

JAIR

2026 | No 1

Journal of Applied
Interdisciplinary Research



JAIRS

Journal of Applied
Interdisciplinary Research

A large, stylized blue graphic element that forms the letter 'S'. It starts as a small square at the top right, then curves down and left, then curves back down and right, and finally curves back down and left, ending in a horizontal bar at the bottom right.

JAIR

Journal of Applied
Interdisciplinary Research

PUBLISHERS

Prof. Waldemar Berg
(President of the Deggendorf Institute of Technology – DIT)
Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Dorner
(Vice President Research & Transfer – DIT)

praesident@th-deg.de
wolfgang.dorner@th-deg.de

EDITORIAL TEAM

Prof. Dr. Michelle Cummings-Koether (principal editor)
Dr. Kristin Seffer (principal editor)
Esther Kinateder (proofreader)
Simone Lindlbauer (coordinator)
Shin-Yo Chen (typesetting)
Steffen Menzel (technical support)

michelle.cummings-koether@th-deg.de
kristin.seffer@th-deg.de
esther.kinateder@th-deg.de
simone.lindlbauer@th-deg.de
shin-yo.chen@th-deg.de
steffen.menzel@th-deg.de

EDITORIAL BOARD

Prof. Dr. med. habil. Thiha Aung (DIT)
Prof. Dr. Georgi Chaltikyan (DIT)
Prof. Dr. Katerina Volchek (DIT)
Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Dorner (DIT)
Prof. Dr. Mouzhi Ge (DIT)
Prof. Dr. Andreas J. Kassler (DIT)
Prof. Dr. Matthias Huber (THI)

thiha.aung@th-deg.de
georgi.chaltikyan@th-deg.de
katerina.volchek@th-deg.de
wolfgang.dorner@th-deg.de
mouzhi.ge@th-deg.de
andreas.kassler@th-deg.de
matthias.huber@thi.de

DESIGN

Sandra Maier, Diana Karl
ISSN: 2940-8199

The Journal of Applied Interdisciplinary Research (JAIR) is published as a series of the Bavarian Journal of Applied Sciences.

CONTACT US

Journal of Applied Interdisciplinary Research (JAIR)
Technische Hochschule Deggendorf
Dieter-Görlitz-Platz 1
94469 Deggendorf, Germany
Phone: ++49 (0) 991 3615-0
Fax: ++49 (0) 991 3615-297
E-Mail: jair@th-deg.de
Web: <https://jas.bayern>



The JAIR is listed in the
Diamond Discovery Hub (DDH).
<https://ddh.edch.eu/en/journals/23881>

This is an open access journal which means that all content is freely available without charge to the user or his / her institution. Users are allowed to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of the articles in this journal without asking for prior permission from the publisher or the author under the condition that the original publication is properly cited. This is pursuant to the BOAI definition of open access.

CONTENT

EDITORS' PREAMBLE

Michelle Cummings-Koether & Kristin Seffer 5

ARTICLES

Sally Meyer, Steven Cuadra, Sabine Dittrich 6

Lifestyle Risk Factors and Health Indicators in Students at a Bavarian University: A Cross-Sectional Study of Physical Activity, Diet, Stress, Sleep Quality, and Body Mass Index

Johanna Trager, Jane Käser, Roland Zink 37

The Influence of Spatial and Temporal Dimensions on the Success of Participation in Czech-Bavarian Interreg Projects

IMPRINT

Editors' Preamble

It is with great pleasure that we present the first volume of the Journal for Applied Interdisciplinary Research (JAIR) for 2026. We are proud to bring another collection of peer-reviewed research to our growing international readership.

The JAIR remains steadfast in its founding principles: rigorous peer review, open-access publishing at no cost to authors, and a genuine commitment to interdisciplinary inquiry. We continue to believe that research which transcends traditional disciplinary boundaries is among the most valuable and far-reaching that applied sciences can offer, and we are grateful to all authors, reviewers, and readers who share and sustain this vision. This is one of the reasons why we have decided to join the Diamond Discovery Hub (DDH), because we continue to support the belief in open science and open access. The DDH is a registry of scholar-led open access journals. In order to become a member, the following Diamond criteria have to be fulfilled: persistent identification, scholarly journal, open access with open licences, no fees, open to all authors and community-owned.

We extend our sincere thanks to the authors whose work appears in this volume. Their contributions reflect scholarly rigor, methodological care, and a meaningful engagement with questions of real-world relevance. In this volume, you will find the following articles:

Sally Meyer, Steven Cuadra & Sabine Dittrich: Lifestyle Risk Factors and Health Indicators in Students at a Bavarian University: A Cross-Sectional Study of Physical Activity, Diet, Stress, Sleep Quality, and Body Mass Index.

Johanna Trager, Jane Käser & Roland Zink: The Influence of Spatial and Temporal Dimensions on the Success of Participation in Czech-Bavarian Interreg Projects.

This volume brings together research that speaks to pressing questions in public health and regional governance. The first article examines student health behaviors at a Bavarian university, drawing on cross-sectional survey data to identify the prevalence of lifestyle risk factors — including insufficient physical activity, stress, and poor diet — and their relationship to health indicators such as insomnia and elevated BMI. The findings carry direct implications for the design of targeted health promotion strategies in higher education settings. The second article shifts focus to cross-border regional cooperation in the Czech-Bavarian border region, evaluating how the spatial and temporal dimensions of participatory events within Interreg projects influence their effectiveness. The study offers concrete recommendations for practitioners seeking to optimize participatory formats in rural and cross-border contexts.

We would like to express our deep gratitude to our reviewers, whose careful and expert engagement with submitted manuscripts is essential to the integrity and quality of every article we publish. We continue to warmly welcome reviewers from all fields and invite scholars and practitioners alike to join us in building the JAIR into an ever more vibrant, open, and inclusive platform for applied interdisciplinary research. Thank you for your continued support and for being part of our journey.

Prof. Dr. Michelle J. Cummings-Koether & Dr. Kristin Seffer
Editors, *Journal of Applied Interdisciplinary Research (JAIR)*

Lifestyle Risk Factors and Health Indicators in Students at a Bavarian University: A Cross-Sectional Study of Physical Activity, Diet, Stress, Sleep Quality, and Body Mass Index

Lifestyle Risk Factors and Health Indicators in University Students

Sally Meyer*, Steven Cuadra*, Sabine Dittrich*

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to assess the frequency of selected lifestyle risk factors and health indicators among university students, and to examine their interrelationships and variation according to demographic and academic characteristics.

A cross-sectional study was conducted using an online survey among students ($n = 106$) at the Deggendorf Institute of Technology (DIT), a higher education institution in Bavaria, Germany. Sleep quality/insomnia and increased BMI were assessed as health indicators, while stress, physical activity, and diet were evaluated as lifestyle risk factors. Information on demographic and academic characteristics was also collected. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the study variables. Differences in categorical outcomes across levels of continuous predictors were assessed using Student's t -test or one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), while differences according to categorical predictors were evaluated using the Chi-square test. Associations between continuous variables were examined using Pearson correlation coefficients. Logistic regression models were used to explore potential predictors of insomnia and increased BMI after adjusting for relevant covariates.

Insufficient physical activity was the most common lifestyle risk factor among students (47.9%), followed by high stress (25.5%) and poor diet (16.7%). Regarding the selected health indicators, 45.3% of students were classified as overweight or obese and 26.9% had probable insomnia. Among complete cases, 42.6% presented none of the selected health indicators, 31.9% had increased BMI only, 12.8% had probable insomnia only, and 12.8% presented both increased BMI and probable insomnia. When examining correlations among lifestyle risk factors, only diet quality showed a significant inverse correlation with physical activity ($r = -0.289$, $p = 0.005$). Among the lifestyle risk factors, stress showed a borderline correlation with sleep quality ($r = -0.189$, $p = 0.057$). Overall, high stress (OR = 6.57, 95% CI: 1.55–27.82) and male gender (OR = 4.77, 95% CI: 1.23–18.55) were significant predictors of insomnia. No significant predictors of increased BMI were identified, although male gender showed a borderline association (OR = 2.6, 95% CI: 0.95–6.9, $p = 0.063$).

Lifestyle risk factors and health indicators such as insomnia and increased BMI were common among students, highlighting the need for targeted health promotion strategies. As an exploratory study, these findings identify trends that warrant further investigation.

KEYWORDS

Student health, stress, sleep, physical activity, diet

*Deggendorf Institute of Technology, Deggendorf, Germany
<https://doi.org/10.25929/m0waw720>

1. Background

Noncommunicable diseases (NCDs) are the leading cause of mortality worldwide and account for the majority of global deaths (Li et al., 2025; WHO, 2025). Cardiovascular diseases, cancer, diabetes, chronic respiratory diseases, and stroke are strongly associated with modifiable risk factors, including unhealthy diet, insufficient physical activity, tobacco and alcohol use, and chronic psychosocial stress (Feng et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025). These risk factors often develop gradually across the life course (Kelishadi, 2019; Mikkelsen et al., 2019), and early adulthood represents a critical period during which long-term health-related behaviors may become established (Wood et al., 2018).

The transition from adolescence to young adulthood is frequently accompanied by changes in autonomy, living conditions, and daily routines, including unhealthy habits (Vanhelst et al., 2023; Winpenny et al., 2020). For many individuals, this transition coincides with entering university, a context often associated with new academic demands, financial responsibilities, altered sleep schedules, and reduced parental supervision (Aceijas et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2023). These changes may influence health-related behaviors (Cruz et al., 2018; Deforche et al., 2015; Lesińska-Sawicka, Pisarek, & Nagórska, 2021; Oftedal et al., 2024) and increase exposure to relevant psychosocial determinants (Johannes et al., 2024; Van Dyck et al., 2015). Together, these behavioral and psychosocial factors can be considered components of students' lifestyle, which in turn may affect both the current health status and future health.

Available evidence indicates that insufficient physical activity, suboptimal dietary patterns, and elevated stress are highly prevalent among university students, although the magnitude varies across settings. Insufficient physical activity, in particular, has been consistently identified as one of the most common lifestyle risk factors in this population across different regions of the world. A pooled analysis of 1.6 million adolescents from 146 countries found that 81.0% did not meet recommended activity levels (Guthold et al., 2020), and similar patterns are observed in university samples. In Sudan, 59.5% of medical students were insufficiently active (Fadul et al., 2023), while in China, 77.6% of more than 30,000 students reported only light-intensity activity (Li et al., 2024). Earlier international data from 27 countries showed that more than half of students in the United States and Canada were not sufficiently active (Irwin, 2004), and low activity has also been documented among Spanish nursing students (Ramón-Arбуés et al., 2023).

Dietary assessments in university students likewise reveal widespread suboptimal diet patterns. In a multicountry study (Chile, Mexico, Spain, Italy), only about 10% met Healthy Eating Index criteria for a healthy diet (Moral-Moreno et al., 2025). In Italy, 17.2% showed low adherence to the Mediterranean diet and 55.0% medium adherence, meaning over 70% did not follow an optimal pattern (Franchini et al., 2025). A systematic review in Iran estimated a 37% prevalence of unhealthy dietary patterns (Ahmadi et al., 2024), while in China fewer than 50% consumed vegetables daily and only 18.2% fruit daily (Liu et al., 2025). High levels of stress are also commonly reported among university students, although prevalence varies considerably across contexts. For example, stress prevalence was 34.5% in Spain (Ramón-Arбуés et al., 2020) and 27.0% for moderate or higher stress in Turkey (Bayram & Bilgel, 2008), whereas 12.7% of students in Saudi Arabia reported high perceived stress (Alsalem et al., 2021). Higher estimates have been observed in other settings, including 53.0% among Indian medical students (Iqbal, Gupta, & Venkatarao, 2015) and a pooled prevalence of 64.7% across African countries (Fentahun et al., 2025), highlighting substantial contextual variability.

Poor sleep quality and insufficient sleep duration are frequently reported health indicators among university students, although their prevalence varies considerably. A meta-analysis of 34 studies (14,704 students) indicated that approximately 30% meet criteria for insomnia and 36–68% report poor sleep quality (Gardani et al., 2022). National studies report 48.7% poor sleep quality in Germany (Schmickler et al., 2023), 39.5% insufficient sleep and 16.7% poor sleep quality in China (Li et al., 2024), and over 60% poor sleepers in U.S. samples (Becker et al., 2018; Lund et al., 2010). Even higher estimates were reported among Saudi medical students (76%) (Almojali et al., 2017) and Jordanian students, where about two-thirds rated their sleep as fairly or very bad (Albqoor & Shaheen, 2021).

An elevated BMI is another health indicator commonly observed. In a multicountry study of 15,746 students across 22 countries, 22.0% were overweight or obese overall, with a higher prevalence in men (24.7%) than women (20.3%), and rates reaching 40.0% in high-income countries (Peltzer et al., 2014). Country-specific studies report 27.9% in the United States (Odlaug et al., 2015), 21.0% in Turkey (Tokaç Er et al., 2021), 38.2% in Bangladesh (Emon et al., 2024), and 37.5% in India (Pengpid & Peltzer, 2014). In Brazil, prevalence differed markedly by sex (17.9% women; 45.8% men) (de Faria et al., 2023). These findings show that both poor sleep and an elevated BMI are common but not uniform across university contexts.

Beyond their individual frequency, evidence suggests that physical activity, diet, and stress frequently cluster and may relate to sleep and BMI, although associations are not uniformly consistent. In Greek students ($n = 5,433$), low Mediterranean diet adherence was associated with low physical activity (OR = 1.73; 95% CI: 1.58–1.97) and moderate/high stress (OR = 2.21; 95% CI: 1.99–2.47) (Dakanalis et al., 2025). In a U.S. national sample ($n = 14,804$), meeting vigorous physical activity recommendations was associated with lower perceived stress (adjusted OR = 0.75; 95% CI: 0.67–0.83) (Vankim & Nelson, 2013). Cluster analysis in an Italian undergraduate cohort identified a subgroup characterized by not meeting exercise guidelines (72.5%), high perceived stress (77.6%), and poor nutrition quality (59.7%), indicating that these lifestyle risk factors tend to cluster within the same subgroup of students (Lucini et al., 2024).

Empirical studies have further examined how these lifestyle risk factors relate to health indicators such as sleep quality and BMI, with some investigations identifying significant associations and others reporting weak or non-significant relationships. In Spain, an unhealthy diet was associated with poor sleep quality (adjusted OR = 4.20; 95% CI: 2.07–8.52) (Ramón-Arбуés et al., 2022), and in Germany, perceived stress predicted worse sleep ($\beta = 0.27$, $p < 0.001$) (Schmickler et al., 2023). In an Italian university student sample, overweight/obesity has been linked to low physical activity (RR = 2.15; 95% CI: 1.87–2.41), high stress (RR = 2.43; 95% CI: 2.19–2.64), and inadequate sleep (RR = 1.86; 95% CI: 1.60–2.14) (Dakanalis et al., 2024). However, in a cross-sectional study of 2,347 Chinese university students, the physical activity level was not independently associated with poor sleep quality after adjustment for confounders (OR = 1.27; 95% CI: 0.95–1.70), although high sedentary time was significantly associated (OR = 1.37; 95% CI: 1.14–1.65) (Li & Li, 2022). Similarly, in a study of 1,125 U.S. college students, exercise frequency was not a significant independent predictor of sleep quality in multivariable regression models once stress-related variables were included (Lund et al., 2010). Also, a meta-analysis synthesizing 29 observational studies and including 141,035 university students found no significant pooled association between moderate-to-vigorous physical activity and sleep quality ($r = -0.18$; $p = 0.10$) or sleep duration ($r = 0.02$; $p = 0.76$) (Memon et al., 2021). Overall, it seems when considering sleep and BMI, associations are mixed for physical activity but clearer for diet and stress.

Although sleep quality, stress, physical activity, diet, and BMI have been examined in university students, reported prevalence estimates and observed associations vary across institutional and cultural contexts. These differences indicate that the distribution of these factors may depend on the characteristics of the student population under study. Examining these variables within a defined higher education environment therefore remains relevant, particularly when the institution includes a substantial proportion of international and culturally diverse students. In the present study, we investigated students at the Deggendorf Institute of Technology (DIT), a higher education institution with more than 9,000 students, including approximately 4,000 (45%) international students (DIT, 2025). The multicultural composition of this student body provides an opportunity to describe the prevalence of these selected lifestyle factors and health indicators and to explore their interrelationships within a diverse academic setting.

Exploring the frequency of these selected lifestyle factors and health indicators in this context may contribute to a clearer understanding of how they present within a multicultural higher education population. Exploring their associations within the same student population may help identify patterns that are consistent with, or differ from, those reported in other university settings. Such findings may provide institution-specific information for the DIT and may also offer comparative insights for other higher education institutions.

2. Research Objective

The primary aim of this study was to assess the frequency of exposure to lifestyle risk factors—physical inactivity, poor diet, and stress—and selected health indicators such as sleep quality and BMI among university students, examining how these factors relate to each other and vary across demographic and study-related characteristics. A secondary aim was to identify potential predictors of increased BMI and poor sleep/insomnia.

3. Methods

Study Design

A cross-sectional exploratory study was conducted using a web-based survey to investigate selected lifestyle risk factors and health indicators among university students. The study was carried out at the Deggendorf Institute of Technology (DIT), a public university of applied sciences located in Bavaria, Germany, with both domestic and international students enrolled in undergraduate and graduate programs across multiple academic disciplines.

Ethical Considerations

DIT guidelines for research involving human participants were followed. The study protocol was approved by the corresponding faculty authorities of the Deggendorf Institute of Technology. All procedures were conducted in accordance with the ethical principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki. Participation in the study was voluntary. Prior to accessing the questionnaire, participants received an electronic information sheet describing the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, and the confidentiality of the collected data. Participants provided informed consent electronically before proceeding with the survey. All responses were collected anonymously, and no personally identifiable information was recorded. Participants were informed that they could discontinue participation at any time without consequences. Contact information for the research team and for university student counselling services was provided in case participants had questions or experienced discomfort related to the survey.

