

## More than the worksite cafeteria: the workplace food environment of small and medium-sized enterprises in the Netherlands

Authors	Geboers,Lisanne; de Vet,Emely; Rongen,Frederique C.; Poelman,Maartje P.
Published in	Public Health Nutrition
DOI	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980024000946">10.1017/S1368980024000946</a>
Publication Date	2024-04-29
Document Version	publishersversion
Link	<a href="https://research.tilburguniversity.edu/en/publications/af306fd0-2fc6-41ce-8fc0-908d97cf95af">https://research.tilburguniversity.edu/en/publications/af306fd0-2fc6-41ce-8fc0-908d97cf95af</a>
Citation	Geboers, L, de Vet, E, Rongen, F C & Poelman, M P 2024, 'More than the worksite cafeteria : the workplace food environment of small and medium-sized enterprises in the Netherlands', Public Health Nutrition, vol. 27, no. 1, e137. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980024000946">https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980024000946</a>
Download Date	2026-04-17 15:48:59
Rights	<p>General rights</p> <p>Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.</li> <li>- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain</li> <li>- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal"</li> </ul> <p>Take down policy</p> <p>If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.</p>



# More than the worksite cafeteria: the workplace food environment of small and medium-sized enterprises in the Netherlands

Lisanne Geboers\* , Emely de Vet, Frédérique C Rongen and Maartje P Poelman 

Chair Group Consumption and Healthy Lifestyles, Department of Social Sciences, Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen, the Netherlands

Submitted 10 October 2023: Final revision received 8 February 2024: Accepted 12 April 2024

## Abstract

**Objective:** To characterise the food environment of Dutch small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), encompassing physical, sociocultural, economic and policy features and to explore variations within SMEs according to company characteristics (number of employees, location of work and presence of worksite cafeteria).

**Design:** Online cross-sectional survey study of a representative Dutch SME sample by a panel agency.

**Setting:** Dutch SMEs.

**Participants:** Three hundred and fifteen employees of Dutch SMEs responsible for food and drink in their company.

**Results:** Most SMEs did not have a worksite cafeteria, no provision of fruits or vegetables, and did not offer discounts on food or drinks. The food environment of these SMEs varied significantly based on company characteristics. For example, SMEs with a worksite cafeteria were significantly more likely to have fruits (OR = 8.76, 95 % CI (4.50, 17.06)), vegetables (OR = 10.29, 95 % CI (5.49, 19.31)) and company food policies (OR = 5.04, 95 % CI (2.08, 12.20)) than SMEs without. Additionally, SMEs with  $\geq 50$  employees were more likely to have fruits (OR = 2.39, 95 % CI (1.42, 4.03)), vegetables (OR = 1.89, 95 % CI (1.04, 3.46)) and company food policies (OR = 2.82, 95 % CI (1.09, 7.29)) than SMEs with  $< 50$  employees. Moreover, having a worksite cafeteria (B = 0.23, 95 % CI (0.08, 0.38)) and employees working mostly on-site (B = 0.14, 95 % CI (0.01, 0.28)) were associated with stronger social norms of healthy and sustainable eating at work compared to SMEs without a worksite cafeteria and working mostly off-site.

**Conclusions:** In SMEs, an overall comprehensive picture of the food environment points to its limited active encouragement of healthy food choices, particularly so in small SMEs without a worksite cafeteria. Company characteristics strongly influence SME food environments and should be considered when developing interventions improving SME workplace food environments.

## Keywords

Food environment  
Small and medium-sized enterprises  
Number of employees  
Work location  
Worksite cafeteria

Unhealthy and unsustainable diets are a major public and planetary health concern, contributing to the burden of diet-related non-communicable diseases and climate change<sup>(1)</sup>. Promoting healthy and sustainable diets is therefore a key public health priority<sup>(2,3)</sup>. While a myriad of factors steer food consumption, unhealthy and unsustainable diets are largely driven by current food environments, such as the availability and accessibility of food and drinks in our living environment (e.g. via supermarkets, restaurants and cafeterias). Currently, the food environment predominantly encourages poor food choices<sup>(4,5)</sup>. Given the substantial time people

spend at work, with full-time employees dedicating a median of 40.5 h per week at work in OECD countries<sup>(6)</sup>, the workplace food environment may affect dietary choices. Employees consume approximately a third of their daily energy intake at the workplace<sup>(7)</sup>, and in many European countries, lunch is often consumed within the workplace premises<sup>(8)</sup>. Similarly, in the Netherlands, 77 % of employees spend their lunch breaks at work, with employees opting to spend their lunch at their desks (21 %), in the office break area (37 %) or at the worksite cafeteria (19 %)<sup>(8)</sup>. Hence, the workplace food

