial accounts of implementation mechanisms and equity outcomes. Review-wise, each synthesis imports stronger theory and sharper policy translation to offset prior depth deficits.

The corpus thus moves from "cognitive tinkerer" to "behavioural ecologist" and, ultimately, to "system re-architect," illustrating that premier health-communication science ends not with memorable messages but with risk reduction and systemic fairness. In short, the field is recast as an implementation science of complex, multi-actor interactions striving for health equity.

Research Signature

A conspicuous hallmark of Professor van Weert's oeuvre is its extraordinary wealth of systematic reviews conducted in parallel with large-scale primary experiments. Rather than a stylistic quirk, this "dual-track" pattern is integral to her scholarly mission: she does not stop at inventing novel communication techniques, but aspires to erect an evidentially robust, exportable knowledge base for high-risk populations.

Her review programme functions as a disciplined audit of extant findings. Because her target groups—older adults, persons with dementia, low-literate migrants—face genuine health hazards, rolling out an inadequately vetted "innovation" could itself generate iatrogenic risk. The antecedent question is therefore, "What does the current evidence truly allow us to claim?" By triangulating multinational trials and large-scale surveys, her syntheses demarcate the boundaries of safe and effective practice, pre-empting the uptake of ineffective or harmful interventions.

Second, the reviews close the loop between "tool creation" and "evidence synthesis." Demonstrating that a single artefact works in one setting is insufficient; van Weert aggregates global databases to elevate "a promising tool" to "a class of empirically supported methods," furnishing clinical guidelines and policy makers with fail-safe evidence. Thus, her prolific review output is not mere bibliographic collation but the methodological linchpin through which individual findings are generalised into transferable principles, ensuring that every advocated technology or strategy has survived stringent, large-scale scrutiny.

Conclusion

1. Future Directions

Contextually, her empirical work remains overwhelmingly Western. Recent COVID-19 news-consumption studies, for example, rely chiefly on Dutch samples, leaving the risk profiles and communication needs of non-Western populations under-explored. Cross-cultural comparative work—indeed, culture-centred design—could yield culturally calibrated risk-reduction tools and extend the global reach of her technological iterations.

Technologically, artificial intelligence and virtual reality remain frontier terrain. AI-driven personalised message tailoring or VR-based clinician communication training could sharpen intervention precision and extend her risk-control architecture into immersive environments.

Evaluation-wise, the bulk of evidence is still short-term. Longitudinal cohorts and hybrid health-economic evaluations are needed to document maintenance effects and cost-effectiveness, thereby furnishing implementers with sustainable, value-based intervention packages.

2. Intellectual Core and Through-Line

Across three decades van Weert has forged an end-to-end risk-control pipeline—risk identification → intervention → system integration—united by the leitmotif of "technology–strategy fusion for risk reduction." Populations investigated have expanded from classical high-risk cohorts to multiply disadvantaged groups; methods have evolved from RCTs to mixed-method, big-data assemblages, mirroring the data-rich turn in health-social science.

Practically, her large-sample trials and exhaustive syntheses have propelled Question Prompt Lists, tiered health animations, and the OnVaCT value-clarification tool into clinical workflows, demonstrably lowering risk for vulnerable patients. Her layered messaging protocols and snoezelen-based dementia care templates have likewise informed macro-policy and micro-service delivery.

Disciplinarily, she has knitted health communication to gerontology, oncology, and public health through a problem-driven, cross-disciplinary, translation-oriented modus that amplifies societal capacity for population-level risk governance.

References

Van Weert, J. C. M., Kerkstra, A., Van Dulmen, A. M., Bensing, J. M., Peter, J. G., & Ribbe, M. W. (2004). The implementation of snoezelen in psychogeriatric care: an evaluation through the eyes of caregivers. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 41(5), 397–409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2003.10.011

Carpenter, B., & Dave, J. (2004). Disclosing a dementia diagnosis: A review of opinion and practice, and a proposed research agenda. *The Gerontologist*, 44(2), 149–158. https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/44.2.149

Verkaik, R., Van Weert, J. C. M., & Francke, A. L. (2005). The effects of psychosocial methods on depressed, aggressive and apathetic behaviors of people with dementia: A systematic review. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 20(4), 301–314. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.1279

Van Weert, J. C. M., Janssen, B. M., Van Dulmen, A. M., Spreeuwenberg, P. M. M., Bensing, J. M., & Ribbe, M. W. (2006). Nursing assistants' behaviour during morning care: effects of the implementation of snoezelen, integrated in 24-hour dementia care. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 53(6), 656–668. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2006.03837.x