Participant Enrolment and Data Collection

Participants were recruited using a convenience sampling approach. All students enrolled at the Deggendorf Institute of Technology (DIT) at the time of data collection and aged 18 years or older were eligible to participate. The survey invitation was distributed through multiple institutional and student communication channels, including the official student mailing list, student WhatsApp groups, and posts on LinkedIn. No financial or academic incentives were offered for participation. A total of 106 students completed the questionnaire and were included in the study sample. Data were collected using a self-administered web-based questionnaire developed only in English and implemented through the LimeSurvey platform (<https://www.limesurvey.org/>), the official survey software supported by the DIT. The questionnaire incorporated four validated instruments commonly used in health and behavioral research to assess sleep quality, perceived stress, physical activity, and dietary patterns, together with additional items addressing demographic and academic characteristics. The questionnaire was organized into sections corresponding to the principal domains assessed in the study. To reduce respondent burden and encourage completion, the survey was designed to be brief and required approximately 5–10 minutes to complete.

Prior to the main data collection, the questionnaire underwent pilot testing with a limited number of students to assess clarity and functionality of the online survey. The adequacy and structure of the questionnaire were also reviewed in consultation with subject-matter experts. Minor adjustments were made before the final survey was distributed. Participants accessed the questionnaire through a secure web link. After reviewing the study information and providing informed consent, respondents completed

the questionnaire anonymously. Data collection took place between 18 March and 15 April 2025, and responses were stored securely on the university server through the LimeSurvey system.

A detailed description of the study variables, measurement instruments, scoring procedures, and classification criteria used in the analysis is provided in the following section.

Measures (Study Variables)

1. Lifestyle risk factors

Three lifestyle-related risk factors were assessed: perceived stress, physical activity, and diet quality. Perceived stress was measured using the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10) (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983), a widely used self-report instrument that assesses the degree to which individuals perceive situations in their lives as stressful. The scale consists of 10 items; each rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). Total scores range from 0 to 40, with higher scores indicating greater perceived stress. For descriptive analyses, stress levels were categorized as low (0–13), moderate (14–26), and high (27–40) following commonly used classification thresholds.

Physical activity was assessed using the Godin Leisure-Time Exercise Questionnaire (Godin & Shephard, 1985), which measures the frequency of mild, moderate, and vigorous leisure-time physical activity during a typical week. Respondents reported how many times per week they performed activities lasting at least 15 minutes in each intensity category. A Total Leisure Activity Score (TLAS) was calculated by weighting frequencies according to intensity (mild $\times 3$, moderate $\times 5$, vigorous $\times 9$) and summing the results. Consistent with established recommendations, individuals with $TLAS \leq 23$ were classified as insufficiently active, while those with $TLAS \geq 24$ were considered active.

Diet quality was assessed using the Starting the Conversation (STC) Diet Tool (Paxton et al., 2011), a brief dietary screening instrument consisting of eight items evaluating common eating patterns such as consumption of fruits and vegetables, sugar-sweetened beverages, snack foods, and fast food. Each item is scored on a 3-point scale, producing a total score ranging from 0 to 16, where higher scores indicate less healthy dietary patterns. As the instrument does not provide a universal cut-off for cross-sectional classification, categories were created by dividing the score range into four intervals: 0–4 (very healthy), 5–8 (healthy), 9–12 (less healthy), and 13–16 (poor diet). For analytical purposes, scores ≥ 9 were considered indicative of an unhealthy diet.

The full versions of the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10), the Godin Leisure-Time Exercise Questionnaire (TLAS), and the Starting the Conversation (STC) Diet Tool are provided in Appendix 1.

2. Selected health indicators

Two health indicators were examined: sleep quality and Body Mass Index (BMI). Sleep quality was assessed using the Sleep Condition Indicator (SCI) (Espie et al., 2014), an 8-item self-report questionnaire designed to evaluate symptoms of insomnia and their impact on daily functioning over the previous month. Each item is rated on a 5-point scale, producing a total score ranging from 0 to 32, with higher scores indicating better sleep quality. In accordance with established recommendations, a score below 16 was used to indicate probable insomnia, whereas scores ≥ 16 indicated no insomnia.

The Body Mass Index (BMI) was calculated using self-reported weight and height provided by participants and expressed in kg/m^2 . For descriptive and analytical purposes, the nutritional status was classified as not overweight/obese or overweight/obese using ethnicity-specific thresholds recommended by international guidelines. Participants of Asian background were classified as overweight/obese at $BMI \geq 23 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$, whereas for all other ethnic groups the threshold was $BMI \geq 25 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$ (Cole & Lobstein, 2012; WHO, 2026).

3. Sociodemographic and academic-related characteristics

The questionnaire collected information on sociodemographic and academic-related characteristics. Age was recorded as a continuous variable (years) and categorized for descriptive analyses into <25, 25–29, and ≥ 30 years. Gender was recorded based on participants' self-identification. Ethnicity was assessed through a self-identification item with the following response options: White/European, South Asian, Black/African descent, Arab/Middle Eastern, Southeast Asian, East Asian, Mixed/Multiracial, and Other. Categories with small numbers were combined for analysis into White, South Asian, Black/African descent, Arab/Middle Eastern, East & Southeast Asian, and Mixed/Other. The self-perceived economic situation was measured using a single-item question with five response options: very comfortable, comfortable, coping, difficult, and very difficult. These were collapsed into three categories: economically secure (very comfortable/comfortable), moderately constrained (coping), and economically insecure (difficult/very difficult). Participants also reported academic-related characteristics, including study program, degree level (Bachelor's or Master's), and stage of study, allowing characterization of the academic profile of the sample.

Data Analysis

Data Cleaning and Processing

Survey responses were exported from LimeSurvey into IBM SPSS Statistics version 26 for data preparation and analysis. Data were screened for completeness, consistency, and plausibility. Continuous variables were visually inspected using histograms and boxplots to evaluate distributional characteristics. A small number of outliers were identified but retained, as they did not meaningfully affect the distribution of the variables. Validated instruments were scored according to their published scoring procedures, as described in the Measures section. During data cleaning, minor inconsistencies in questionnaire responses were identified and corrected where possible to ensure consistency with the instruments' scoring formats.

The dataset initially contained 106 completed questionnaires. Missing data were handled using complete-case analysis, meaning that participants with missing values for variables required in a given analysis were excluded from that specific analysis. No statistical imputation was performed. Analyses examining the combined lifestyle risk factors and health indicators were conducted using 94 complete cases, while logistic regression models were estimated using 84 cases with complete information on all variables included in the models.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were calculated for all study variables. Continuous variables are presented as means and standard deviations, together with minimum, maximum, and selected percentiles, while categorical variables are reported as frequencies and percentages.

Group differences in continuous variables across categorical predictors were assessed using Student's t-tests for dichotomous variables and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for variables with more than two categories. When assumptions for parametric tests were not met, the Mann-Whitney U test was used as a non-parametric alternative. Associations between categorical variables were evaluated using the chi-square test. Relationships between continuous lifestyle risk factors (exposure variables) and health indicators (outcome variables) were examined using Pearson correlation coefficients, while Spearman rank correlations were applied when assumptions for parametric correlation analysis were not satisfied. Statistical significance was defined as $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed).

To examine the combined presence of lifestyle risk factors, dichotomous indicators were created for each exposure variable (e.g., presence vs. absence of high stress, insufficient physical activity, and unhealthy diet). These variables were coded as 1 (present) or 0 (absent) and summed to create a com-

posite exposure variable representing the number of concurrent lifestyle risk factors experienced by each participant.

Finally, binary logistic regression models were fitted to estimate adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for selected health indicators (outcome variables). Independent variables included the lifestyle risk factors (exposure variables), while sociodemographic and academic-related characteristics were included as covariates. Separate models were estimated for each outcome variable.

4. Results

Participants' Characteristics

A summary of the demographic and current academic study program characteristics of participants is provided in Table 1. The study included 106 participants, 51% females and 49% males. Most of the respondents were aged 25–29 years (40.2%), and the average age was approximately 27 years old. The vast majority of participants lived in Germany (92.2%). In terms of ethnicity, participants were diverse, with the largest group identifying as South Asian (33%), followed by White/European (28.2%) and Black/African descent (17.5%). Of the respondents, almost half (47.1%) considered themselves to be moderately financially constrained. Regarding education, over half of the students were enrolled in a Master's degree (61.9%) and almost half studied both on campus and online (46.5%).

Sociodemographic		n	%
Age ¹	<25 y	32	34.8
	25 to 29 y	37	40.2
	≥30 y	23	25
	Total	92	100
Gender	Female	53	51
	Male	51	49
	Total	104	100
Ethnicity	White/ European	29	28.2
	South Asian	34	33
	Black (African descendant)	18	17.5
	Arab (Middle Eastern)	12	11.7
	East/Southeast Asian	4	3.9
	Mixed/Others	6	5.8
	Total	103	100
Living in Germany	Yes	95	92.2
	No	8	7.8
	Total	103	100
Self-perceived economic situation	Economically secure	36	35.3
	Moderately constrained	48	47.1
	Economically Insecure	18	17.6
	Total	102	100
Academic study program characteristics			
Type of study program	MSc	60	61.9
	BSc	37	38.1
	Total	97	100
Mode of study	Campus	29	28.7
	Online	25	24.8
	Both	47	46.5
	Total	101	100

n = number of valid cases (with appropriately recorded responses).

¹Mean age (standard deviation): 26.87 (4.96) years; median (range): 27.00 (30) years.

Table 1: Sociodemographic and academic study program characteristics of participants

Patterns of lifestyle risk factors among students

Table 2 presents an assessment of selected lifestyle risk factors among university students, including perceived stress, physical activity, and diet, disaggregated by sociodemographic and academic study program characteristics. It includes both mean scores (with standard deviations) and the proportion of participants meeting risk criteria based on validated cutoffs: high stress (Perceived Stress Scale Total Score [PSS-TS] > 27), insufficient physical activity (Total Leisure Activity Score [TLAS] ≤ 23), and poor diet (Starting the Conversation Diet Score [STC-DS] ≥ 9). Statistical comparisons were performed using t-tests, ANOVA, and chi-square tests, with a significance threshold of $p < 0.05$.

Regarding perceived stress scores (PSS-TS), a mean score of 19.0 (SD = 6.1) was observed, and overall, 25.5% of students were classified as experiencing high stress (Table 2). PSS-TS differed significantly by gender ($p = 0.031$). Female students reported higher mean scores ($M = 20.4$, $SD = 6.2$) than males ($M = 17.8$, $SD = 5.7$). The proportion of students classified as having high stress was also significantly higher among females (23.1%) compared to males (8.2%; $p = 0.045$). Ethnicity was significantly associated with high stress classification ($p = 0.047$). Participants identifying as Mixed/Others showed the highest proportion of high stress (33.3%), followed by East/Southeast Asians (25.0%), South Asians (21.2%), White Europeans (13.8%), Arabs (10.0%), and Black/African descendants (5.6%). No significant differences in PSS-TS scores or high stress classification were observed by age group ($p = 0.244$ and 0.168), country of residence ($p = 0.960$ and 0.881), self-perceived economic status ($p = 0.165$ and 0.160), study program ($p = 0.573$ and 0.729), or mode of study ($p = 0.311$ and 0.548).

With regard to physical activity (Table 2), the mean TLAS was 42.8 (SD = 42.5), and 47.9% of students were classified as insufficiently active. When physical activity was examined as a categorical variable, gender was the only factor significantly associated with activity classification ($p = 0.049$), with a greater proportion of females classified as insufficiently active (58.0%) compared with males (37.8%). When TLAS was analyzed as a continuous score, mean values did not differ significantly by gender according to Student's t test ($p = 0.538$). However, because TLAS did not meet the assumption of normality, a Mann-Whitney U test was also conducted, which indicated a significant difference between males and females ($p = 0.037$). Ethnicity was not significantly associated with TLAS scores ($p = 0.403$), although descriptive differences were observed: South Asian students had the highest mean TLAS ($M = 50.7$, $SD = 44.6$), whereas East/Southeast Asian students had the lowest ($M = 12.3$, $SD = 13.8$), and all students in this group were classified as insufficiently active. When physical activity was examined as a categorical outcome, ethnicity approached statistical significance ($p = 0.092$). No significant associations were observed between physical activity and age, economic status, study program, or mode of study.

Diet quality, measured by the STC-DS, showed a mean score of 6.3 (SD = 2.2), with 16.7% of students classified as having a poor diet. Although no group differences reached statistical significance (all $p > 0.05$), some trends were noted: the proportion of students with a poor diet decreased with age, and males (22.4%) had higher rates than females (9.6%), with a borderline difference ($p = 0.077$) (table 2)

	Stress				Physical activity				Diet												
	PSS-TS		p	High level		TLAS		p	Insufficiently active		STC-DS		p	Non-healthy (poor diet)							
	n	Mean		SD	n	%	n		Mean	SD	n	Mean		SD	n	%					
All participants																					
	102	19.0	6.1	26	25.5	96	42.8	42.5	46	47.9	102	6.3	2.2	17	16.7						
Sociodemographic																					
Age																					
< 25 years	31	17.1	6	2	6.5	0.168	30	47.7	42.7	0.801	11	36.7	0.191	31	6.65	2	0.401	6	19.4	0.828	
25 to 29 years	36	19.3	6.6	6	16.7		35	40.7	47.2		18	51.4		36	6.33	2.31		6	16.7		
≥ 30 years	23	19.4	5.5	4	17.4		21	41.5	41.6		13	61.9		23	5.83	2.25		3	13.0		
Gender																					
Female	52	20.4	6.2	0.031	12	23.1	0.045	50	40.2	50.5	0.538	29	58	0.049	52	6.23	1.9	0.722	5	9.6	0.077
Males	49	17.8	5.7		4	8.2		45	45.6	32.4		17	37.8		49	6.39	2.51		11	22.4	
Ethnicity																					
East/Southeast Asian	4	19.3	6.6	0.532	1	25	0.047	4	12.3	13.8	0.403	4	100	0.092	4	6.0	1.41	0.229	0	0.0	0.824
South Asian	33	19	6.7		7	21.2		34	50.7	44.6		13	38.2		33	6.36	2.16		6	18.2	
Black/African descendant	18	20	4.5		1	5.6		15	29.3	27.8		9	60		18	6.67	2.06		3	16.7	
Arab (Middle Eastern)	10	21.2	3.2		1	10		8	44.1	66.5		6	75		10	6.2	2.49		2	20.0	
White European	29	17.3	7.2		4	13.8		29	43.4	40.9		12	41.4		29	6.52	2.05		5	17.2	
Mixed/Others	6	20.5	5.5		2	33.3		5	32.2	22.4		2	40		6	4.17	2.14		0	0.0	
Living in Germany																					
Yes	92	19	6.3	0.960	15	16.3	0.881	89	41.8	41.5	0.798	43	48.3	0.936	92	6.36	2.08	0.743	15	16.3	0.530
No	8	19.1	5.2		1	12.5		6	37.3	34.5		3	50		8	6.63	3.38		2	25.0	
Self-perceived economic situation																					
Secure	35	17.6	6.4	0.165	4	11.4	0.16	34	45.1	32.5	0.683	14	41.2	0.458	35	6.17	2.58	0.854	7	20.0	0.700
Moderately constrained	46	19.8	5.4		7	15.2		44	43.8	53		22	50		46	6.43	1.77		6	13.0	
Insecure	18	20.4	6.5		5	27.8		15	33.7	31.9		9	60		18	6.39	2.06		3	16.7	
Study program characteristics																					
Type of study																					
MSc	59	19.1	6.2	0.573	10	16.9	0.729	56	42.8	44.3	0.393	29	51.8	0.393	59	6.49	2.32	0.692	13	22.0	0.178
BSc	36	18.4	6.2		4	11.1		33	45.2	43.6		14	42.4		36	6.31	2.01		4	11.1	
Mode of study																					
Onsite	28	18.1	5.8	0.311	3	10.7	0.548	26	36.2	26.1	0.548	11	42.3	0.234	28	6.43	2.2	0.638	6	21.4	0.432
Distance	25	20.6	6.7		6	24		22	38.8	51.4		14	63.6		25	6.6	2.68		5	20.0	
Both	45	18.9	5.8		7	15.6		44	46.8	43.6		19	43.2		45	6.11	1.81		5	11.1	

Note. SD = standard deviation; n = number of valid cases; PSS-TS: Perceived Stress Scale Total Score; TLAS: Total Leisure Activity Score; STC-DS: Starting the Conversation Diet Score. P values for group mean comparisons of TLAS, PSS-TS, and STC-DS were calculated using two-tailed Student's t tests for binary variables when the assumption of normal distribution was met within each category, and one-way ANOVA for variables with more than two categories. Because TLAS did not meet the assumption of normality, Mann-Whitney U tests were also conducted for binary variables (gender: p = 0.037; place of residence: p = 0.765; Bachelor's vs. Master's students: p = 0.705). Chi-square tests assessed differences across groups in the proportion of high-risk cases: high stress (PSS-TS > 27; Cohen et al., 1983), insufficient physical activity (TLAS ≤ 23; Amireault et al., 2015), and unhealthy diet (STC-DS ≥ 9). Statistical significance was set at p < 0.05. Significant values are highlighted in grey.

Table 2: Assessment of lifestyle risk factors among university students

Patterns of Health (Outcomes) Indicators among University Students

Table 3 presents an assessment of health-related risk indicators among university students, focusing on nutritional status and sleep quality, disaggregated by sociodemographic and study-related characteristics. The table includes both continuous measures—Body Mass Index (BMI) and Sleep Condition Indicator Total Score (SCI-TS)—and the proportion of participants classified as at risk based on validated cutoffs: overweight/obesity (BMI ≥ 23 for Asian students and ≥ 25 for others) and probable insomnia (SCI-TS < 16). Statistical comparisons used t-tests, ANOVA, and chi-square tests, with significance defined as $p < 0.05$.