\*Corresponding author: Email [lisanne.geboers@wur.nl](mailto:lisanne.geboers@wur.nl)

© Wageningen University & Research, 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Nutrition Society. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.





environment holds significant potential as a leverage point to foster healthy diets.

However, a gap arises because there is a limited understanding of the characteristics of all dimensions of the workplace food environment, with most insights mainly capturing the physical food environment<sup>(9–12)</sup>. In general, the food environment can be defined as the collective physical (availability, quality and advertisements), economic (costs), policy (rules) and sociocultural (norms and beliefs) surroundings, opportunities, and conditions that influence food and beverage consumption<sup>(13)</sup>. At the organisational level, the food environment encompasses the institutional level (e.g. eating spaces made available), internal level of the eating spaces (e.g. prices, promotion), the surroundings (e.g. outside establishments that sell food) and the decisional level (e.g. policies and institutional culture)<sup>(14)</sup>. For example, the workplace food environment of four metropolitan bus garages in the USA showed that all garages had vending machines, microwaves and refrigerators, with only 15% of the vending machine foods meeting the criteria for healthful choices<sup>(12)</sup>. Furthermore, a recent systematic review revealed that, beyond the physical food environment, other factors also had an impact on eating behaviours<sup>(7)</sup>. To illustrate, factors related to job roles (e.g. work stress), cost of food and social dynamics (e.g. social norms) at work were linked to food consumption<sup>(7)</sup>. The social dynamics during lunch breaks not only stimulate stronger connections with colleagues but in turn also exert both positive and negative influences on healthy eating behaviour at the workplace. The lunch break's culture, encompassing factors like location and the source of the meal, further contributes to these influences<sup>(8)</sup>. Furthermore, food policies at work prohibiting the consumption of all fast foods, sweets, and sugary soft drinks and providing free fruit have been shown to be effective in limiting the consumption of foods and drinks high in sugar and increasing fruit intake at work<sup>(15,16)</sup>. Additionally, discounts specifically for healthy foods have been shown to increase healthy food sales in worksite cafeterias<sup>(17)</sup>. These findings can be linked to policy, economic and sociocultural facets of the workplace food environment, indicating that the impact of the workplace food environment goes beyond mere physical factors such as the availability of healthy foods. Despite the importance and relevance of these insights, we currently lack a comprehensive picture of workplace food environments that encompasses all domains, including physical, sociocultural, economic and policy aspects. Our study aims to fill this gap by providing comprehensive insights across all facets of the food environment.

A second gap arises from our limited understanding of how food environments are influenced in smaller companies *without* worksite cafeterias, mainly due to the prevailing focus on workplace food environments in large companies *with* worksite cafeterias<sup>(17–22)</sup>. However, 99% of companies in the European Union (EU) are small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), with a maximum of 250

employees<sup>(23)</sup>. These SMEs collectively employ approximately 100 million people within the EU<sup>(24)</sup> and 4 million within the Netherlands<sup>(25)</sup>. Therefore, in the present study, we focus on SMEs as an understudied area, yet an important setting to study employees' food environment and food consumption. These SMEs frequently lack worksite cafeterias due to the lack of financial viability<sup>(26)</sup>, which may notably impact the physical and economic facets of the food environment within these SMEs. In addition, irrespective of the presence of a worksite cafeteria, prior research has shown that smaller companies are generally less likely to offer workplace programmes promoting employees' health than larger companies<sup>(27–29)</sup>. These findings suggest differences in the policy food environment, which could potentially extend to practices related to other features of the food environment. Given the differences between SMEs in the presence of a worksite cafeteria and the number of employees, our study examines worksite food environments while acknowledging these distinct characteristics.