Jansen, J., Van Weert, J. C. M., Van Dulmen, S., Heeren, T., & Bensing, J. (2007). Patient education about treatment in cancer care: An overview of the literature on older patients' needs. *Cancer Nursing*, 30(4), 251–260. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NCC.0000275024.44224.84

Jansen, J., Butow, P. N., van Weert, J. C. M., van Dulmen, S., Devine, R. J., Heeren, T. J., Bensing, J. M., & Tattersall, M. H. N. (2008). Does age really matter? Recall of information presented to newly referred patients with cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 26, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2007.15.2322

Posma, E. R., van Weert, J. C. M., Jansen, J., & Bensing, J. M. (2009). Older cancer patients' information and support needs surrounding treatment: An evaluation through the eyes of patients, relatives and professionals. *BMC Nursing*, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6955-8-1

Vervloet, M., Linn, A. J., van Weert, J. C. M., de Bakker, D. H., Bouvy, M. L., & van Dijk, L. (2012). The effectiveness of interventions using electronic reminders to improve adherence to chronic medication: a systematic review of the literature. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 19(5), 696-704. https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000748

Boersma, P., van Weert, J. C. M., Lakerveld, J., & Dröes, R. M. (2015). The art of successful implementation of psychosocial interventions in residential dementia care: a systematic review of the literature based on the RE-AIM framework. *International Psychogeriatrics*, 27(1), 19-35. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1041610214001409

Diviani, N., van den Putte, B., Giani, S., & van Weert, J. C. M. (2015). Low health literacy and evaluation of online health information: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 17(5), e112. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.4018

Meppelink, C. S., van Weert, J. C. M., Haven, C. J., & Smit, E. G. (2015). The effectiveness of health animations in audiences with different health literacy levels: An experimental study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 17(1), e11. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.3979

van Weert, J. C. M., van Munster, B. C., Sanders, R., Spijker, R., Hooft, L., & Jansen, J. (2016). Decision aids to help older people make health decisions: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 16(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-016-0281-8

Bol, N., Helberger, N., & van Weert, J. C. M. (2018). Differences in mobile health app use: A source of new digital inequalities? *The Information Society*, 34(3), 183–193. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2018.1438550

Finset, A., Bosworth, H., Butow, P., Gulbrandsen, P., Hulsman, R. L., Pieterse, A. H., Tschoetschel, R., & van Weert, J. (2020). Effective health communication–a key factor in fighting the COVID-19 pandemic. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 103(6), 873–876. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2020.03.027

Pel-Littel, R. E., Snaterse, M., Teppich, N. M., Buurman, B. M., van Etten-Jamaludin, F. S., van Weert, J. C. M., Minkman, M. M., & Scholte op Reimer, W. J. M. (2021). Barriers and facilit ators for shared decision making in older patients with multiple chronic conditions: A systematic review. *BMC Geriatrics*, 21(1), 112. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-021-02050-y

Linn, A. J., van Weert, J. C. M., & Bylund, C. L. (2024). Are they important? Patients' communication barriers to discussing online health information during consultations. *Health Communication*, 39(5), 945–950. https://doi.org/10.1080/10410236.2023.2197311

Araújo, R., & van Weert, J. C. M. (2024). Editorial: Accessing health information and health services—Why (health) literacy matters. *European Journal of Health Communication*, 5(2), I–V. https://doi.org/10.47368/ejhc.2024.200

Solovei, A., van Weert, J. C. M., van den Putte, B., Boukes, M., van der Meer, T. G. L. A., Mollen, S., Smit, E. S., Yilmaz, N. G., & de Bruin, M. (2024). Patterns of news consumption during the COVID-19 pandemic crisis: A 2.5 year longitudinal study in the Netherlands. *Journalism Studies*, 25(16), 1968–1989. https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2024.2407944

Chan, B. M. C., van Weert, J. C. M., Fang, Y., Song, J., Suurmond, J., & Schouten, B. C. (2025). Identifying needs for a decision aid to support communication with low-language-proficient migrant patients. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 141, 109307. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2025.109307

van Lent, L. G. G., van Weert, J. C. M., de Jonge, M. J. A., van der Ham, M., Lolkema, M. P., van Mil, M., Gort, E. H., van Gurp, J., Oomen-de Hoop, E., Hasselaar, J., & van der Rijt, C. C. D. (2025). Improving shared decision-making in early phase clinical trials and palliative care: A prospective study on the impact of an online value clarification tool intervention. *Psycho-Oncology*, 34, e70168. https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.70168