Regarding nutritional status, the mean BMI across participants was 23.6 (SD = 4.3), and 45.3% were classified as overweight or obese (Table 3). Significant differences in overweight/obesity prevalence were observed by gender ($p = 0.037$), with a higher proportion among males (56.3%) than females (34.8%). Mean BMI also varied significantly by ethnicity ($p = 0.020$), with Arab (M = 27.4, SD = 5.75) and South Asian (M = 23.4, SD = 3.49) students showing higher averages, while East/Southeast Asian students reported the lowest (M = 20.1, SD = 2.43). Mode of study was also associated with BMI scores ($p = 0.046$), with onsite students reporting lower mean BMI (M = 21.7, SD = 3.97) compared to those studying through both modes (M = 24.2, SD = 4.05). No significant differences in BMI or overweight/obesity classification were observed by age, economic status, study program, or residence in Germany (table 3).

Sleep quality, assessed using the SCI-TS, showed a mean score of 18.9 (SD = 5.1), with 26.9% of students classified as having probable insomnia. When SCI-TS was analyzed as a continuous variable, most sociodemographic and study characteristics were not significantly associated with mean scores. However, the economic situation was significantly related to sleep quality: economically secure students reported higher mean SCI-TS values (M = 20.7, SD = 4.1; $p = 0.014$) compared with students who were moderately constrained or economically insecure. When sleep quality was examined as a categorical outcome (probable insomnia), the economic situation also showed a significant association ($p = 0.023$), with a lower proportion of probable insomnia among economically secure students (11.4%) compared with those moderately constrained (31.3%) and economically insecure (44.4%). Ethnicity was likewise associated with insomnia classification ($p = 0.014$); the highest proportions of probable insomnia were observed among Black students (50.0%) and Arab students (54.5%), whereas no cases were identified among East/Southeast Asian students. No significant differences in SCI-TS scores or insomnia classification were observed according to gender, age, study program, or mode of study. Similarly, no significant difference in SCI-TS scores was found by place of residence (Germany versus another country), including when evaluated using the Mann–Whitney U test due to non-normal distribution ($p = 0.789$) (table 3).

	Nutritional Status						Sleep quality								
	BMI Score (kg/m ²)		p	Overweight/Obese		p	SCL-ITS		Probable Insomnia		p				
	n	Mean		n	%		n	Mean	n	%					
All participants	95	23.6	4.3	43	45.3	104	18.9	5.1	28	26.9					
Sociodemographic															
Age	< 25 years	29	22.3	4.05	0.086	11	37.9	0.704	32	20.1	3.6	0.328	4	12.5	0.118
	25 to 29 years	33	23.5	4.13		16	48.5		37	18.8	6.1		11	29.7	
	≥ 30 years	21	25.1	4.97		9	42.9		23	18	5.3		8	34.8	
Gender	Female	46	23.2	4.23	0.368	16	34.8	0.037	53	19.3	4.8	0.387	12	22.6	0.286
	Males	48	24	4.41		27	56.3		50	20.4	5.5		16	32	
Ethnicity	East/Southeast Asian	4	20.1	2.43	0.020	1	25	0.210	4	21	3.7	0.077	0	0	0.014
	South Asian	27	23.4	3.49		17	63		34	18.9	4.7		7	20.6	
	Black (African descendant)	16	23.6	5.16		7	43.8		18	15.9	5.9		9	50.0	
	Arab (Middle Eastern)	12	27.4	5.75		7	58.3		11	18.7	7.6		6	54.5	
	White European	28	23.3	3.18		9	32.1		29	20.6	3.7		4	13.8	
	Mixed/Others	6	21.8	4.74		2	33.3		6	19.5	3.9		1	16.7	
Living in Germany	Yes	85	23.3	4.07	0.271	38	44.7	0.774	94	18.8	5	0.971	25	26.6	0.507
	No	8	25	4.81		4	50		8	18.9	4.9		3	37.5	
Self-perceived economic situation	Economically secure	34	23.9	3.57	0.878	17	50	0.887	35	20.7	4.1	0.014	4	11.4	0.023
	Moderately constrained	42	23.6	4.65		19	45.2		48	18.5	5.4		15	31.3	
	Economically Insecure	16	23.3	5.35		7	43.8		18	16.6	5.1		8	44.4	
Study program characteristics															
Type of study program	MSc	53	23.8	4.46	0.337	27	50.9	0.275	60	18.7	5.5	0.569	19	31.7	0.169
	BSc	35	22.9	3.9		13	37.1		37	19.3	4.6		7	18.9	
Mode of study	Onsite	25	21.7	3.97	0.046	8	32	0.118	28	19.9	4.6	0.283	6	21.4	0.413
	Distance	22	24	4.26		9	40.9		25	19.1	6.4		9	36	
	Both	44	24.2	4.05		25	56.8		47	18.1	4.2		11	23.4	

Note. SD = standard deviation; n = number of valid cases; BMI: Body Mass Index; SCL-ITS: Sleep Condition Indicator; Total Score; P values for group mean comparisons of BMI and SCL-ITS were calculated using two-tailed Student's t tests for binary variables and one-way ANOVA for variables with more than two categories. For comparisons involving binary variables, the assumption of normality was met for both BMI and SCL-ITS, with the exception of SCL-ITS when comparing place of residence (students living in Germany versus another country), where the normality assumption was not met. Therefore, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted for this comparison, which indicated no significant difference ($p = 0.789$). Chi-square tests assessed differences across groups in the proportion of high-risk cases: "Overweight/Obese" (BMI ≥ 23 for Asian students and ≥ 25 for all other ethnicities; Cole & Lobstein, 2012; WHO, 2026) and "Probable Insomnia" (SCL total score < 16 ; Espie et al., 2014). Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Significant values are highlighted in grey.

Table 3: Assessment of selected health indicators (outcomes) among university students

Figure 1 presents the percentage of students reporting various combinations of lifestyle risk exposures, including stress, poor diet, and insufficient physical activity. Approximately one-third of the students (34%) did not report any of these risks. The most prevalent individual factor was insufficient physical activity (27.7%), followed by stress alone (11.7%) and poor diet alone (6.4%). Co-occurrence of two or more factors was less common: 10.6% of students reported both stress and insufficient physical activity, 6.4% reported poor diet along with insufficient physical activity, and only 3.2% were affected by all three. These findings indicate that while some students faced multiple lifestyle-related risks, most either reported none or only one, with insufficient physical activity being the most widespread.

Figure 1 also displays the distribution of students across four health outcome categories derived from survey responses: no adverse outcome, increased BMI only, probable insomnia only, and both increased BMI and probable insomnia. These classifications were based on data from 94 students who provided complete information on height, weight, and sleep; 12 cases with incomplete data were excluded from the analysis.

Among the 94 valid cases, 42.6% of students were categorized as having no adverse outcome. Increased BMI alone was observed in 31.9% of participants, probable insomnia alone in 12.8%, and both conditions concurrently in a further 12.8%.

Figure 2 illustrates a scatter plot matrix showing all pairwise bivariate relationships among five health-related factors in university students. These include two health indicators—Body Mass Index (BMI) (where higher scores reflect increased body mass and associated health risk) and Sleep Condition Indicator (SCI) Total Scores (where higher scores reflect better sleep quality and lower scores indicate greater sleep difficulties)—and three lifestyle-related factors: Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) Total Scores (where higher scores reflect greater perceived stress), Starting the Conversation (STC) Diet Score (where higher scores reflect poorer diet quality), and Total Leisure Activity Score (TLAS) (where higher scores reflect greater engagement in physical or leisure activities). The matrix allows for visual inspection of linear trends and potential correlation between variables. Pearson correlation coefficients, with p values in parentheses are also included in the figure.

The only statistically significant correlation was a modest inverse correlation between STC Diet Scores and TLAS ($r = -0.289$, $p = 0.005$). Given that higher STC scores reflect a poorer diet quality (i.e., greater frequency of consuming unhealthy foods such as fast food, sugary beverages, and snacks), this result suggests that students who engaged more in leisure activities tended to report better dietary patterns. Conversely, lower engagement in leisure activities was associated with less healthy eating behaviors.

A borderline association was observed between SCI Total Scores and PSS Total Scores ($r = -0.189$, $p = 0.057$), indicating a potential inverse relationship between sleep quality and perceived stress. While this trend did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance, it suggests that poorer sleep condition may be linked to higher stress levels.

No other statistically significant correlations were found. BMI was not meaningfully associated with any of the other variables, and there were no significant associations between sleep quality, stress, or diet quality beyond the relationships noted above.




Figure 1. Estimated frequency of single and combined lifestyle risk factors and selected health indicators (outcomes) among university students.

Note. Percentages are based on 94 valid cases with appropriately recorded responses for all assessed indicators.




Figure 2: Scatter plot matrix of all pairwise bivariate correlations among lifestyle risk factors (stress, physical activity, diet) and health indicators (BMI and sleep quality) in university students.

Note: Values in the figure represent Pearson correlation coefficients with p values in parentheses. A significance level of $p < 0.05$ was applied. Statistically significant correlations are indicated with an asterisk. Pairwise sample sizes: BMI–SCI (n = 94), BMI–PSS (n = 93), BMI–STC Diet (n = 93), BMI–TLAS (n = 86), SCI–PSS (n = 102), SCI–STC Diet (n = 102), SCI–TLAS (n = 96), PSS–STC Diet (n = 101), PSS–TLAS (n = 95), STC Diet–TLAS (n = 95).

Table 4 presents the results of a multivariable logistic regression analysis examining demographic and lifestyle risk factors as predictors of insomnia and increased Body Mass Index (BMI) among university students. Adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) are reported for each variable, with statistical significance evaluated using the Wald test at a threshold of $p < 0.05$.

For insomnia, a total of 84 students were included in the analysis after excluding 22 individuals with incomplete responses. Two predictors showed statistically significant associations with insomnia. Students reporting high levels of perceived stress were significantly more likely to experience insomnia, with an OR of 6.57 (95% CI: 1.55–27.82; $p = 0.011$), compared to those with low or moderate stress. Similarly, male students had significantly higher odds of insomnia than female students (OR = 4.77; 95% CI: 1.23–18.55; $p = 0.024$). Physical inactivity was a borderline predictor, with inactive students showing higher odds of reporting insomnia (OR = 3.42; 95% CI: 0.97–11.98; $p = 0.055$), although this association did not reach statistical significance. Other variables showed no significant association with insomnia but suggested possible trends. Students aged 25–29 had slightly higher odds compared to those under 25 (OR = 1.27; 95% CI: 0.28–5.80; $p = 0.760$), and those aged 30 or older also showed a non-significant trend toward an increased risk (OR = 2.64; 95% CI: 0.55–12.55; $p = 0.223$). Poor diet was associated with lower odds of insomnia (OR = 0.44; 95% CI: 0.08–2.47; $p = 0.351$), although this result was not statistically significant.

Regarding BMI, 77 students were included in the final analysis after excluding 29 with incomplete responses. None of the predictors reached statistical significance. Male students showed higher odds of an increased BMI compared with females (OR = 2.56; 95% CI: 0.95–6.88; $p = 0.063$), although this association did not reach statistical significance. Age was not significantly associated with BMI, with ORs of 1.83 (95% CI: 0.51–6.59; $p = 0.353$) for students aged ≥ 30 years and 2.03 (95% CI: 0.65–6.30; $p = 0.222$) for those aged 25–29 years compared with students under 25. Lifestyle variables also showed no significant associations. Poor diet was associated with lower odds of increased BMI (OR = 0.41; 95% CI: 0.11–1.60; $p = 0.201$), while insufficient physical activity showed an OR of 0.66 (95% CI: 0.25–1.75; $p = 0.400$). High perceived stress was not associated with increased BMI (OR = 0.80; 95% CI: 0.23–2.81; $p = 0.722$).

Variables in the model		Probable insomnia			Increased BMI				
		OR	95% CI		p	OR	95% CI		p
			LL	UL			LL	UL	
Gender	Males	4.77	1.23	18.55	0.024*	2.56	0.95	6.88	0.063
	Females (ref)	-				-			
Age	≥ 30 years	2.64	0.55	12.55	0.223	1.83	0.51	6.59	0.353
	25–29 years	1.27	0.28	5.80	0.760	2.03	0.65	6.30	0.222
	<25 years (ref)	-				-			
Diet	Poor diet	0.44	0.08	2.47	0.351	0.41	0.11	1.60	0.201
	Healthy diet (ref)	-				-			
Physical activity	Insufficiently Active	3.42	0.97	11.98	0.055	0.66	0.25	1.75	0.400
	Active (ref)	-				-			
Stress level	High	6.57	1.55	27.82	0.011*	0.80	0.23	2.81	0.722
	Low/moderate (ref)	-				-			

OR: Odds ratios; CI: Confidence interval; LL: Lower limits; UL: Upper limits; Ref: Reference category.

Note: Here an adjusted OR is reported for each predictor included in the model. A significance level of $p < 0.05$ was applied based on a Wald Test.

Table 4: Exploration of demographic and lifestyle risk factors as potential predictors of insomnia and increased Body Mass Index (BMI) among university students using multivariable logistic regression

5. Discussion

Overview of Key Findings

This exploratory cross-sectional study examined the distribution of selected lifestyle risk factors and health indicators among university students in a multicultural higher education setting and explored how these factors appeared to relate within the same student population. Several general patterns were observed.

First, among the lifestyle risk factors examined, insufficient physical activity appeared to be the most common, while elevated perceived stress was also present in a notable proportion of students. Poor diet was reported less frequently. When these lifestyle risk factors were considered together, most students appeared to report either none or only one of them, whereas the simultaneous presence of multiple lifestyle risk factors was less commonly observed. This pattern may suggest that, within this sample, these factors tended to occur individually rather than accumulating within the same individuals.

Second, regarding health indicators, increased BMI appeared more common than probable insomnia. Although both health indicators were present within the population, most students did not appear to report both conditions simultaneously, suggesting that these outcomes were often observed independently.

Third, when relationships among lifestyle risk factors were examined, a modest association was observed between diet quality and physical activity, suggesting that students who reported higher levels of leisure activity also tended to report healthier dietary patterns. Other lifestyle risk factors did not show clear relationships with one another.

Finally, when the relationships between lifestyle risk factors and health indicators were explored, perceived stress showed an association with probable insomnia, while no clear associations were observed between the lifestyle risk factors and increased BMI in the multivariable models. Overall, the findings suggest that lifestyle risk factors and health indicators may occur within the same student population, although the relationships among them appear to be modest and not uniformly consistent across factors.

Comparison with Previous Studies

Frequency of Selected Lifestyle Risk Factors

The distribution of lifestyle risk factors observed in the present study appears broadly consistent with the general pattern described in the literature, although the magnitude of these factors varies substantially across student populations and institutional contexts.

Insufficient physical activity was the most common lifestyle risk factor in the present sample. Studies conducted in university populations across different regions have reported wide variability in the prevalence of insufficient physical activity, often ranging from approximately 40% to more than 70% of students (Fadul et al., 2023; Irwin, 2004; Li et al., 2024; Ramón-Arбуés et al., 2023). For example, a large epidemiological survey of 30,475 university students from 104 universities across China reported that 77.6% of students engaged predominantly in low levels of physical activity, indicating a high prevalence of insufficient activity patterns in this population (Li et al., 2024). Within this spectrum, the prevalence observed in the present study appears to fall within the lower-to-middle range of estimates reported in the literature. Differences in academic schedules, campus infrastructure supporting physical activity, and broader lifestyle patterns during university life have been suggested as possible contextual factors influencing activity levels among students (Deforche et al., 2015; Winpenny et al., 2020).

In contrast, poor diet appeared less frequent in the present sample than in many previously reported studies. Available evidence indicates that unhealthy dietary patterns among university students often affect roughly one third or more of students in several settings (Ahmadi et al., 2024). Other studies focusing on

adherence to recommended dietary patterns suggest that only a minority of students meet optimal nutritional guidelines, indicating that suboptimal diet is widespread even when specific classification criteria differ (Franchini et al., 2025; Moral-Moreno et al., 2025). The relatively lower prevalence observed in the present study may therefore reflect contextual factors related to the university environment, differences in dietary assessment instruments, or variation in how dietary quality is classified. Institutional food environments, cultural dietary habits, and affordability of healthy food options have all been suggested as factors that may influence diet patterns among university students (Aceijas et al., 2017).

Perceived stress was also observed in a notable proportion of students in the present study. Previous research indicates that the prevalence of elevated stress among university students varies widely, with estimates ranging from approximately 25% in some European student populations to more than 60% in certain settings or academic programs (Bayram & Bilgel, 2008; Fentahun et al., 2025; Iqbal, Gupta, & Venkatarao, 2015; Ramón-Arbués et al., 2020). Within this range, the level observed in the present study appears closer to the lower end of reported estimates. Differences across studies may reflect variation in academic pressures, institutional environments, social support systems, and the measurement instruments used to assess perceived stress.

Overall, the available evidence suggests that insufficient physical activity and elevated perceived stress are recurrent lifestyle risk factors in university populations across different settings. In contrast, dietary patterns appear to show greater variability between studies, likely reflecting differences in cultural norms, food environments, and institutional contexts. This suggests that while some lifestyle risk factors may be broadly characteristic of student populations, others may be more strongly shaped by local conditions.

Frequency of Health Indicators

The prevalence of the health indicators observed in the present study also appears to fall within the broad range reported in university student populations internationally.

Increased BMI was observed in a substantial proportion of students in the present sample. Previous multicountry research involving more than 15,000 university students reported that approximately 22% of students were overweight or obese overall, although prevalence approached 40% in high-income countries (Peltzer et al., 2014). Country-specific studies have documented estimates ranging from approximately 20% in some university populations to more than one third of students in others (Emon et al., 2024; Odlaug et al., 2015; Pengpid & Peltzer, 2014; Tokaç Er et al., 2021). Within this range, the prevalence observed in the present study appears toward the higher end of previously reported estimates. Differences in age distribution, cultural dietary patterns, levels of physical activity, and socioeconomic environments have all been suggested as factors that may influence weight-related health indicators among university students (de Faria et al., 2023).