Thirdly, SME workplaces vary considerably according to the nature of the work and therefore the type of workplaces also differ greatly among SMEs<sup>(30)</sup>. Employees working on-site, particularly in office settings, may have easier access to conveniently located food options, including worksite cafeterias, in-house facilities or nearby food services. On the other hand, employees working off-site, such as those in transportation or remote locations, often have limited access to healthy food options and may be exposed more often to unhealthy foods (e.g. on-the-go food outlets)<sup>(31)</sup>. Therefore, we hypothesise that different types of workplaces (working on-site (e.g. IT sector) *v.* off-site (e.g. transport sector)) can substantially shape exposure to food environments and that employees working off-site may have less access to healthy food than those working on-site<sup>(31)</sup>. The food environment of on-site and off-site employees may be further influenced by health policies at work. As indicated by the findings of Seward and colleagues<sup>(32)</sup>, employees working off-site generally have access to fewer health promotion programmes compared to those working on-site. Drawing upon these findings, it could be hypothesised that on-site work environments may prioritise employee health and wellbeing differently, potentially resulting in the adoption of policies and initiatives aimed at encouraging healthier food options at the workplace.

Given these considerations, this study aims to characterise the food environment of SMEs in the Netherlands in a comprehensive manner encompassing the physical, economic, policy and sociocultural aspects and to examine how the food environment varies within SMEs according to (1) the number of employees, (2) location of work and (3) presence of a worksite cafeteria. These insights are crucial, as they contribute to the advancement of knowledge regarding how workplace factors interact with the food environment. Additionally, this understanding can



support employers, policymakers and health professionals in formulating interventions that align with the unique circumstances of different types of SMEs, ultimately promoting better employee health and well-being.

## Methods

### *Study design*

A cross-sectional survey was conducted amongst an online panel, recruited, by panel agency Flycatcher Internet Research B.V. The panel comprises individually applied Dutch participants, collectively representing the Dutch population. During the application process for joining the online panel, panel members submitted background details including the company size or responsibilities at work (if applicable).

### *Procedure and participants*

To gain insight into the food environments of SMEs, we recruited employees or employers of SMEs nationwide that, during the application process for the panel indicated to be (co)responsible for the 'food and drink' in their company. Eligible respondents were invited by email to participate in the survey. The inclusion criterion was that respondents had to be working in an SME (i.e. an organisation with 2–250 employees). Respondents working in the catering or healthcare industry were excluded due to their food environments being designed not only for employees but also for visitors and patients. Respondents were invited between December 2021 and March 2022, reflecting a situation during the COVID-19 pandemic.

An initial number of 2200 invitations for the survey were sent to employees or employers who were responsible for the food and drink. A total of 469 respondents started the survey. Of the 469 participants, the panel agency excluded respondents who did not consent to using their data ( $n$  6, 1.3%), respondents who were not eligible due to not complying with the selection criteria stated in the survey ( $n$  119, 25.4%), participants with incomplete surveys ( $n$  22, 4.7%) or a poor response quality resulting from straight lining, responding too quickly and incoherent answers to open questions ( $n$  7, 1.5%) were excluded from the analyses. A final sample of 315 respondents (14.3% of the initial invited) was included in the analyses. This final included sample is in close alignment with the TNO Employers Survey of 2021, showing comparable sector distributions with minor variations<sup>(33)</sup>. While our sample's company size differs from the national SME landscape<sup>(34)</sup>, intentionally incorporating diverse SME types enhances the study's representativeness.

### *Measures*

The survey consisted of questions about participant and company characteristics as well as measures about the

physical, sociocultural, economic and policy food environment of the workplace. These measurements were aligned with the Analysis Grid for Environments Linked to Obesity (ANGELO) framework's definition of the food environment<sup>(4)</sup>. The exclusion of the more narrow organisational food environment definition to construct the measures was deliberate, as this presupposes the provision of food at the workplace, a concept not always suitable for SMEs (that do not always offer food at work)<sup>(35,36)</sup>. Furthermore, the survey was pretested by two employees of Flycatcher Internet Research B.V.

### *Participant characteristics*

Sex, age and job position (based on a previous employer study<sup>(37)</sup>) were assessed. Additionally, the sector in which participants worked was assessed from a predefined list (e.g. construction and industry<sup>(37)</sup>).