Sleep difficulties were also present among a notable proportion of students in the present study. A systematic review and meta-analysis estimated that approximately 30% of university students meet criteria for insomnia, while reports of poor sleep quality often range between roughly one third and two thirds of students depending on the measurement approach (Becker et al., 2018; Gardani et al., 2022; Lund et al., 2010; Schmickler et al., 2023). Within this spectrum, the prevalence observed in the present study appears to fall within the lower-to-middle range of reported estimates. Several factors have been proposed to contribute to sleep difficulties among university students, including irregular sleep schedules, academic workload, stress, and screen use (Ofstedal et al., 2024).

When considered alongside previous studies, the findings suggest that sleep-related difficulties appear to emerge with notable regularity across university populations, whereas the distribution of increased BMI tends to vary more markedly between settings. This contrast may reflect differences in the processes underlying these health indicators. Sleep disturbances may arise more readily from features

commonly associated with student life, such as irregular schedules, academic demands, and psychosocial pressures, while body weight reflects longer-term interactions between dietary patterns, physical activity, and broader environmental influences. Also, cultural differences in sleep habits, such as later bedtimes or daytime napping practices, may also contribute to these observed differences (Jeon, Dimitriou, & Halstead, 2021) and should be considered when interpreting the results.

As a result, the prevalence of increased BMI may be more sensitive to contextual and population characteristics, whereas sleep problems appear to be a more consistently observed feature of student populations.

Relationships among Lifestyle Risk Factors

In the present study, the only statistically significant relationship observed among the lifestyle risk factors was a modest inverse association between diet quality and physical activity. Students reporting higher engagement in leisure activity tended to report healthier dietary patterns, whereas other pairwise relationships among lifestyle risk factors were not statistically significant. Although the strength of this association was moderate, it suggests that some lifestyle behaviors may align within individuals rather than occurring independently.

Similar patterns have been reported in other university populations. For example, in a large cross-sectional study of Greek university students, lower adherence to the Mediterranean diet was associated with lower physical activity levels (OR = 1.73; 95 % CI 1.58–1.97) and higher perceived stress (OR = 2.21; 95 % CI 1.99–2.47) (Dakanalis et al., 2025). Likewise, cluster analysis conducted among Italian undergraduates identified a subgroup characterized by the concurrent presence of insufficient physical activity, elevated stress, and poorer nutrition quality (Lucini et al., 2024). Evidence from U.S. national student samples has also shown that students meeting vigorous physical activity recommendations tend to report lower perceived stress (adjusted OR = 0.75; 95 % CI 0.67–0.83) (Vankim & Nelson, 2013). Collectively, these findings have been interpreted as suggesting that lifestyle behaviors may partially cluster within the same individuals or student population.

However, the pattern observed in the present study was more limited, with a detectable relationship only between diet and physical activity and no statistically significant associations involving perceived stress. One possible explanation is that the determinants of these behaviors may only partially overlap. Physical activity and diet may be more closely linked through daily routines and behavioral choices, for example, individuals who actively engage in sports or structured exercise may also adopt dietary habits that support those activities. In contrast, perceived stress may be influenced by different mechanisms, such as academic workload, financial concerns, and psychosocial pressures, which do not necessarily translate directly into dietary or activity behaviors.

Another plausible explanation relates to heterogeneity within the student population. University students may adopt diverse coping strategies in response to stress, some of which involve increased physical activity, while others may involve sedentary behaviors or changes in eating patterns. Such variation could weaken observable statistical relationships between stress and other lifestyle factors at the population level. In addition, previous studies that identified stronger clustering patterns often relied on larger samples or cluster-analytic approaches specifically designed to detect behavioral profiles (Lucini et al., 2024), whereas the present study examined pairwise relationships within a smaller sample.

Considered alongside previous studies, the pattern observed here suggests that lifestyle risk factors in student populations do not necessarily accumulate in a uniform way. While behaviors related to daily routines, such as diet and physical activity, may occasionally move in the same direction, other factors like perceived stress appear to follow more independent trajectories. This may reflect the diverse ways in which students organize their daily lives and cope with academic and social demands, resulting in lifestyle profiles that are more heterogeneous than often assumed.

Relationships between Lifestyle Risk Factors and Health Indicators

When the relationships between lifestyle risk factors and health indicators were examined, the most prominent finding in the present study concerned the association between perceived stress and sleep outcomes. Students reporting high levels of perceived stress had markedly greater odds of meeting the threshold for probable insomnia. Although the cross-sectional nature of the data does not allow conclusions about directionality, the magnitude of this association suggests that stress and sleep disturbances tend to appear together within student populations.

Evidence from several university-based studies points in a similar direction. Research conducted among German students identified perceived stress as one of the strongest correlates of poor sleep quality after adjusting for demographic and behavioral factors (Schmickler et al., 2023). Comparable relationships have been reported in Middle Eastern student populations, where higher perceived stress levels were linked to poorer sleep quality and longer sleep latency (Albqoor & Shaheen, 2021). Observations from U.S. university samples likewise indicate that psychological strain, including stress and related emotional states, is closely intertwined with sleep disturbances (Becker et al., 2018). Syntheses of the broader literature also suggest that insomnia symptoms affect roughly one third of university students and frequently coexist with elevated psychological distress (Gardani et al., 2022). Viewed together, these findings suggest that the coexistence of stress and sleep difficulties represents a recurring feature in many student populations, even though the magnitude of the association varies across studies.

Several processes may plausibly contribute to this relationship. Elevated perceived stress can be accompanied by cognitive hyperarousal, rumination, and difficulty disengaging from academic or personal concerns, all of which may interfere with sleep initiation and continuity. At the same time, disrupted sleep may impair emotional regulation and coping capacity, which can heighten perceived stress during waking hours. Within university environments, often characterized by irregular schedules, academic deadlines, and multiple competing demands, these processes may interact in ways that make the coexistence of stress and sleep difficulties particularly common. Rather than reflecting a single directional pathway, the relationship between these two indicators may therefore be better understood as part of a dynamic interplay between psychological strain and sleep regulation in student life.

The relationship between physical activity and sleep outcomes appeared less pronounced in the present study. Physical inactivity showed a borderline association with probable insomnia, suggesting that students reporting lower activity levels tended to have higher odds of sleep difficulties, although the association did not reach conventional statistical significance. The literature on this relationship among university students is notably inconsistent. Some investigations have reported modest associations between higher levels of physical activity and improved sleep quality (Schultchen et al., 2019), while others have found that these relationships become attenuated once additional behavioral or psychological factors are taken into account. For example, a meta-analysis including more than 140,000 university students did not identify a significant pooled association between moderate-to-vigorous physical activity and either sleep quality or sleep duration (Memon et al., 2021). Similarly, research in Chinese university cohorts found that physical activity was not independently associated with sleep quality after accounting for sedentary behavior and mental health indicators (Li & Li, 2022). Within this broader evidence base, the borderline association observed in the present study may reflect a relationship that exists but is relatively modest and potentially influenced by other factors shaping students' daily routines.

In contrast, none of the lifestyle risk factors examined showed statistically significant associations with increased BMI in the adjusted models. Studies conducted in other student populations have sometimes reported links between weight status and lifestyle patterns. Multicountry analyses involving more than 15,000 students found that overweight and obesity were more common among those reporting lower physical activity and less favorable lifestyle profiles (Peltzer et al., 2014). Other investigations have similarly described higher BMI values among students characterized by sedentary behavior, elevated stress, or poorer diet quality (Dakanalis et al., 2024; de Faria et al., 2023). Nevertheless, such associations are not observed consistently across all university settings.

Several factors may help account for this variability. Unlike sleep outcomes, which can respond relatively quickly to psychological and behavioral conditions, the BMI reflects cumulative energy balance over longer periods of time. Consequently, lifestyle behaviors measured at a single time point may not correspond closely with current body weight. Early adulthood is also a period marked by substantial lifestyle transitions, including changes in diet, activity patterns, and daily schedules, which may introduce variability in behaviors without immediately translating into measurable differences in BMI. Differences in population composition, cultural dietary practices, and measurement approaches may further contribute to the heterogeneity observed across studies.

It seems that, overall, the relationships between lifestyle risk factors and health indicators in university populations appear to differ according to the outcome examined. Sleep outcomes show a clearer alignment with psychosocial factors such as perceived stress, whereas relationships involving BMI appear less readily detectable in cross-sectional analyses and may depend on longer-term behavioral trajectories and environmental influences.

Sociodemographic and Study Program Characteristics in Relation to Lifestyle Risk Factors and Health Indicators

Although the primary aim of this study was to examine lifestyle risk factors and health indicators, several sociodemographic and study program characteristics showed associations with some outcomes, helping to contextualize the observed patterns and generating questions for future research. In the present sample, gender was one of the few characteristics consistently related to several variables. Female students reported higher perceived stress levels and were more frequently classified as insufficiently physically active, whereas male students showed a higher prevalence of increased BMI and greater odds of probable insomnia in the multivariable analysis. Similar patterns have been described in other university populations, where female students tend to report higher perceived stress and lower physical activity, while male students more often present higher BMI levels (Du et al., 2021; Peltzer et al., 2014; Schultchen et al., 2019). These differences may partly reflect gender-related variations in coping strategies, social expectations around physical activity, and differences in body composition and lifestyle patterns during early adulthood.

The economic situation was also associated with sleep outcomes. Students who perceived themselves as economically secure reported better sleep quality and a lower prevalence of probable insomnia compared with those experiencing financial constraints. Financial concerns are widely described as an important stressor among university students and may influence sleep through psychological strain, competing work or study responsibilities, and uncertainty about academic or financial stability (Lund et al., 2010).

Some differences were also observed across ethnic groups and mode of study. Mean BMI varied by ethnicity, and students attending classes exclusively on campus showed lower BMI values compared with those studying online or in hybrid formats. Although these observations should be interpreted cautiously, they may reflect differences in daily routines, dietary practices, and sedentary time associated with remote learning environments, which have been linked to reduced physical activity and weight gain in some student populations (Romero-Blanco et al., 2020).

It is important to note that most of these observations were derived from bivariate analyses without adjustment for potential confounding factors. Therefore, they should be interpreted as descriptive patterns rather than independent associations. While not a primary objective of the study, these findings highlight potentially relevant sociodemographic dimensions that may warrant more focused investigation in larger studies designed to explore these relationships in greater depth.

Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings of this study. The cross-sectional design limits the ability to determine the directionality of the observed relationships, and the

results therefore describe patterns of association between lifestyle risk factors and health indicators at a single point in time rather than temporal relationships between them. Longitudinal designs would be necessary to better understand how changes in lifestyle risk factors and health indicators may evolve and interact over time during the university years.

The study was conducted within a single higher education institution and relied on a convenience sample recruited through institutional mailing lists and student communication channels. Although the student population included individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds, participation was voluntary and the final sample size was relatively small. These factors limit the generalizability of the findings and raise the possibility of selection bias, as students with a particular interest in health-related topics may have been more likely to participate. The modest sample size may also have influenced the statistical power of the analyses, particularly the multivariable models. Consequently, some associations may not have reached statistical significance due to limited statistical power rather than the absence of an underlying relationship.

All data were based on self-reported information, which introduces the possibility of recall bias and social desirability bias. Participants may unintentionally overreport favorable lifestyle patterns or underreport behaviors perceived as less healthy (Alhubaiti, 2016). In addition, height and weight were self-reported and therefore the calculated BMI values may not fully reflect measured anthropometric data.

Although validated instruments were used to assess the main study variables, certain measurement limitations should be acknowledged. The dietary assessment tool captured general dietary patterns but did not collect information on portion size or total energy intake, which may reduce the precision of dietary assessment, particularly in a multicultural student population with diverse dietary habits. In the case of physical activity, a small number of participants appeared to misinterpret the response format of the questionnaire and reported minutes rather than session frequency, which may have introduced some variability in the calculation of activity scores.

Some potentially relevant factors were not included in the survey. Information on alcohol consumption, smoking, caffeine intake, medication use, and medical history was not collected, even though these variables may influence sleep patterns or body weight. In addition, some sociodemographic and study-related characteristics that could also influence the observed patterns, such as students' fields of study or academic workload, were not specifically examined in this analysis. The absence of these variables limits the ability to more fully explore contextual factors that may influence the observed associations. In addition, BMI has well-recognized limitations as a measure of adiposity, particularly in multi-ethnic populations where the relationship between BMI, body fat distribution, and health outcomes may vary across groups (Nuttall, 2015). Complementary anthropometric measures such as waist circumference or waist-to-hip ratio could provide additional insight in future studies. Furthermore, BMI may also be influenced by a range of behavioral, environmental, and genetic factors that were not measured in this study.

Additionally, several of the exploratory analyses examining potential relationships between sociodemographic and study program characteristics and lifestyle risk factors and selected health indicators, were based on bivariate comparisons without adjustment for potential confounding factors. These observations should therefore be interpreted cautiously and primarily as descriptive patterns that may help generate hypotheses for future research rather than solid evidence of independent relationships.

Moreover, multiple statistical tests were conducted in this study, and no formal adjustment for multiple comparisons (e.g., Bonferroni or Benjamini–Hochberg correction) was applied. Such adjustments are commonly used to reduce the risk of type I errors (false positives) when many hypotheses are tested (Ludbrook, 1998). However, given the relatively small sample size of the present study, the main statistical concern is limited power and therefore an increased risk of type II errors (false negatives), meaning that true associations may not have been detected. For this reason, the analyses should be interpreted as exploratory.

Implications for Policy and Practice

The findings of this study may be particularly relevant for institutional planning and health promotion strategies within higher education settings. Although the study was exploratory and conducted within a single institution, the results provide institution-specific information on the distribution of selected lifestyle risk factors and health indicators among students. Such data can help universities identify areas where preventive strategies may be most relevant. Institutional surveillance of student health patterns has been recommended as an important step in developing evidence-informed campus health promotion programs (Aceijas et al., 2017; Dooris, Doherty, & Orme, 2017). In this context, the present findings may assist local planning by highlighting areas that could warrant attention, such as perceived stress, sleep difficulties, and insufficient physical activity.

For example, the observed association between perceived stress and sleep outcomes suggests that interventions addressing stress management may also have relevance for sleep-related problems. Universities have increasingly implemented integrated well-being programmes that combine mental health support, time management training, and stress reduction strategies, with some evidence indicating beneficial effects on students' well-being and sleep quality (Amanvermez et al., 2022; Schmickler et al., 2025). While the present study cannot determine the effectiveness of such approaches, the findings support the potential value of considering mental health and sleep as interconnected domains when designing student well-being initiatives.

Similarly, the high frequency of insufficient physical activity observed in the sample suggests that opportunities for regular movement may represent an important area for campus health promotion. Previous research has shown that university environments can play a meaningful role in shaping activity patterns through the availability of sports facilities, active campus design, and structured exercise programs (Keating et al., 2005; Plotnikoff et al., 2015). Institutions may therefore benefit from considering how both physical infrastructure and programmatic initiatives support student engagement in physical activity, particularly for students who spend substantial time in online or hybrid learning environments.

The findings may also have relevance beyond the specific institutional context. The Deggendorf Institute of Technology hosts a multicultural student population with a large proportion of international students, a characteristic increasingly common in many higher education institutions. As a result, the patterns observed in this study may offer comparative insights for other universities seeking to understand how lifestyle risk factors and health indicators manifest in diverse student populations. Health promotion initiatives that take into account cultural diversity, varying study formats, and different socioeconomic circumstances may be particularly important in such settings.

Overall, the study illustrates how institution-specific assessments of lifestyle risk factors and health indicators can provide useful information for guiding locally relevant health promotion strategies. Even when broader international evidence is available, understanding how these patterns appear within a particular student population may help universities tailor interventions that better reflect the needs and circumstances of their students.

Implications for Future Research

The findings of this exploratory study highlight several areas that could be examined in greater depth in future research. Longitudinal designs would be particularly valuable for understanding how lifestyle risk factors and health indicators evolve over time during the university years. Tracking students across different stages of their academic trajectory could help clarify whether changes in perceived stress, physical activity, or dietary patterns are followed by changes in sleep quality or body weight.

Future studies may also benefit from including a broader range of behavioral and contextual variables. Factors such as alcohol consumption, smoking, caffeine intake, medication use, academic workload, and financial stress were not assessed in the present study but may influence both lifestyle risk

factors and health indicators in student populations. Including these variables could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the behavioral and environmental contexts in which these patterns occur.

In addition, the use of objective measurement methods could help improve the accuracy of reported information. Wearable devices and digital monitoring tools may provide more precise estimates of physical activity and sleep patterns, while direct anthropometric measurements or alternative indicators of adiposity could complement BMI when assessing body composition.

The differences observed according to mode of study suggest that academic environments themselves may influence daily routines related to activity, diet, and sedentary behavior. As hybrid and online learning formats become more common in higher education, further research examining how study formats shape lifestyle patterns and health indicators among students could provide valuable insight for both research and institutional health promotion.

6. Concluding Remarks

This exploratory study provides an institution-specific overview of selected lifestyle risk factors and health indicators among students in a higher education setting. Given the small sample size, the cross-sectional design, and the exploratory nature of the analysis, the findings should be interpreted with caution and cannot be considered representative of the broader student population. Instead, the results should be understood primarily as a local snapshot of health-related patterns within this academic context.

Examining these factors together within a single institutional environment offers an initial perspective on how lifestyle behaviors and health indicators may coexist during the university years. Although limited, such local assessments may help identify areas that warrant attention within the institution and can serve as a starting point for further investigation. In this sense, the findings contribute to the expanding body of research examining student health and lifestyle patterns, adding institution-level evidence that may complement and inform similar assessments across diverse higher education settings.

7. Funding

This research received no external funding.

8. Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

9. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the student organisation at the DIT for their support in disseminating the survey among the student community. We also acknowledge the DIT IT team for facilitating access to and availability of the LimeSurvey platform, which enabled the implementation of the online questionnaire. Their assistance was essential for the successful administration of the survey.

References

- Aceijas, C., Waldhäusl, S., Lambert, N., Cassar, S., & Bello-Corassa, R. (2017). Determinants of health-related lifestyles among university students. *Perspectives in Public Health, 137*(4), 227-236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1757913916666875>.
- Ahmadi, S. A. Y., SoleimanvandiAzar, N., Roohravan Benis, M., Mehrabi, A., Vesal Azad, R., & Nojomi, M. (2024). Prevalence of the Patterns of Unhealthy Diet in the School and University Students of Iran: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *ScientificWorldJournal, 2024*, 2697001. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2024/2697001>.
- Albqoor, M. A., & Shaheen, A. M. (2021). Sleep quality, sleep latency, and sleep duration: a national comparative study of university students in Jordan. *Sleep and Breathing, 25*(2), 1147-1154. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11325-020-02188-w>.
- Almojali, A. I., Almalki, S. A., Alothman, A. S., Masuadi, E. M., & Alaqeel, M. K. (2017). The prevalence and association of stress with sleep quality among medical students. *Journal of Epidemiology and Global Health, 7*(3), 169-174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jegh.2017.04.005>.
- Alsaleem, M. A., Alsaleem, S. A., Shehri, S. A., Awadalla, N. J., Mirdad, T. M., Abbag, F. I., & Mahfouz, A. A. (2021). Prevalence and correlates of university students' perceived stress in southwestern Saudi Arabia. *Medicine (Baltimore), 100*(38), e27295. <https://doi.org/10.1097/md.00000000000027295>.
- Althubaiti, A. (2016). Information bias in health research: definition, pitfalls, and adjustment methods. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare, 9*, 211-217. <https://doi.org/10.2147/jmdh.S104807>.
- Amanvermez, Y., Zhao, R., Cuijpers, P., de Wit, L. M., Ebert, D. D., Kessler, R. C., Bruffaerts, R., & Karyotaki, E. (2022). Effects of self-guided stress management interventions in college students: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Internet Interventions, 28*, 100503. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.invent.2022.100503>.
- Bayram, N., & Bilgel, N. (2008). The prevalence and socio-demographic correlations of depression, anxiety and stress among a group of university students. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 43*(8), 667-672. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-008-0345-x>.
- Becker, S. P., Jarrett, M. A., Luebbe, A. M., Garner, A. A., Burns, G. L., & Kofler, M. J. (2018). Sleep in a large, multi-university sample of college students: sleep problem prevalence, sex differences, and mental health correlates. *Sleep Health: Journal of the National Sleep Foundation, 4*(2), 174-181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sleh.2018.01.001>.
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24*(4), 385-396. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2136404>.
- Cole, T. J., & Lobstein, T. (2012). Extended international (IOTF) body mass index cut-offs for thinness, overweight and obesity. *Pediatric Obesity, 7*(4), 284-294. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2047-6310.2012.00064.x>.
- Cruz, J. P., Felicilda-Reynaldo, R. F. D., Lam, S. C., Machuca Contreras, F. A., John Cecily, H. S., Papathanasiou, I. V., Fouly, H. A., Kamau, S. M., Valdez, G. F. D., Adams, K. A., & Colet, P. C. (2018). Quality of life of nursing students from nine countries: A cross-sectional study. *Nurse Education Today, 66*, 135-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2018.04.016>.
- Dakanalis, A., Papadimitriou, K., Alexatou, O., Deligiannidou, G. E., Pappa, M., Papadopoulou, S. K., Louka, A., Paschodimas, G., Mentzelou, M., & Giaginis, C. (2025). Mediterranean Diet Compliance Is Related with Lower Prevalence of Perceived Stress and Poor Sleep Quality in University Students: A Cross-Sectional Study in Greece. *Nutrients, 17*(13). <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu17132174>.
- Dakanalis, A., Voulgaridou, G., Alexatou, O., Papadopoulou, S. K., Jacovides, C., Pritsa, A., Chrysafi, M., Papacosta, E., Kapetanou, M. G., Tsourouffis, G., Antonopoulou, M., Mitsiou, M., Antasouras, G., & Giaginis, C. (2024). Overweight and Obesity Is Associated with Higher Risk of Perceived Stress and Poor Sleep Quality in Young Adults. *Medicina (Kaunas), 60*(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina60060983>.
- de Faria, H. C. F., Garcez, A., da Costa, J. S. D., Ramos, M., & Paniz, V. M. V. (2023). Overweight and obesity among Brazilian healthcare university students: prevalence and associated factors. *Archives of Endocrinology and Metabolism, 67*(3), 416-426. <https://doi.org/10.20945/2359-3997000000602>.

- Deforche, B., Van Dyck, D., Deliëns, T., & De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2015). Changes in weight, physical activity, sedentary behaviour and dietary intake during the transition to higher education: a prospective study. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12, 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-015-0173-9>.
- DIT. (2025). *About DIT*. Deggendorf Institute of Technology (DIT). Retrieved March 2 from <https://www.th-deg.de/en>.
- Dooris, M., Doherty, S., & Orme, J. (2017). The Application of Salutogenesis in Universities. In M. B. Mittelmark, S. Sagy, M. Eriksson, G. F. Bauer, J. M. Pelikan, B. Lindström, & G. A. Espnes (Eds.), *The Handbook of Salutogenesis* (pp. 237-245). Springer Copyright 2017, The Author(s). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04600-6_23.
- Du, C., Zan, M. C. H., Cho, M. J., Fenton, J. I., Hsiao, P. Y., Hsiao, R., Keaver, L., Lai, C. C., Lee, H., Ludy, M. J., Shen, W., Swee, W. C. S., Thirivikraman, J., Tseng, K. W., Tseng, W. C., Almotwa, J., Feldpausch, C. E., Folk, S. Y. L., Gadd, S., . . . Tucker, R. M. (2021). Health Behaviors of Higher Education Students from 7 Countries: Poorer Sleep Quality during the COVID-19 Pandemic Predicts Higher Dietary Risk. *Clocks Sleep*, 3(1), 12-30. <https://doi.org/10.3390/clockssleep3010002>.
- Emon, H. H., Sarker, S., Lima, M. S. A., Tasnim, F. A., Al Nabil, A., Azam, M. I., & Hossain, M. M. (2024). Prevalence of overweight and obesity and their impact on academic performance and psychological well-being among university students in 2024 in Bangladesh. *PLoS One*, 19(12), e0315321. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0315321>.
- Espie, C. A., Kyle, S. D., Hames, P., Gardani, M., Fleming, L., & Cape, J. (2014). The Sleep Condition Indicator: a clinical screening tool to evaluate insomnia disorder. *BMJ Open*, 4(3), e004183. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004183>.
- Fadul, M. H., Fadul, A., Yasir, H. E. A., Mohamed Elhassan, A. Z. W., Manhal, G. A. A., & Abdelgafour, R. H. (2023). Physical Activity Among Medical Students at the University of Khartoum, Sudan, 2022: Knowledge, Practice, and Barriers. *Cureus*, 15(9), e45914. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.45914>.
- Feng, Y., Sun, D., Sun, X., Guo, Q., Zhang, J., & Li, Y. (2025). Global burden of noncommunicable diseases attributable to modifiable behavioral risks among adolescents and young adults aged 10-24 years, 1990-2021. *BMC Medicine*, 23(1), 636. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-025-04463-7>.
- Fentahun, S., Rtbey, G., Nakie, G., Andualem, F., Tinsae, T., Kibralew, G., Tesfaw, G., Kifle, T., Kelebie, M., & Tadesse, G. (2025). Burden of perceived stress among university students in Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health*, 25(1), 2248. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-025-23533-2>.
- Franchini, C., Biasini, B., Sogari, G., Wongprawmas, R., Andreani, G., Gómez, M. I., Menozzi, D., Mora, C., Scazzina, F., & Rosi, A. (2025). A Nationwide Survey of Italian University Students: Exploring the Influences of Sustainable Dietary Behaviors, Lifestyle, and Sociodemographic Factors on Adherence to the Mediterranean Diet. *Nutrients*, 17(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu17121988>.
- Gardani, M., Bradford, D. R. R., Russell, K., Allan, S., Beattie, L., Ellis, J. G., & Akram, U. (2022). A systematic review and meta-analysis of poor sleep, insomnia symptoms and stress in undergraduate students. *Sleep Medicine Reviews*, 61, 101565. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smrv.2021.101565>.
- Godin, G., & Shephard, R. J. (1985). A simple method to assess exercise behavior in the community. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 10(3), 141-146.
- Guthold, R., Stevens, G. A., Riley, L. M., & Bull, F. C. (2020). Global trends in insufficient physical activity among adolescents: a pooled analysis of 298 population-based surveys with 1v6 million participants. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, 4(1), 23-35. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642\(19\)30323-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(19)30323-2).
- Iqbal, S., Gupta, S., & Venkatarao, E. (2015). Stress, anxiety and depression among medical undergraduate students and their socio-demographic correlates. *Indian Journal of Medical Research*, 141(3), 354-357. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0971-5916.156571>.
- Irwin, J. D. (2004). Prevalence of university students' sufficient physical activity: a systematic review. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 98(3 Pt 1), 927-943. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.98.3.927-943>.

- Jeon, M., Dimitriou, D., & Halstead, E. J. (2021). A Systematic Review on Cross-Cultural Comparative Studies of Sleep in Young Populations: The Roles of Cultural Factors. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18042005>.
- Johannes, C., Roman, N. V., Onagbiye, S. O., Titus, S., & Leach, L. L. (2024). Relationship between Psychosocial Factors and Physical Activity among Undergraduate Students from a South African University. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 21(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph21040441>.
- Keating, X. D., Guan, J., Piñero, J. C., & Bridges, D. M. (2005). A meta-analysis of college students' physical activity behaviors. *Journal of American College Health*, 54(2), 116-125. <https://doi.org/10.3200/jach.54.2.116-126>
- Kelishadi, R. (2019). Life-Cycle Approach for Prevention of Non Communicable Disease. *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology*, 1121, 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-10616-4_1.
- Lesińska-Sawicka, M., Pisarek, E., & Nagórska, M. (2021). The Health Behaviours of Students from Selected Countries-A Comparative Study. *Nursing Reports*, 11(2), 404-417. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nursrep11020039>.
- Li, B., Han, S. S., Ye, Y. P., Li, Y. X., Meng, S. Q., Feng, S., Li, H., Cui, Z. L., Zhang, Y. S., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Q., Wang, G. X., Lou, H., Zhu, W., & Liu, Y. (2024). Cross sectional associations of physical activity and sleep with mental health among Chinese university students. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1), 31614. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-80034-9>.
- Li, D., & Li, X. (2022). Independent and Combined Associations between Physical Activity and Sedentary Time with Sleep Quality among Chinese College Students. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(11), 6697.
- Li, J., Pandian, V., Davidson, P. M., Song, Y., Chen, N., & Fong, D. Y. T. (2025). Burden and attributable risk factors of non-communicable diseases and subtypes in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2021: a systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2021. *International Journal of Surgery*, 111(3), 2385-2397. <https://doi.org/10.1097/js9.0000000000002260>.
- Liu, L., Gong, W., Li, J., Zhou, W., & Lin, L. (2025). Eating habits, nutritional status, and lifestyle correlates of body composition in Chinese university students: a cross-sectional study. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 13, 1668307. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1668307>.
- Lucini, D., Luconi, E., Giovanelli, L., Marano, G., Bernardelli, G., Guidetti, R., Morello, E., Cribellati, S., Brambilla, M. M., & Biganzoli, E. M. (2024). Assessing Lifestyle in a Large Cohort of Undergraduate Students: Significance of Stress, Exercise and Nutrition. *Nutrients*, 16(24). <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu16244339>.
- Ludbrook, J. (1998). Multiple comparison procedures updated. *Clinical and Experimental Pharmacology and Physiology*, 25(12), 1032-1037. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1681.1998.tb02179.x>.
- Lund, H. G., Reider, B. D., Whiting, A. B., & Prichard, J. R. (2010). Sleep patterns and predictors of disturbed sleep in a large population of college students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 46(2), 124-132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.06.016>.
- Memon, A. R., Gupta, C. C., Crowther, M. E., Ferguson, S. A., Tuckwell, G. A., & Vincent, G. E. (2021). Sleep and physical activity in university students: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sleep Medicine Reviews*, 58, 101482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smrv.2021.101482>.
- Mikkelsen, B., Williams, J., Rakovac, I., Wickramasinghe, K., Hennis, A., Shin, H. R., Farmer, M., Weber, M., Berdzuli, N., Borges, C., Huber, M., & Breda, J. (2019). Life course approach to prevention and control of non-communicable diseases. *BMJ*, 364, 1257. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.1257>.
- Moral-Moreno, L., Flores-Ferro, E., Cid, F. M., Vizcarra, I., Benítez-Arciniega, A. D., García, E. G., & Cortés, M. E. (2025). Risk Profiles of Poor Diet Quality Among University Students: A Multivariate Segmentation Analysis. *Nutrients*, 17(23). <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu17233639>.
- Nuttall, F. Q. (2015). Body Mass Index: Obesity, BMI, and Health: A Critical Review. *Nutrition Today*, 50(3). https://journals.lww.com/nutritiontodayonline/fulltext/2015/05000/body_mass_index_obesity_bmi_and_health__a.5.aspx

- Odlaug, B. L., Lust, K., Wimmelmann, C. L., Chamberlain, S. R., Mortensen, E. L., Derbyshire, K., Christenson, G., & Grant, J. E. (2015). Prevalence and correlates of being overweight or obese in college. *Psychiatry Research*, 227(1), 58-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2015.01.029>.
- Oftedal, S., Fenton, S., Hansen, V., Whatnall, M. C., Ashton, L. M., Haslam, R. L., Hutchesson, M. J., & Duncan, M. J. (2024). Changes in physical activity, diet, sleep, and mental well-being when starting university: A qualitative exploration of Australian student experiences. *Journal of American College Health*, 72(9), 3715-3724. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2023.2194426>.
- Paxton, A. E., Strycker, L. A., Toobert, D. J., Ammerman, A. S., & Glasgow, R. E. (2011). Starting the conversation performance of a brief dietary assessment and intervention tool for health professionals. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 40(1), 67-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2010.10.009>.
- Peltzer, K., Pengpid, S., Samuels, T. A., Özcan, N. K., Mantilla, C., Rahamefy, O. H., Wong, M. L., & Gasparishvili, A. (2014). Prevalence of overweight/obesity and its associated factors among university students from 22 countries. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11(7), 7425-7441. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph110707425>.
- Pengpid, S., & Peltzer, K. (2014). Prevalence of overweight/obesity and central obesity and its associated factors among a sample of university students in India. *Obesity Research & Clinical Practice*, 8(6), e558-570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orcp.2013.12.003>.
- Plotnikoff, R. C., Costigan, S. A., Williams, R. L., Hutchesson, M. J., Kennedy, S. G., Robards, S. L., Allen, J., Collins, C. E., Callister, R., & Germov, J. (2015). Effectiveness of interventions targeting physical activity, nutrition and healthy weight for university and college students: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-015-0203-7>.
- Ramón-Arбуés, E., Gea-Caballero, V., Granada-López, J. M., Juárez-Vela, R., Pellicer-García, B., & Antón-Solanas, I. (2020). The Prevalence of Depression, Anxiety and Stress and Their Associated Factors in College Students. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(19). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17197001>.
- Ramón-Arбуés, E., Granada-López, J. M., Martínez-Abadía, B., Echániz-Serrano, E., Antón-Solanas, I., & Jerue, B. A. (2022). The Association between Diet and Sleep Quality among Spanish University Students. *Nutrients*, 14(16). <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu14163291>.
- Ramón-Arбуés, E., Sagarra-Romero, L., Echániz-Serrano, E., Granada-López, J. M., Cobos-Rincón, A., Juárez-Vela, R., Navas-Echazarreta, N., & Antón-Solanas, I. (2023). Health-related behaviors and symptoms of anxiety and depression in Spanish nursing students: an observational study. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11, 1265775. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1265775>.
- Romero-Blanco, C., Rodríguez-Almagro, J., Onieva-Zafra, M. D., Parra-Fernández, M. L., Prado-Laguna, M. D., & Hernández-Martínez, A. (2020). Physical Activity and Sedentary Lifestyle in University Students: Changes during Confinement Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(18), 6567.
- Schmickler, J. M., Blaschke, S., Mess, F., Olson, N., Reiner, B., Schulz, T., & Friedrich, J. (2025). Sleep in the academic sphere: identifying sleep profiles and their influencing factors using latent profile analysis in German university students. *BMC Psychology*, 13(1), 907. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-03280-0>.
- Schmickler, J. M., Blaschke, S., Robbins, R., & Mess, F. (2023). Determinants of Sleep Quality: A Cross-Sectional Study in University Students. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(3), 2019.
- Schultchen, D., Reichenberger, J., Mittl, T., Weh, T. R. M., Smyth, J. M., Blechert, J., & Pollatos, O. (2019). Bidirectional relationship of stress and affect with physical activity and healthy eating. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 24(2), 315-333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12355>.
- Tokaç Er, N., Doğan, G., Meriç Ç, S., Yılmaz, H., Öztürk, M. E., & Ayhan, N. Y. (2021). Prevalence of overweight, obesity and abdominal obesity in Health Sciences Faculty students. *Clinical Nutrition ESPEN*, 46, 466-470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnesp.2021.09.008>.
- Van Dyck, D., De Bourdeaudhuij, I., Deliens, T., & Deforche, B. (2015). Can changes in psychosocial factors and residency explain the decrease in physical activity during the transition from high school to college or university? *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 22(2), 178-186. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-014-9424-4>.