### *Implications of COVID-19 on food and drink offer and eating practices*

The survey included four items to identify the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the SME food environment. First, it was inquired if the offer of food and/or drinks at the workplace had changed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Second, if respondents indicated that the offer of food and/or drinks at the workplace had indeed changed due to COVID-19, they were asked what had changed with an open-ended question. Third, it was asked if eating practices of employees had changed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Lastly, if respondents indicated that eating practices of employees had indeed changed due to COVID-19, they were asked what had changed with an open-ended question.

### *Company characteristics*

Company characteristics were assessed by three items. First, the total number of employees (2–250) was defined, and answers were recoded into two categories of fifty and more ( $\geq 50$ ) or less than fifty ( $< 50$ ) employees. The cut-off of fifty employees was used because small enterprises are defined as having less than fifty employees, and medium-sized enterprises have 50–250 employees<sup>(23)</sup>. Second, to determine the primary location of work there were three response options ('all or most employees work on-site', 'half the employees work on-site' and 'all or most employees do not work on-site')

These options were recoded into two categories: 'most employees work on-site' and 'most employees work off-site (including both half the employees work on-site and all or most employees do not work on-site)'. On-site work was defined in the survey as working in settings such as offices or stores, while off-site work was specified as activities such as working at client's premises or engaging in transportation-related tasks. Finally, the presence of a worksite cafeteria was identified (yes/no). Respondents ( $n$  67) who indicated having a 'worksite cafeteria' but also indicated that no food and drinks were available for sale at work were

recoded into having a 'canteen' (common break room) only.

#### *Physical food environment influences*

Three measures were used to assess the physical food environment. First, the presence of amenities at the worksite was assessed from a predefined list containing seven items (worksite cafeteria (mentioned above), catered lunch, soft drink vending machine, coffee and tea vending machine, snack vending machine, water tap and kitchen). When inquiring about snacks, the reference was unhealthy snacks (as per the Dutch translation). Hereafter, the term 'snacks' will be thus used to denote unhealthy snacks. Second, based on the NEMS-P survey<sup>(38)</sup>, respondents had to indicate whether eleven predefined kitchen appliances were available at work for employees, such as microwaves or refrigerators (see Appendix 1 for the full list). Lastly, based on the 'Guidelines for the food environment' of the Netherlands Nutrition Centre, the availability of certain food and drinks at the workplace was assessed, including fresh fruits, vegetables and/or salads, and 'other' products/meals<sup>(39)</sup>. If respondents indicated that other products/meals were available, they were asked about the availability of other foods and drinks from a predefined list (e.g. sandwiches, sweet snacks and sugary soft drinks) in more detail (see Appendix 2 for the full list).

#### *Sociocultural food environment influences*

Four variables were included to determine the socio-cultural food environment. Based on Corvo and colleagues<sup>(8)</sup>, two questions were included regarding lunch break habits. First, respondents were presented with a predefined list and were asked to indicate the most common ways their colleagues typically spent their lunch breaks during working hours (in a communal break room or canteen/behind a desk/walking/at an external eating facility/at home/on-the-go) and the latter four options were categorised into 'out-of-the-office'. Second, participants were required to select, from a predefined list, the primary sources from which their colleagues typically brought lunch. The options included bringing it from home, buying it from a local food provider such as a bakery or supermarket, buying it from the worksite cafeteria or canteen, groceries purchased by a colleague, or ordering lunch for delivery. The answer options from a local provider, groceries bought by a colleague and lunch ordered for delivery were recoded during data analysis into one answer option called 'purchased elsewhere'. Third, a variable was included measuring social norms of healthy and sustainable eating at work. Respondents indicated on a five-point Likert scale (e.g. 1 = totally disagree to 5 = totally agree) to what extent they agreed on the following six statements; 'There is a healthy eating culture at work.'; 'There is a sustainable eating culture at work.'; 'In general, colleagues have a positive attitude towards healthy food.'; 'In general, colleagues have a

positive attitude towards sustainable eating.'; 'My colleagues eat snacks when they are at work.'; and 'My colleagues eat vegetables and/or fruit when they are at work.'. A higher rating (1–5) indicated healthier and more sustainable choices, leading to the reverse-coding of the statement about snacking. The statements were based on Rongen *et al.*<sup>(40)</sup> and were preceded by an explanation of what a healthy and sustainable diet constituted<sup>(41)</sup> (see Appendix 3 for the definitions). A mean score for the six items was calculated to represent 'social norms of healthy and sustainable eating at work'. Internal consistency was sufficient (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.77$ ).