- Vanhelst, J., Béghin, L., Drumez, E., Labreuche, J., Polito, A., De Ruyter, T., Censi, L., Ferrari, M., Miguel-Berges, M. L., Michels, N., De Henauw, S., Moreno, L. A., & Gottrand, F. (2023). Changes in physical activity patterns from adolescence to young adulthood: the BELINDA study. *European Journal of Pediatrics*, *182*(6), 2891-2902. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00431-023-04948-8>.
- Vankim, N. A., & Nelson, T. F. (2013). Vigorous physical activity, mental health, perceived stress, and socializing among college students. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *28*(1), 7-15. <https://doi.org/10.4278/ajhp.111101-QUAN-395>.
- WHO. (2025). *Noncommunicable diseases: progress monitor 2025*. World Health Organization (WHO). <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/381602>
- WHO. (2026). *Body mass index (BMI)*. The Global Health Observatory, World Health Organization (WHO). Retrieved February 25 from <https://www.who.int/data/gho/data/themes/topics/topic-details/GHO/body-mass-index>.
- Winpenny, E. M., Winkler, M. R., Stochl, J., van Sluijs, E. M. F., Larson, N., & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2020). Associations of early adulthood life transitions with changes in fast food intake: a latent trajectory analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, *17*(1), 130. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-020-01024-4>
- Wood, D., Crapnell, T., Lau, L., Bennett, A., Lotstein, D., Ferris, M., & Kuo, A. (2018). Emerging Adulthood as a Critical Stage in the Life Course. In N. Halfon, C. B. Forrest, R. M. Lerner, & E. M. Faustman (Eds.), *Handbook of Life Course Health Development* (pp. 123-143). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47143-3_7.
- Zhao, S., Zhang, Y., Yu, C., Zhang, H., Xie, M., Chen, P., & Lin, D. (2023). Trajectories of Perceived Stress among Students in Transition to College: Mindset Antecedents and Adjustment Outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *52*(9), 1873-1886. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-023-01788-5>.

10. Appendix

Supplementary file 1. Composition of scales used in the study

1. Sleep Condition Indicator (SCI)

Item	Question
1	How would you rate your sleep quality?
2	How long does it take you to fall asleep after turning off the lights?
3	How many nights per week do you have a problem with sleep?
4	To what extent has poor sleep troubled you in general?
5	How noticeable to others is your sleep problem?
6	To what extent has your sleep problem interfered with daily functioning (e.g., mood, energy, concentration)?
7	To what extent are you concerned about your current sleep pattern?
8	How long have you had problems with sleep?

Response scale: 4-point Likert scale

Score range: 0–32

Interpretation: higher scores = better sleep quality.

2. Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10)

Item	Question
1	In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something unexpected?
2	How often have you felt unable to control important things in your life?
3	How often have you felt nervous or stressed?
4	How often have you felt confident about your ability to handle personal problems?
5	How often have you felt that things were going your way?
6	How often have you felt unable to cope with all the things you had to do?
7	How often have you been able to control irritations in your life?
8	How often have you felt that you were on top of things?
9	How often have you been angered because of things outside your control?
10	How often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?

Response scale: 0–4 (Never → Very often)

3. Starting the Conversation (STC) Diet Tool

Item	Question
1	How often do you eat fast food meals or snacks?
2	How often do you eat fruit?
3	How often do you eat vegetables?
4	How often do you drink sugary beverages (soft drinks, energy drinks)?
5	How often do you eat desserts or sweets?
6	How often do you eat chips, crackers, or salty snacks?
7	How often do you eat processed meats (sausages, burgers, etc.)?
8	How often do you eat meals prepared at home vs outside?

Response: frequency categories

Interpretation: lower scores = healthier diet, higher scores = poorer diet quality.

4. Godin Leisure-Time Exercise Questionnaire (GLTEQ)

Question	Item	Response format
1. During a typical 7-day period (a week), how many times on average do you engage in the following kinds of exercise for more than 15 minutes during your free time?		
	a. Strenuous exercise (e.g., running, vigorous swimming, competitive sports)	Number of times per week
	b. Moderate exercise (e.g., fast walking, easy bicycling, recreational swimming)	Number of times per week
	c. Mild exercise (e.g., easy walking, yoga, stretching)	Number of times per week
2. During a typical 7-day period, how often do you engage in any regular activity long enough to work up a sweat (heart beats rapidly)?	Never / Sometimes / Often	Categorical response

The Total Leisure Activity Score (TLAS) is calculated by multiplying the weekly frequency of strenuous activities by nine, moderate activities by five, and mild activities by three, and then summing these values. Higher scores indicate greater engagement in leisure-time physical activity. In this study, participants were classified as active if their TLAS was 24 or higher and as insufficiently active if their score was 23 or lower.

Supplementary table 1. Distribution of study scale scores overall and stratified by sociodemographic and study-related characteristics.: BMI and SCI (continuation)

Categories	n	BMI			SCI		
		Mean (SD)	Median (Min–Max)	p25–p75	Mean (SD)	Median (Min–Max)	p25–p75
All participants	104	23.6 (4.3)	23.4 (13.6–36.8)	20.4–26.3	18.9 (5.1)	19.0 (8–32)	15.3–22.0
Gender							
Female	52	23.2 (4.2)	22.8 (15.2–35.0)	20.3–25.6	19.3 (4.8)	19.0 (10–32)	17.0–23.0
Male	49	24.0 (4.4)	23.5 (13.6–36.8)	20.6–27.0	18.4 (5.5)	19.5 (8–32)	13.8–22.0
Type of study program							
MSc	59	23.8 (4.5)	23.8 (13.6–36.8)	20.6–26.1	18.6 (5.5)	19.0 (10–32)	13.0–23.0
BSc	36	22.9 (3.9)	22.9 (15.2–31.6)	20.3–26.4	19.3 (4.6)	19.0 (8–29)	17.5–22.0
Ethnicity							
White/European	29	23.3 (3.2)	22.5 (18.9–29.6)	20.4–26.3	20.6 (3.7)	21.0 (13–29)	18.0–23.0
East Asian	1	20.0 (—)	20.0 (20–20)	20–20	19.0 (—)	19.0 (19–19)	19–19
South Asian	33	23.4 (3.5)	23.4 (13.6–31.6)	22.7–25.3	18.9 (4.7)	19.0 (10–28)	17.0–23.0
Southeast Asian	3	20.2 (3.0)	18.7 (18.3–23.6)	18.3—	21.7 (4.2)	23.0 (17–25)	17—
Black/African descent	18	23.6 (5.2)	22.6 (15.2–35.0)	20.3–26.8	15.9 (5.9)	16.5 (8–32)	10.8–20.3
Arab/Middle Eastern	10	27.4 (5.8)	27.0 (19.4–36.8)	22.3–32.7	18.7 (7.6)	15.0 (11–32)	13–25
Other ethnic groups	5	20.5 (3.8)	20.7 (15.6–25.2)	16.8–24.0	19.8 (4.3)	22.0 (13–23)	15.5–23
Country of residency							
Reside in Germany	92	23.3 (4.1)	23.2 (13.6–34.5)	20.3–26.1	18.8 (5.0)	19.0 (8–32)	15.0–22.0
Reside in other country	8	25.0 (4.8)	24.7 (18.7–35.0)	21.8–26.7	18.9 (4.9)	20.5 (12–24)	13.0–23.0
Mode of study							
Study on Campus (on site)	28	21.7 (4.0)	21.5 (13.6–29.6)	18.9–24.9	19.9 (4.6)	20.0 (10–29)	17.3–22.8
Distance (remote study)	25	24.0 (4.3)	23.8 (18.7–35.0)	20.2–26.5	19.1 (6.4)	19.0 (10–32)	13.0–23.0
Hybrid	45	24.2 (4.0)	23.8 (15.2–34.5)	20.8–27.3	18.1 (4.2)	18.0 (8–26)	17.0–21.0
Self-perceived socioeconomic condition							
No difficulties	35	23.9 (3.6)	23.9 (18.0–36.8)	21.1–26.0	20.7 (4.1)	21.0 (13–32)	18.0–23.0
With some limitation	46	23.6 (4.7)	23.1 (13.6–34.5)	20.3–27.0	18.5 (5.4)	18.5 (10–32)	14.0–22.0
With difficulties	16	23.6 (5.4)	21.1 (15.6–35.0)	19.8–27.5	15.9 (5.1)	16.0 (8–25)	12.0–20.5

Note: BMI = body mass index (kg/m²); SCI = Sleep Condition Indicator score; SD= standard deviation; p25 = 25th percentile; p75 = 75th percentile; BSc= Bachelor of Science; MSc= Master of Science.

Supplementary table 1. Distribution of study scale scores overall and stratified by sociodemographic and study-related characteristics: TLAS, STC Diet, and PSS

Categories	n	TLAS			STC Diet			PSS		
		Mean (SD)	Median (Min-Max)	p25-p75	Mean (SD)	Median (Min-Max)	p25-p75	Mean (SD)	Median (Min-Max)	p25-p75
All participants	104	42.8 (42.5)	35.5 (0-270)	18.0-52.8	6.3 (2.2)	6.0 (1-12)	5.0-7.0	19.0 (6.1)	18.5 (4-34)	15.0-23.3
Gender										
Female	52	40.2 (50.5)	28.0 (0-270)	14.8-47.5	6.2 (1.9)	6.0 (1-11)	5.0-7.0	20.4 (6.2)	20.0 (6-34)	16.0-25.8
Male	49	45.6 (32.4)	45.0 (0-162)	23.5-66.0	6.4 (2.5)	6.0 (2-12)	5.0-8.0	17.8 (5.7)	18.0 (4-29)	14.0-21.0
Type of study program										
MSc	59	42.8 (44.3)	35.0 (0-270)	17.3-52.3	6.5 (2.3)	6.0 (2-12)	5.0-8.0	19.1 (6.2)	18.0 (4-34)	15.0-24.0
BSc	36	45.2 (43.6)	41.0 (0-235)	18.0-61.5	6.3 (2.0)	6.0 (2-12)	5.0-7.0	18.4 (6.2)	19.5 (6-29)	15.3-22.0
Ethnicity										
White/European	29	43.5 (40.9)	36.0 (3-235)	23.0-53.0	6.5 (2.0)	7.0 (2-11)	5.0-7.5	17.3 (7.2)	18.0 (6-34)	10.0-22.5
East Asian	1	32.0 (—)	32.0 (32-32)	32-32	4.0 (—)	4.0 (4-4)	4-4	16.0 (—)	16.0 (16-16)	16-16
South Asian	33	50.7 (44.6)	47.0 (0-270)	24.5-66.0	6.4 (2.2)	6.0 (2-11)	5.0-7.0	19.0 (6.7)	18.0 (4-32)	13.5-23.5
Southeast Asian	3	5.7 (4.9)	8.0 (0-9)	0—	6.7 (0.6)	7.0 (6-7)	6—	20.3 (7.6)	17.0 (15-29)	15—
Black/African descent	18	29.3 (27.8)	26.0 (0-92)	0-44	6.7 (2.1)	6.0 (3-12)	5-8	20.0 (4.5)	20.5 (14-28)	16-25
Arab/Middle Eastern	10	44.1 (66.5)	12.0 (0-162)	2.3-109.5	6.2 (2.5)	6.0 (2-10)	4.8-7.8	21.2 (3.2)	20.5 (17-27)	19-24.3
Other ethnic groups	5	29.8 (25.1)	22.5 (9-65)	10.5-56.3	3.6 (1.8)	4.0 (1-6)	2-5	19.0 (4.6)	18.0 (16-27)	16-22.5
Country of residency										
Germany	92	41.8 (41.5)	36.0 (0-270)	18.0-51.0	6.4 (2.1)	6.0 (2-12)	5.0-7.0	19.0 (6.3)	19.0 (4-34)	15.0-23.8
Other country	8	37.3 (34.5)	26.0 (0-92)	11.3-71.8	6.6 (3.4)	6.0 (1-12)	5.0-9.5	19.1 (5.2)	17.5 (12-27)	16.0-24.8
Mode of study										
On Campus (on site)	28	36.2 (26.1)	34.0 (0-119)	16.5-52.3	6.4 (2.2)	6.0 (2-12)	5.0-7.8	18.1 (5.8)	18.0 (6-29)	15.3-21.0
Distance (remote study)	25	38.8 (51.4)	23.5 (0-235)	2.3-53.8	6.6 (2.7)	6.0 (1-12)	5.0-8.0	20.6 (6.7)	19.0 (8-34)	16.0-26.5
Hybrid	45	46.8 (43.6)	38.0 (0-270)	22.3-55.5	6.1 (1.8)	6.0 (2-10)	5.0-7.0	18.9 (5.8)	18.0 (7-29)	15.0-23.5
Self-perceived socio-economic condition										
No difficulties	35	45.1 (32.5)	39.0 (0-162)	19.8-62.3	6.2 (2.6)	6.0 (2-12)	4.0-8.0	17.6 (6.4)	17.0 (6-34)	13.0-21.0
With some limitation	46	43.8 (53.0)	33.0 (0-270)	17.3-47.8	6.4 (1.8)	6.0 (3-11)	5.0-7.0	19.9 (5.4)	19.5 (9-32)	16.0-24.3
With difficulties	16	36.8 (32.9)	36.0 (0-119)	13.5-49.0	6.4 (2.2)	6.0 (4-12)	5.0-7.0	20.3 (6.6)	20.5 (7-29)	16.3-26.8

Note: TLAS = Total Leisure Activity Score (Godin Leisure-Time Exercise Questionnaire); STC Diet = Short Test of Dietary Compliance score; PSS = Perceived Stress Scale score; SD = standard deviation; p25 = 25th percentile; p75 = 75th percentile; BSc= Bachelor of Science; MSc= Master of Science.

The Influence of Spatial and Temporal Dimensions on the Success of Participation in Czech-Bavarian Interreg Projects

Johanna Trager*, Jane Käser*, Roland Zink*

ABSTRACT

The aims of Interreg projects include strengthening cross-border cooperation between regions in Europe, contributing to sustainable regional development, facilitating knowledge exchange and innovation, and promoting social and cultural integration. Participation of citizens and key stakeholders plays a central role in this process. The article presents the results of an evaluation of participatory events in two Interreg projects in the Bavarian-Czech border region. The evaluation focuses primarily on the influence of the spatial and temporal dimensions of events taking place within funded Interreg projects. Our findings highlight the importance of tailoring participation event formats in Interreg projects to regional characteristics, including rural settings, cross-border dynamics, and current developments in citizen participation. The study concludes with recommendations for optimizing spatial and temporal parameters in participatory formats.

KEYWORDS

Interreg, participation, spatio-temporal dimension

1. Introduction

While the importance of public participation is widely accepted in European society, regardless of current political upheavals, the methods of its effective implementation leave room for discussion (Lovric & Lovric 2018). On the one hand, manuals for participation such as the ones by Nanz & Fritsche (2024) or Patze-Diordiychuk et al. (2017a & 2017b) are of great importance for practice, but often remain at the level of method description, while empirically grounded evaluations of participation outcomes remain limited. On the other hand, analytical approaches that aggregate participation formats, such as in Marzouki et al. (2017), are rare and often do not address the questions of how participation events can be designed to maximize engagement, recruitment success, and meaningful outcomes. Despite intensive efforts and goodwill to participate, the result is often not substantial. Consequently, a critical research gap remains in understanding which parameters influence the success of participation events and how this can be systematically assessed.

This study addresses this gap by examining the role of spatial and temporal organization in the success of participation events in regional research projects funded by Interreg – an EU funding scheme that seeks to foster (cross-border) regional cooperation. Specifically, the study seeks to answer the following research question:

How is the spatial and temporal organization of stakeholder events relevant for successful participation in Interreg projects?

By focusing on when and where participation takes place, as well as how events are structured in space and time, this research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how participatory formats can be improved to achieve stronger engagement and more effective outcomes. We narrow this research gap regarding spatial and temporal dimensions by evaluating in a case study-based approach two Interreg projects in which a set of participation events is analyzed concerning its temporal and spatial dimensions and the success of the events. This approach is supported by Shirk et al. (2012), who suggest that irrespective of the research context, project results are influenced by (1) the degree of public participation in the research process and (2) the quality of public participation negotiated during the design of the project. Mapping the spatio-temporal dimensions of participatory practice involves understanding how different contexts influence the evaluation of participatory initiatives (Chouinard & Milley 2016). Key factors considered in this study include physical and virtual spaces, as well as temporal scheduling.

In the two Interreg projects presented, different forms of participation formats and events were implemented, which are self-critically evaluated. The formats used differ in their length, location, the extent of the region in which participation takes place or individual events are advertised, whether the events take place offline, online, or in hybrid form, and the method used to invite potential participants. Both research projects strongly focused on creating networks and cooperation among regional (cross-border) stakeholders and finding and bringing together an audience that has interest in the projects' topics. In addition, the goal of both projects was to collect information and geodata (Volunteered Geographic Information, VGI; Goodchild 2007) on the respective topics, which is why both projects also used people-centered approaches, which in turn are used for various participatory spatial planning processes (Hachmann et al. 2018; Flacke et al. 2025). Therefore, participation itself and the recruitment of participants in the presented projects are not considered for the purpose of joint decision-making. Instead, this study derives recommendations on how spatial and temporal dimensions should be optimized to improve participation in Interreg projects, through which project outcomes are optimized.

Due to the location of the two Interreg projects located in the Bavarian-Czech border region, our analysis specifically focuses on participation events in rural areas. While there is a need for research on participation and its effective design for valuable outputs, in general, the geographic and socio-cultural context of participation remains underexplored. As already mentioned, regional culture, available resources, and general participation of citizens are important drivers that are decisive in understanding

participation and its effectiveness. Although our two case studies work on a local and regional level, they also cover regions in both Germany and the Czech Republic. The participation events took place both uni- and bilaterally. The study areas of the two case studies are also interesting because both regions were politically separated for a long time and therefore different traditions of civic participation can be expected. In our case, there may also be barriers to participation created by the bilateral project region, even if the events take place unilaterally. This could be due to lack of awareness or cultural and social barriers, but also financial restrictions that could prevent participants from participating (Lengerer et al. 2022). Our case study approach focuses on two projects in the same study region along the southern Bavarian-Czech border, with the same regional factors, but with two different stakeholder groups and project topics. Thereby we can identify which participation events worked better or worse, according to different target groups and two different project topics. This comparative design allows us to identify how different target groups and thematic contexts influence participation success under similar spatial and temporal conditions.