Company food policies shape food environments, impacting resources and incentives for healthy eating<sup>(42)</sup>. Whether these policies exist depends on underlying values/beliefs within the company, which can range from supporting employee's health as a responsibility of the employer or the employee's own responsibility<sup>(43)</sup>. The value assigned to this, including companies' responsibility to create healthy and sustainable food environments, is part of its sociocultural food environment<sup>(4)</sup>.

Finally, inspired by McCleary *et al.*<sup>(44)</sup>, a variable was included to measure the extent to which respondents agreed that employers were responsible for facilitating and reimbursing healthy and sustainable food environments and stimulating the general health of their employees at the workplace. Respondents indicated on a five-point Likert scale (e.g. 1 = totally disagree to 5 = totally agree) to what extent they agreed on the following five statements; 'Employers must play an active role in facilitating a healthy and sustainable food supply at work'; 'Employers must play an active role in stimulating healthy and sustainable eating behaviour of their employees at work.'; 'Employers must play an active role in stimulating the general health of their employees'; 'The costs of facilitating a healthy and sustainable food supply among employees must be reimbursed by the employer'; and 'The costs of stimulating healthy and sustainable eating behaviour among employees must be reimbursed by the employer'. A mean score including the five items was computed for 'Employer responsibility for employee health'. Internal consistency was sufficient (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.89$ ).

#### *Economic food environment influences*

Concerning economic features three items were included, we assessed whether employees received discounts on food or drinks through work (e.g. discount on lunch orders) or a budget for lunch (e.g. employees being able to buy a free lunch up to three euros in the supermarket) which could be answered by yes/no/don't know. When employees did receive a discount or budget, they were inquired about the specific products for which it applied, through open-ended questions. Furthermore, for each product or meal available at work, as indicated in the physical food environment section, respondents indicated



whether the product or meal was for free for employees (yes/ no/ don't know).

### *Policy food environment influences*

Four items were included to determine the policy food environment. First, the presence of a food procurement policy, which is the presence of guidelines or rules to regulate the sourcing and purchasing of food products, was assessed by one item if this was present for healthy and sustainable foods (yes/no/don't know). Second, the existence of other company food policies related to stimulating the consumption of healthy and sustainable foods (e.g. policies for collective sharing of birthday treats at work to reduce treat frequency or policies to promote a healthy eating pattern) was assessed (yes/no/don't know). Hereafter, these policies will be referred to as 'company food policies'. If no company food policies were present, respondents were asked to indicate whether informal agreements were present (yes/no) and if so, what they were. Third, it was assessed if (yes/no) employees were able to participate in work-supported health promotion programmes (e.g. stimulating more exercise, a healthy diet and smoking cessation). Lastly, the presence of initiatives among employees concerning policies to improve healthy and sustainable food at the workplace was assessed with a multiple-choice question where participants indicated which initiatives were present or if there were no initiatives present (Meatless Monday or other initiatives to inspire a vegetarian diet/vegan Friday or other initiatives for inspiration for a vegan diet/policies regarding treats/celebrations (at birthdays)/no-waste initiatives/no initiatives (unique option)/don't know (unique option)/other).

### *Statistical analyses*

Descriptive statistics were used to describe participant socio-demographic, company and food environment characteristics. For the six items where 'I don't know' was a possible answer, if a participant answered 'I don't know' they were excluded from the respective analysis that involved that item. For the measures where Likert scales were used, mean values and standard deviations (SD) were calculated. These descriptive statistics were given for the total group as well as for the three independent variables (company characteristics): (1) number of employees (< 50 and  $\geq$  50), (2) location of work (mostly off-site *v.* on-site) and (3) availability of a worksite cafeteria (yes *v.* no).