2. Literature-Based Conceptual Framework

2.1 Related Research in the Czech-German Border Region

In general, research on cross-border cooperation in an EU and institutional context is well developed for the Czech-German border region (e.g. Bertram et al. 2023; Bloßfeldt 2023; Böhm 2023; Chilla and Lambracht 2023; Novotný 2025). The importance of explicitly communicating the needs of border regions in policy-making became especially evident during the COVID-19 pandemic and the related border closures. In this respect, the Czech-German border region was no exception (Böhm 2023). One of the central aims of Interreg funding is to foster cross-border cooperation through the involvement of regional stakeholders (Novotný 2025). Strengthening such cross-border cooperation can increase the visibility of border regions in policy-making processes (Böhm 2023), with the applied character of Interreg funding playing a crucial role in this regard (Chilla and Lambracht 2023).

While project ideas are typically developed directly within and for the border region, existing research also points to several critical aspects of the funding scheme. These include relatively rigid thematic priorities within individual funding periods and evaluation criteria that may be informal and dependent on the respective decision-making committees (Chilla and Lambracht 2023; Novotný 2025). Interreg has existed as a funding instrument since 1990, and the current funding period (2021–2027) is gradually coming to an end. Against this background, analyzing critical aspects of how projects are designed and implemented can contribute to improving the outcomes of future Interreg-funded projects. First insights into such challenges are already available for the Czech-German border region.

Recent literature highlights the need to restructure and update the Interreg framework in the Czech-German border region in order to address concerns raised by regional stakeholders (Novotný 2025). Similar to Novotný (2025), our study aims to contribute to improving the conditions for more successful Interreg project outcomes. However, while Novotný (2025) focuses on the overall orientation of the funding scheme, our study shifts the focus to funded and ongoing projects and examines how the spatial and temporal design and implementation of events within project can be improved.

2.2 Research on Evaluation of Interreg Projects

The evaluation of already funded Interreg projects has been researched in different ways. Knippschild & Cock (2017) analyzed aspects of conformance and performance in their study and state that it is not only important to evaluate whether the project objectives were met, but also whether a learning process took place during the project and among the project partners. Especially region-specific contexts should be taken into account when evaluating the success of a funded Interreg project.

Haarich et al. (2019) describe that evaluation of Interreg projects is difficult, because the definitions of impacts of the project results on the region vary. On the one side, there are “direct contributions

to socioeconomic change in the region”, on the other side there are “contributions to the building of relevant capacities in institutions” (Haarich et al. 2019, p.12). The authors further add that the lessons learned during the funding period they investigated are beneficial for the following funding period. The importance of the process of learning among actors within the project is also supported by earlier research by Thierstein et al. (1998). Interreg projects and the produced outcomes of those projects are “subject to extensive monitoring and evaluation processes”. However, project outputs and results are often hard to measure tangibly, therefore, a unified approach called “results orientation” was introduced in the funding period 2014–2020, the aim of which was to provide “measurable milestones and targets to ensure progress is made” (McMaster et al. 2019, p. 2–3).

Research on the evaluation of Interreg projects and ways to improve them has so far mainly focused on the project level rather than on individual events within projects. Evaluating different types of events, their outputs, and developing recommendations for how these events can be improved can therefore contribute to the existing literature outlined above. Since the participation of regional stakeholders is a key component of Interreg projects, successfully recruiting participants for events and achieving the intended project outputs are crucial.

2.3 Formats and Impacts of Participation

Traditionally, research on citizen participation has distinguished between various levels of involvement and the extent to which individuals can influence the development of programs or projects (e.g. Arnstein 1969; Wiedemann & Femers 1993; Pretty 1995), even if these are not used further in the empirical analysis. The primary objective of intensive public participation is to ensure that individuals take part in decision-making (Heller 1984). Participation occurs when individuals are affected by the outcomes of decisions and are granted the opportunity to influence those outcomes (Farazmand 2018). Therefore, participation should be understood as a process rather than a singular event.

Citizen participation yields mutual benefits for both governments and citizens. Citizens gain insights into governmental processes and acquire the skills necessary for active engagement in decision-making. Conversely, governments benefit from citizen input, fostering trust and legitimacy. However, participation is inherently time-consuming for both sides, may reduce the budget available for policy implementation, and can lead to adverse outcomes if decisions are influenced by non-representative (Marzouki et al. 2017) or oppositional groups. Irvin & Stansbury (2004) provide a list of characteristics of effective citizen participation frequently cited in the literature: careful selection of participants, transparency in decision-making to build trust, clear communication of decision-making authority, regular meetings, and adequate funding throughout the process. However, they caution that even when these conditions are met, the success of participatory initiatives in achieving meaningful outcomes – such as more effective community decisions and public acceptance of new policies – may depend heavily on the local context (Irvin & Stansbury 2004). The physical proximity of decision-making venues to potential participants is particularly critical, especially for stakeholders essential to the participatory process.

The literature outlines various methods for implementing participation, for example informal or structured approaches (Farazmand 2018), or offline, online, or hybrid formats. The adoption of digital methods accelerated significantly during the COVID-19 pandemic (Pantić et al. 2021). E-Participation – described as citizen participation through information and communication technologies – introduced new electronic forms such as social media, blogs, and forums (Marzouki et al. 2017). At the same time, numerous platforms specifically designed for public participation emerged, offering diverse functionalities (Schmuderer et al. 2019). The rapid evolution of digital technologies continues to expand communication possibilities, profoundly influencing citizen participation and citizen science initiatives (Pantić et al. 2021; Hovik & Giannoumis 2022; Grigoletto et al. 2023). Despite these advancements, the societal adaptation to digital tools, their competent use, and their actual effectiveness often remain vague. This problem is addressed, arguing that public communication is frequently driven by technological considerations (“how”) rather than by the topic (“what”), the target group (“who”), or the intended

purpose (“why”) (Bock 2013). Although the pandemic has improved the means of digital participation, the use of a combined approach – integrating both offline and online methods – is suggested to enhance inclusivity and diversity, thereby ensuring a more representative group of participants.

Marzouki et al. (2017) derived a typology of public participation challenges based on the e-participation literature, identifying six categories, including citizen issues. These emphasize the importance of involving citizens early in the decision-making process to ensure successful participation. Drawing on the citizens’ issues category, Marzouki et al. (2017) proposed a novel participatory approach combining three main concepts: 1) context-based reasoning, 2) spatio-temporal representation and 3) visual analytics. Context-based reasoning suggests that participatory technologies should align with the social conditions and capacities of the involved citizens. Spatio-temporal representation posits that an opinion refers also to a location and a time. The visual analytics concept says that visual analytics should be included in the e-participation process to allow participants to get real-time insight into the participation and decision-making results and create transparency. Scherer et al. (2012) elaborate on inter-regional participation formats but do not mention the duration or location of participation.

Our study mainly builds upon Meschede & Mainka (2020) by using a similar case study-based approach. Their research examined citizen participation in a pilot project on sustainable global municipalities in Germany. The study focuses on the decision-making part of the project but also includes the phases before the decision-making takes place. They discuss a phase that they call “*analysis and drafting phase*”, which involves the use of various formats of citizen participation. This approach is particularly effective during the initial stages of assessing existing conditions and developing a mission statement for a sustainable development strategy. Within the project, different event formats, such as scenario conferences and workshops are used during which participating citizens share their ideas on the topic while they are also provided information. After the first phase, the project team developed a model for citizen participation in sustainable development strategies. It suggests formats for each phase, showing how different approaches suit specific goals. For instance, the team found that “open formats” are most suitable during the early stages of participation and emphasized that such formats should avoid “predefined outcomes”. However, the study did not account for factors such as event duration or other logistical considerations. Additional constraints included limited budgets and the availability of personnel to organize participatory events.

The presented literature mainly targets citizen participation in decision-making, mostly in the context of implementing new policies. But citizen participation can also be used in generating research output; here, decision-making is not the primary output, but successful participation in project events is necessary for data generation.

We built the conceptual framework of our study by combining the insight in citizen participation literature and in Czech-German cross-border cooperation and more recent research contributions on Interreg.

3. Methodology and Interreg Project Region

Building on the work of Marzouki et al. (2017) and their formulated spatiotemporal representation, this study examines the impact of spatial and temporal dimensions on the effectiveness of participation. We generate one data set from two Interreg projects, taking place in the same study region. This investigation is conducted as a case study detailed in subsection 3.1. Furthermore, subsection 3.2 outlines the evaluation process employed to identify these spatial and temporal dimensions.

3.1 Interreg Project Region

The analysis is based on two Interreg research projects with comparable structures, focusing on the Bavarian-Czech border region of Lower Bavaria and South Bohemia. This region is predominantly rural, with limited infrastructure and significant language barriers. During the time of the Iron Curtain,

the border was an insurmountable obstacle. With the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989, the border became passable. The Czech Republic joined the European Union in 2004, transforming the former external border of the EU into a joint border region. The region now benefits from access to funding programs aimed at fostering integration and strengthening border regions, such as Interreg projects. These funding schemes clearly define the regions where research must be conducted, and project objectives must be implemented (Figure 1). However, the funding schemes also address the specific needs of the border regions within the EU. Therefore both projects are aimed at connecting a group of citizens from two sides of a historically closed and only relatively recently opened border region. This makes the setting of our analysis unique in regard to how people at certain times and places react and answer to participation events (Marzouki et al. 2017).

Both projects aimed to initiate cross-border networks and collaboration to enhance stakeholders' visibility and communication in two sectors. *The Creative Borderland Project*¹ concentrated on uniting individuals from the cultural and creative sectors, analyzing, and strengthening their position in regional politics. *The Open Data Project*² targeted public administration, non-governmental organizations, and companies that use or produce open data, with the goal of informing and motivating network partners to collaborate and increase the use and production of open data. Both projects were implemented by Bavarian and Czech research institutes and concluded in December 2022. Public network managers were included as official project partners in organizing and promoting the projects' events and recruiting participants.




Figure 1: Project region of Lower Bavaria and South Bohemia.

The projects had mutually beneficial research and networking aims: gathering knowledge to analyze two distinct regional sectors (research aim) and connecting relevant stakeholders in these sectors to enhance cooperation (networking aim). These aims were achieved by organizing events that required the participation of relevant stakeholders and the interested public. The roles of the research institute and other project team members differed in the projects. While in the Creative Borderland Project the research institute organized and observed the events (output observing role), in the Open Data Project, it also provided input to the participants (input providing role).

¹ funded under Interreg V, 2014–2020, Project Number 336

² funded under Interreg V, 2014–2020, Project Number 340

3.2 Evaluation Method

In the first step, we group all events held within the two Interreg projects into event formats according to the type of participation used within the events (see Figure 2). Only events involving Bavarian stakeholders were included in the analysis, regardless of whether they took place in Bavaria or Czechia. Events aimed solely at Czech stakeholders were excluded. These events can be categorized similarly to the approach of Meschede & Mainka (2020). Our classification is based on the three formats of events: (1) informative, (2) networking, and (3) data creation events. Building on this, we analyze the spatial and temporal dimensions that influence the success of participation within each event format. In the third step, we define what constitutes successful participation and interpret the dimensions that contribute to it. Based on the results, we formulate recommendations for improving the implementation of participation events for each format. Figure 2 depicts the whole evaluation process.




Figure 2: Data generation and evaluation process.

3.3 Role of the Research Team

All events held within the projects were initiated by the research team, which therefore can be described as the enabler of participation in the events. As detailed in the Case Study description, this role varied between projects. In the Creative Borderland Project, the team primarily observed and benefited from the participants’ output, whereas in the Open Data Project, the team also provided input to guide participants. Interestingly, the Creative Borderland Project, where the team took a more observational role, appears to have achieved higher levels of quantitative participation of the participants. We interpret this finding to suggest that the project’s clear focus on networking was particularly appealing to local stakeholders.

4. Data Generation and Evaluation

4.1 Successful Participation Event

Funding projects within the framework of Interreg require a certain number of participants at the events, not least because of their network goal. At the same time, the bilateral project region is also determined by the funding program. In order to build comprehensive, area-wide regional networks, the quantitative objective at the start of the projects is to recruit as many participants as possible to achieve the research goals. However, due to the sheer size of the region with over 1,900,000 inhabitants (Lower Bavaria [NUTS 2] plus Budweis [NUTS 3]), it is difficult to define a manageable target group and to quantify it. The results of the projects show that fewer people participated in all participation formats than initially hoped, but the research and project goals were still achieved. The surveys are an exception to this. The two Interreg projects with the aim of cross-border networking make it clear that qualitative aspects must

be considered when recruiting participants by addressing the right stakeholders, experts, key persons, and multipliers. A focus on purely quantitative targets appears to be of secondary importance, without denying that a certain minimum number must be met. Therefore, we have used qualitative standards for the evaluation of our results, which are defined by the content-related objectives of the projects. If small but productive groups can be formed, valuable human and financial resources can be reallocated to other parts of the project, or the quality can be increased in terms of multiple participation events. This is particularly important for networking objectives in a cross-border context, as it can lead to better implementation and sustainability of the results. Regarding the network goal, it should be noted that the interest of the participants in creating a comprehensive network in both projects is low, especially when cross-border connections are to be created. As a result, micro-networks with a small number of participants were formed, but they work together productively beyond the project period. Although the broad network was not realized, the success of these locally operating micro-networks underlines the impetus provided by the two projects. At the same time, the knowledge gained also serves as valuable feedback for future project designs and transnational financing programs.

4.2 Categorization of the Events Held

A total of 15 participation events were held in the two Interreg projects. We evaluated these 15 events and assigned each event to one of three categories (see Figure 3): (1) informative events, (2) networking events, and (3) data creation events. The core aspects of these events, which generate the data used in this evaluation, are introduced in the following chapters. The evaluated events varied in duration, location, implementation, whether they were held offline, online, or in hybrid form, and the manner of participant involvement. Furthermore, they differ in how and whether data is created, whether they focus on the research or networking aim of the projects, and how participation takes place. Our evaluation specifically focuses on the projects' events, excluding other project-related content. The following method builds on the similarities and differences between the projects' events.

Figure 3 also highlights two insights from the two projects evaluated. First, the networking events play a central role for both projects, as they address almost all the projects' objectives. Second, it shows that the aim of data gathering and the research aim are strongly linked. This connection is inherent in the event formats Mapathon and Survey, as input from participants is mandatory.

	Event	Number during Case Studies	Research aim	Networking aim	Informative aim	Aim of data gathering
Data creation	Mapathon	2	X			X
	Hackathon	1		X		X
	Survey	3	X			X
Networking	Workshop	3	X	X	X	X
	Round Table	2	X	X		X
Informative	Opening Event	2			X	
	Closing Event	2			X	

Figure 3: Categorization results.

4.2.1 Informative Events

Opening and *Closing* events are classified as informative events. Their primary objectives are to introduce the projects to the public and present the results without focusing on the research or networking purpose. During these events, no interaction between participants was conceptually planned.

Both projects events were held offline and lasted half a day. Recruitment was limited, particularly for events held at more distant locations. Since the purpose of these informative events is to spread information widely, the small number of participants was inadequate to reach a broad audience. It could be beneficial to hold informative events in a hybrid format, offering online streaming options to facilitate a wider sharing of the project, communicate results effectively, and reach people both within and beyond the project region.

4.2.2 Networking Events

All (offline) events generally provide networking opportunities for participants, such as coffee and lunch breaks, open-ended sessions, and time slots to present individual work in the sector. These events are marketed as networking opportunities to attract participants. However, the emphasis on networking varies between events. An event is only categorized as a networking event if networking is defined as a core component. This applies to *Workshops and Round Tables*. The events focused on both research and networking objectives (see Figure 3). During these events, the research team initiated and observed discussions between participants on predefined questions and topics. Although the insights gained from these discussions contributed to the research aim, the networking aspect was clearly emphasized, especially compared to the other events. The round table events were conducted offline and lasted half a day each. The location significantly influenced participant recruitment, resulting in attendance primarily from individuals in the immediate surrounding region.

The workshops were held in part online and in part offline. They were constructed similar to the round tables but only lasted about 2 hours each. In the offline events also mostly individuals from the immediate surroundings attended, in the online events participants took place from further away but were still part of the project region. The output of content production and new insights into the topic of open data were successfully collected in both online and offline workshops. However, the number of participants was much higher in the offline events than in the online events.

Generally, fewer participants than expected were recruited for the networking events, especially in the online workshops. However, this did not affect the overall output of the events. A sufficient amount of information was collected to meet the research aim. Although the networking objective was met as well, it occurred in a somewhat different manner than initially anticipated. The events helped the creation of micro-networks that persist beyond the projects' duration. Throughout the project, new networks formed, and a core group of participants emerged, who consistently attended almost all events. Both these newly established networks and the core group were predominantly regionally connected to the locations of the main events.

4.2.3 Data Creation Events

Mapathon, Hackathon and Survey are classified as data creation events. The primary goal of these events is to generate datasets based on the knowledge of stakeholders. The success of these events is measured by the extent of the datasets created; the more comprehensive the datasets, the better. The events focus on achieving the research aim of the projects. An event is considered successful if a sufficiently large dataset is created.

The surveys in both Interreg projects refer to questionnaires which are not events in the classical sense. However, as surveys are one of the classic but also most effective tools for gathering low-key feedback, they are an essential part of data creation or – gathering in terms of participation. All surveys and a Mapathon were conducted exclusively online. We encountered difficulties recruiting the desired number

of participants for these online participation concepts. Specifically, while a representative sample was essential for the surveys, it was not achieved. In contrast, the Mapathons and the Hackathon did not require a representative sample, and their results were beneficial regardless of the number of participants.

Among the three types of events, only a limited number of participants were recruited, fewer than anticipated during the planning stages. In particular, there were differences in the extent of the data sets produced. An offline Mapathon, which included on-site online mapping and lasted one day, generated a larger dataset compared to an online Mapathon that spanned several weeks. Purely online events yielded minimal output. Furthermore, the location of the event played a crucial role in participant recruitment; most participants came from the immediate area, despite efforts to advertise throughout the project area.