For each dichotomised dependent food environment measure (i.e. discounts on food and drink (yes/no)), a combined binary logistic regression model was run including the three dichotomous independent variables simultaneously to evaluate their collective influence on the likelihood of the presence of the respective dependent variables. These independent variables were coded as follows: (1) number of employees (0 = < 50 employees, 1 =  $\geq$  50 employees), (2) location of work (0 = at least half or most employees working off-site, and 1 = most

employees working on-site) and (3) availability of a worksite cafeteria (0 = no worksite cafeteria, 1 = worksite cafeteria present). Multinomial logistic regression models were used similarly for the dependent measures 'Where are lunch breaks most often spent?' and 'Where is lunch most often brought from?'. Odds Ratios (OR), p-values and their 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) were presented. Linear regression models were used similarly for the dependent food environment measures which were measured on a Likert scale and of which a mean value was calculated. Regression coefficients (B) and their 95% CI were presented. Lastly, the Pearson chi-squared and Fisher's exact tests were used to evaluate the association between job position (employer *v.* employee) and all categorical food environment measures. The Mann-Whitney test assessed the association between job position and food environment measures where Likert scales were used. Analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS 28.0.

## **Results**

### ***Participant characteristics***

Of the 315 participants, 187 (59.4%) were male and 128 (40.6%) were female, and the mean age was 45.6 (SD = 12.49) years. Most participants were employees of the SME (*n* 245, 77.8%) and 22.2% of participants were company owners (*n* 70). The participants most frequently represented the trade sector (*n* 68, 21.6%) or business services sector (*n* 65, 20.6%).

### ***Implications of COVID-19 on food and drink offer and eating practices***

Changes in the offer of food and/or drinks due to COVID-19 were reported by forty-nine (15.6%) of participants. Examples included the closure of facilities (e.g. worksite cafeteria) and less or no more available food at the workplace. Additionally, thirty-nine (12.4%) of participants reported changes in work-related eating practices (e.g. participants eating at home, taking fewer lunch breaks together at the workplace (due to group restrictions) and a shift to healthier eating habits).

### ***Company characteristics***

Overall, 58.4% of SMEs had less than fifty employees (*n* 184) and 41.6% of SMEs had fifty or more employees (*n* 131). Respondents indicated that most employees worked on-site in 67.6% of SMEs (*n* 213) and most employees worked off-site in 32.4% of the SMEs (*n* 102). The majority of SMEs did not have a worksite cafeteria (*n* 243, 77.1%). Among the SMEs that had a worksite cafeteria (*n* 72), 33.3% (*n* 24) of them had less than fifty employees, while 66.7% (*n* 48) had fifty or more employees. Out of the SMEs that had a worksite cafeteria, most employees worked on-site (56.9%, *n* 41) and 43.1% (*n* 31) had most of their employees

working off-site. Of the SMEs where employees worked predominantly on-site ( $n = 213$ ), 62.0% had less than fifty employees ( $n = 132$ ) and 38.0% had fifty or more employees ( $n = 81$ ).

### **Physical food environment influences**

Most SMEs did not have soft drink vending machines ( $n = 219$ , 69.5%), snack vending machines ( $n = 250$ , 79.4%), on-site fruit available ( $n = 185$ , 58.7%) or on-site vegetables available ( $n = 230$ , 73.0%) (Table 1). The majority of SMEs had a coffee and tea vending machine ( $n = 281$ , 89.2%) and a kitchen ( $n = 247$ , 78.4%). Having fifty or more employees significantly increased the likelihood that soft drink vending machines (OR = 2.71, 95% CI 1.59, 4.61) and snack vending machines (OR = 3.93, 95% CI = 2.08, 7.51) were present compared to having less than fifty employees, as shown in Table 2. Additionally, the likelihood of having on-site fruits and vegetables available was higher in SMEs with fifty or more employees (OR = 2.39, 95% CI 1.42, 4.03 and OR = 1.89, 95% CI 1.04, 3.46, respectively) than in SMEs with less than fifty employees. Having a worksite cafeteria significantly increased the likelihood of soft drink vending machines and snack vending machines being present compared to SMEs without a worksite cafeteria (OR = 4.37, 95% CI 2.42, 7.89 and OR = 5.38, 95% CI 2.83, 10.24, respectively). Moreover, the likelihood of having on-site fruits and vegetables available was also higher in SMEs with a worksite cafeteria (OR = 8.76, 95% CI 4.50, 17.06 and OR = 10.29, 95% CI 5.49, 19.31, respectively) than in SMEs without a worksite cafeteria. The location of work did not significantly increase the likelihood of any of these variables being present. No statistical differences in physical food environment influences were found based on job position (Appendix 4).