4.3 Results

Based on the experience from the projects and the presented evaluation, we define two leverage dimensions that should be considered when conducting events in Interreg projects anticipating participation: The temporal dimension and the spatial dimension. Depending on the chosen event format, time and space must be carefully considered to successfully recruit participants.

- 1. Temporal dimension:** Interreg projects usually have a duration ranging between 12 and 36 months, depending on the specific objectives and complexity of the project. The time frame is often determined by the planned activities and in our case the participatory process. Therefore, two aspects are important. Firstly, the time management for the entire project, and secondly, the scheduling of the individual participation events. Hence, the temporal dimension includes different scales, with event formats ranging from a few hours to several weeks (e.g. online surveys). The role of the participation enabler can be analyzed for each specific event format with the same temporal dimensions, as well as across the entire project during which these events occur.
- 2. Spatial dimension:** The regions funded by Interreg projects vary in size, as they encompass cross-border areas. The funding regions are often designed to form functional geographic units that are relevant for collaboration in specific thematic areas, such as economic development, environmental protection, or social integration. Therefore, the size can range from small local communities to larger regional entities, depending on the specific objectives and requirements of the respective project. Accordingly, the spatial dimension ranges from a highly localized (within the project region), concentrated focus on events and projects to an interregional approach (beyond the project region), even when the project area is predefined. Some event formats are more effective when applied in a concentrated, local context, while others perform best across a broader region.

Figure 4 provides recommendations on how to adjust the temporal and spatial dimension in the three event formats used in the evaluated Interreg projects.




Figure 4: Temporal and spatial dimension of the events.

Informative events should be kept relatively short — typically, half a day is sufficient based on the case studies. These events should be conducted on a regional scale and can be held in a hybrid format, where participants stream online but cannot participate actively. Given their informative nature, which does not focus on research or networking, hybrid or online formats may offer greater convenience for both, participation and organization. This approach is based on the premise that the effectiveness of information dissemination improves with a larger number of participants.

Networking events should be brief, on a local level, and offline. The Interreg projects demonstrated that such events effectively achieved their networking and research objectives with a small number of participants. Offline networking events proved to be the most successful, drawing attendees primarily from the immediate area surrounding the event location. Although hybrid and online formats can address geographical challenges, particularly in sparsely populated regions, the two projects revealed that these formats had limited impact. Online participation was minimal and did not attract people from outside the local area. Consequently, the best results were achieved through purely offline events.

Data creation events should last a full working day and be conducted on a local to regional level, incorporating both offline and online participation. Purely online events were less successful, while hybrid formats in the sense that people met on-site but worked with digital tools proved effective, producing substantial output with adequate participant involvement. Hybrid data creation events demonstrated qualitative success, offering a balanced approach that leveraged the strengths of both in-person and virtual engagement. Using digital tools in offline data creation events has proven beneficial, enhancing the overall success of the event.

The participation process in the evaluated Interreg projects spanned a long period of time relative to the project duration. In our two cases it took at least several months to accommodate multiple participation events. This can be attributed to the projects' objectives. This approach ensures sufficient time for engagement and interaction across various stages of the whole project. While the process can operate on a regional scale, it is important to maintain a local focus to avoid overextending. Additionally, given the diverse nature of event formats – whether online, offline, or in hybrid form – the participation process should incorporate all these dimensions to maximize the flexibility and effectiveness of all events.

The participation enabler, in this study represented by the research and project team, should be available for a duration that exceeds the length of the participation process itself. This extended availability is crucial for effective preparation, follow-up, and for fostering trust within participants. The participation enabler should operate at a regional to inter-regional level to effectively oversee the integration of the participation events and the project's progress. The participation enabler should be accessible in both offline and online formats, attending offline events in person and providing online support and consultation as needed.

In conclusion, networking events are most effective when conducted offline, while data creation activities benefit from a hybrid approach. Informative events are best suited to modern, hybrid, and online formats to maximize information dissemination. Although online and hybrid participation options offer valuable flexibility, their impact on event success remains limited, as indicated by the literature. Therefore, while digital participation methods are useful, they do not always guarantee enhanced outcomes.

5. Discussion

Novotný (2025) concludes that achieving cross-border innovation – one of the main objectives of Interreg – requires the establishment of project and local stakeholders, as well as policymakers and appropriate policy tools. Our results add that the way in which different types of stakeholders – whether citizens in the project region, policymakers, or enterprises – are included and participate in Interreg project events is equally important.

So far, the region of an Interreg project is defined before the start of the project, and activities such as event advertising, dissemination of information and results, as well as efforts to build project networks during the project, are typically carried out at the level of this predefined project region. Our results suggest that the spatial dimension should be adjusted to the specific aim of each event rather than being held constant throughout the project.

Networking activities and data creation events should be conducted locally or regionally, therefore in a much smaller spatial dimension than the project region. In contrast, information about the project, the results of events, and more general processes in border regions can be disseminated across a wider area than the region targeted when holding on-site events and inviting participants. This allows for bigger visibility of the border regions and their specific needs (Böhm 2023). However, when a broader target group is intended, particularly for networking purposes, online formats should be preferred over inviting participants to attend on site.

Yet, not only the spatial, but also the temporal dimension varies across event types and further influences the discussion on online versus offline formats. Our results suggest a rather brief event duration, especially when combined with online formats, to keep participation attractive. Hybrid participation appears to be feasible and meaningful only for informative events, namely those in which participants are largely passive.

As participation is time- and budget-consuming for both sides and can lead to adverse outcomes if decisions are influenced by non-representatives, the fitting organization of events is very important (Marzouki et al. 2017). This is where our results support organizers: they provide a baseline to decide which time and space should be used for which participation event. This also positively influences project results due to a more adequate degree of public participation in the research process and design of the project (Shirk et al. 2012).

This study is subject to several limitations. First, it is based on only two projects conducted within a very similar regional context, therefore social and cultural differences and their impacts on participation events could not be included, however region-specific context might matter (Knippschild & Vock 2017). Both projects were funded within the same funding period and by the same regional funding scheme. As a result, the findings may not be fully transferable to other regions or funding contexts, where levels of regional interest and patterns of event participation may differ. This also aligns with the findings von Marzouki et al. (2017), as results should always be set in context to the social conditions and capacities of the citizens one wants to involve in the participation process. Second, both projects were implemented in the immediate post-COVID phase. During this period, an exceptionally high number of events were organized, which may have led to lower participation rates due to competition between simultaneous or overlapping events. Third, while the two projects addressed different thematic areas, the analysis is limited to only these two topics. It is therefore possible that other project topics would have generated higher levels of regional interest and participation. Fourth, this study focuses exclusively on event participation on the German side of the border, despite the projects being explicitly cross-border in nature. The core project activities were designed to be implemented across borders, which may have limited participation among individuals in the region who have little interest in cross-border cooperation. Some individuals who may have had a general interest in the project topics, but have personal constraints, such as limited English or Czech language skills, might have chosen not to participate.

While our results are based on only two Interreg projects, the idea of approaching event planning in Interreg projects more flexibly in spatial and temporal terms can be transferred to other projects using similar project event formats. Further, the findings can support the general outline of Interreg projects and also project calls regarding how the success of events is measured. While currently event participation (the number of participants) is used to prove an event's success and a regional interest in the topic, the event-based outcome and reaching the events' goals independent from the number of participants can also be used to measure the success of such participation events.

6. Conclusion

In this article, we consider different types of events to foster participation in terms of knowledge gathering and networking among different stakeholder groups in two Interreg projects. We compared the outputs of different event formats that took place in two cross-border projects that spanned the same time and region frame. The findings are important both for the authors of proposals for Interreg projects and for the funding institutions. Participation events should take place close to (potential) participants. This shows the need to adjust the regional scope of projects and funding to match these findings. The region should reflect the interests of the stakeholders. Spatiotemporal factors, especially in rural areas with longer distances, must be considered in funding options. Calls for proposals and funding should not only focus on large and geographically wide regions or prioritize participatory quantity. Instead, they should also support smaller regions and high-quality participation that promote meaningful engagement. Networking events, for instance, should be short, not last longer than 2 hours and only invite the core stakeholders of a network or the region under investigation. The participation process as a whole, similar to the participation enabler, should be already well known in the region to be perceived as trustworthy and reliable to the participants. According to the project aims, the overall process must span a long enough time horizon for the relevant stakeholders to be aware of and take part in the process. Another factor that gained a lot of importance during the COVID-19 pandemic very quickly is the use of digital participation tools. Although fully online events were as successful as offline events, the use of digital tools during on-site events gives them a hybrid character that cannot be overlooked. Reaching a wide audience solely through online advertising and online event implementation worked during COVID-19, but its effectiveness has declined since the last lockdown has largely faded from memory. Using digital tools to collect data and information from stakeholders to make informed decisions or generate an overview of a sector to enable individual networking helps to generate a long-lasting output of projects. It makes participants more willing to take part in events and enables them to gain easy overview of all inputs provided on a given topic by everyone involved.

Also due to the COVID-19 pandemic, some of the evaluated events took place online only. However, there were also offline events and hybrid events. The use of online event formats, e.g. using video conferencing tools, impacts both the temporal and spatial dimensions. Online events easily reach a broader spatial scope than offline events. When travel to the event site becomes unnecessary, more events can be held as a result. We found, however, that online participation did not create the necessary output in terms of quality and that purely offline events worked best. In general, allowing for online or hybrid participation can alter the spatial and temporal context of an event. Offline events can integrate on-site digital tools to enhance participant engagement, an approach that worked well within both projects.

While our results are based on only two Interreg projects in one region, the idea of approaching event planning more flexibly in spatial and temporal terms can be transferred to similar projects and regions. Since both projects were implemented during and shortly after the last COVID-19 lockdown, the question remains as to how future, specifically online events will be accepted by potential participants. In addition to interest in the topic, regional culture can also influence whether public participation can take place and in what form. This aspect was not explicitly addressed in our study.

7. Acknowledgements

Both evaluated projects were funded by the EU INTERREG VI-A Program 2014–2020, Project Numbers 336 and 340.

References

- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Ladder Of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>.
- Bertram, D., Chilla, T., Hippe, S. (2023). The laboratory dimension in cross-border development: Insights from the Czech-German Border Region. *Trendy v podnikání*, 13(2), 4–16. https://doi.org/10.24132/jbt.2023.13.2.4_16.
- Bloßfeldt, S. (2023). Promoting cross-border cooperation through cross-border central places: Strategic town-twinning on the Bavarian-Czech border reconsidered. *European Planning Studies*, 31(8), 1594–1611. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2022.2083913>.
- Böhm, H. (2023). Five Roles of Cross-border Cooperation Against Re-bordering. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 38(3), 487–506. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2021.1948900>.
- Bock, S. (2013). Selle, Klaus (2013): Über Bürgerbeteiligung Hinaus: Stadtentwicklung Als Gemeinschaftsaufgabe? Analysen Und Konzepte. Raumforschung Und Raumordnung. *Spatial Research and Planning*, 71(6). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13147-013-0252-9>.
- Chilla, T., & Lambracht, M. (2023). Institutional mapping of cross-border cooperation. INTERREG programme analyses with KEEP data. *European Planning Studies*, 31(4), 700–718. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2022.2058321>.
- Chouinard, J. A., & Milley, P. (2016). Mapping the spatial dimensions of participatory practice: A discussion of context in evaluation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 54, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2015.09.003>.
- Farazmand, A. (Ed.). (2018). Springer Reference. *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance: With 294 Figures and 229 Tables*. Springer.
- Flacke, J., Hoefsloot, F. I., & Pfeffer, K. (2025). Inclusive Digital Planning – Co-designing a collaborative mapping tool to support the planning of accessible public space for all. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 121, 102310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2025.102310>.
- Goodchild, M. F. (2007). Citizens as sensors: the world of volunteered geography. *GeoJournal*, 69(4), 211–221. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-007-9111-y>.
- Grigoletto, F., Oliveira, F. A. de, Momesso, C. C., Nehemy, I. K. R., Junior, João Emilio De Almeida, São Pedro, Vinícius De Avelar, Greco, R., Alves, M. A., & Edwards, T. (2023). Technological Affordance and the Realities of Citizen Science Projects Developed in Challenging Territories. *Sustainability*, 15(8), 6654. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15086654>.
- Haarich, N., S., Salvatori, G., Toptsidou, M. (2019), Evaluating Interreg programmes. The challenge of demonstrating results and value of European Territorial Cooperation. *Spatial Foresight Brief 2019:10*. Luxembourg. www.spatialforesight.eu.
- Hachmann, S., Jokar Arsanjani, J., & Vaz, E. (2018). Spatial data for slum upgrading: Volunteered Geographic Information and the role of citizen science. *Habitat International*, 72, 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2017.04.011>.
- Heller, K. (Ed.). (1984). *Psychology and Community Change: Challenges of the Future* (2. ed. [Nachdr.]). Brooks/Cole.
- Hovik, S., & Giannoumis, G. A. (2022). Linkages Between Citizen Participation, Digital Technology, and Urban Development. In S. Hovik, G. A. Giannoumis, K. Reichborn-Kjennerud, J. M. Ruano, I. McShane, & S. Legard (Eds.), *Citizen Participation in the Information Society: Comparing Participatory Channels in Urban Development* (pp. 1–23). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99940-7_1.
- Irvin, R. A., & Stansbury, J. (2004). Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is It Worth the Effort? *Public Administration Review*, 64(1), 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00346.x>.
- Knippschild, R., & Vock, A. (2017). The conformance and performance principles in territorial cooperation: A critical reflection on the evaluation of INTERREG projects. *Regional Studies*, 51(11), 1735–1745. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2016.1255323>.

- Lengerer, F., Steinführer, A., & Haartsen, T. (2022). To Participate, or Not to Participate That Is the Question. (Non-)Participation of Older Residents in Rural Communities. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 91, 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.02.008>.
- Lovric, N., & Lovric, M. (2018). Network Approach to Constructing Theory of Participation in Spatial Planning. *LAND USE POLICY*, 79, 30–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.07.038>.
- Marzouki, A., Mellouli, S., & Daniel, S. (2017). Towards a Context-based Citizen Participation Approach: A Literature Review of Citizen Participation Issues and a Conceptual Framework. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance* (pp. 204–213). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3047273.3047352>.
- Meschede, C., & Mainka, A. (2020). Including Citizen Participation Formats for Drafting and Implementing Local Sustainable Development Strategies. *Urban Science*, 4(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci4010013>.
- McMaster, I., Wergles, N., & Vironen, H. (2019). Results orientation: what is it doing for Interreg? *European Structural and Investment Funds Journal*, 7(1), 2–8.
- Nanz, P., & Fritsche, M. (2024). *Handbuch Beteiligung: Gestaltungsmöglichkeiten für Bürgerinnen und Bürger (Aktualisierte Neuauflage, Sonderausgabe für die Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung)*. Schriftenreihe / Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung: Band 11093. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung bpb.
- Novotný, L. (2026). Innovations in EU cross-border project management: A case study of Interreg. *European Planning Studies*, 34(2), 350–372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2025.2562168>.
- Pantić, M., Cilliers, J., Cimadomo, G., Montaña, F., Olufemi, O., Torres Mallma, S., & van den Berg, J. (2021). Challenges and Opportunities for Public Participation in Urban and Regional Planning during the COVID-19 Pandemic-Lessons Learned for the Future. *Land*, 10(12), 1379. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10121379>.
- Patze-Diordiychuk, P., Smettan, J. R., Renner, P., & Föhr, T. (Eds.). (2017a). *Methodenhandbuch Bürgerbeteiligung / Peter Patze-Diordiychuk, Jürgen Smettan, Paul Renner, Tanja Föhr (Hrsg.) Akademie für Lokale Demokratie: Band 1. Beteiligungsprozesse erfolgreich planen*. oekom.
- Patze-Diordiychuk, P., Smettan, J. R., Renner, P., & Föhr, T. (Eds.). (2017b). *Methodenhandbuch Bürgerbeteiligung / Peter Patze-Diordiychuk, Jürgen Smettan, Paul Renner, Tanja Föhr (Hrsg.) Akademie für Lokale Demokratie: Band 2. Passende Beteiligungsformate wählen*. oekom.
- Pretty, J. N. (1995). Participatory Learning for Sustainable Agriculture. *World Development*, 23(8), 1247–1263. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(95\)00046-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(95)00046-F)
- Scherer, S., Wimmer, M. A., & Schepers, J. (2012). Regional Participation Model to Engage Citizens in Distant Decision-Making. In Y. Charalabidis & S. Koussouris (Eds.), *Empowering Open and Collaborative Governance* (pp. 139–155). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-27219-6_8.
- Schmuderer, S., Zink, R., & Gamerith, W. (2019). Citizen Participation via Digital Maps: A Comparison of Current Applications. *GI_Forum*, 1, 34–46. https://doi.org/10.1553/giscience2019_02_s34.
- Shirk, J. L., Ballard, H. L., Wilderman, C. C., Phillips, T., Wiggins, A., Jordan, R., McCallie, E., Minarchek, M., Lewenstein, B. V., Krasny, M. E., & Bonney, R. (2012). Public Participation in Scientific Research: A Framework for Deliberate Design. *Ecology and Society*, 17(2), art29. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-04705-170229>.
- Thierstein, A., Rey, M., Walser, M., & Vodoz, L. (o. J.). The 'hidden hypothesis'- approach in evaluation methodology: The Swiss participation in the European INTERREG II- Programme.
- Wiedemann, P. M., & Femers, S. (1993). Public Participation in Waste Management Decision Making: Analysis and Management of Conflicts. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 33(3), 355–368. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3894\(93\)85085-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3894(93)85085-S)

JAIR

Journal of Applied
Interdisciplinary Research



JAIR – Journal of Applied Interdisciplinary Research Issue 1 Vol. 3 (2026)

Publishers:

Prof. Waldemar Berg & Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Dorner

The Journal of Applied Interdisciplinary Research (JAIR)
is a series of the Bavarian Journal of Applied Sciences (BJAS).
The JAIR is an English-language journal that is only published online at
<https://jas.bayern>

Deggendorf Institute of Technology, 2026