### **Sociocultural food environment influences**

In general, lunch breaks were most often spent in a common break room ( $n = 192$ , 61.0%) and most often brought from home ( $n = 208$ , 66.0%). In larger SMEs ( $\geq 50$  employees), lunch was more often spent in a common break room and less often behind their desk (OR = 0.53, 95% CI 0.28, 1.00) or out-of-office (OR = 0.54, 95% CI 0.28, 1.03) than in smaller SMEs (Table 3). The likelihood of employees spending lunch out-of-the-office instead of in a common break room was significantly lower for SMEs where most employees worked on-site compared to those predominantly working off-site (OR = 0.40, 95% CI 0.22, 0.75). Additionally, having a worksite cafeteria significantly decreased the likelihood of employees spending lunch behind a desk instead of spending it in a common break room compared to not having a worksite cafeteria (OR = 0.30, 95% CI 0.12, 0.77). Furthermore, having fifty or more employees or having a worksite cafeteria both significantly increased the likelihood of lunch being brought from the worksite cafeteria instead of bringing

lunch from home (OR = 2.39, 95% CI 1.12, 5.11 and OR = 11.18, 95% CI 5.24, 23.86, respectively) compared to having less than fifty employees or not having a worksite cafeteria. Employers reported that lunch breaks were significantly less often spent in a common break room and were more often spent out-of-the-office, compared to what employees reported (Appendix 4). The respondents had an average score of 3.28 (SD = 0.56, Table 1) on social norms of healthy and sustainable eating at work. Having a worksite cafeteria (B = 0.23, 95% CI 0.08, 0.38) and working primarily on-site (B = 0.14, 95% CI 0.01, 0.28) were significantly positively associated with stronger norms of healthy and sustainable eating at work compared to not having a worksite cafeteria and working primarily off-site, as shown in Table 4. Furthermore, the respondents had an average score of 3.18 (SD = 0.76, Table 1) on employer responsibility for employee health. Having a worksite cafeteria (B = 0.27, 95% CI 0.07, 0.48), but not the number of employees and the location of work, was significantly positively associated with stronger perceptions that employers were responsible for employees' health (Table 4). Employers reported significantly stronger social norms of healthy and sustainable eating at work than employees. No other statistical differences were identified in the sociocultural food environment influences based on job position (Appendix 4).

### **Economic food environment influences**

In the majority of SMEs, there were no discounts on food or drinks ( $n = 267$ , 84.8%) or available budget for lunch at the workplace ( $n = 287$ , 91.1%), as shown in Table 1. Overall, 27.0% ( $n = 85$ ) of SMEs provided free fruit whilst 15.2% ( $n = 48$ ) of SMEs provided free vegetables. When discounts or budgets were offered, they were often not explicitly designated for specific types of products (e.g. exclusively healthy items). Only two companies explicitly stated that their discounts applied solely to healthy foods. Having a worksite cafeteria significantly increased the likelihood of discounts on food and drink being present at work compared to not having a worksite cafeteria (OR = 3.02, 95% CI 1.29, 7.08), as shown in Table 5. Discounts were reported to be present significantly more by employers than by employees, who more often did not know whether discounts were present. No significant difference was reported in budgets available based on job position (Appendix 4).

### **Policy food environment influences**

Company food policies concerning the consumption of healthy and sustainable foods were present in a small number of SMEs ( $n = 26$ , 8.3%) (Table 1), and even a smaller number of SMEs ( $n = 8$ , 2.5%) indicated the presence of informal agreements (e.g. preferably no drinks from plastic bottles or a joint birthday treat by the SME once a month). Furthermore, the minority of SMEs with a worksite cafeteria

**Table 1** Descriptive statistics, in total and stratified by company characteristics: worksite cafeteria availability, number of employees and location of work

	Total		< 50 employees		≥ 50 employees		Most employees work on-site		Most employees work off-site		With a worksite cafeteria		Without a worksite cafeteria	
	n 315		n 184		n 131		n 213		n 102		n 72		n 243	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Physical food environment</b>														
Soft drink vending machine														
Yes	96	30.5%	36	19.6%	60	45.8%	65	30.5%	31	30.4%	43	59.7%	53	21.8%
No	219	69.5%	148	80.4%	71	54.2%	148	69.5%	71	69.6%	29	40.3%	190	78.2%
Coffee and tea vending machine														
Yes	281	89.2%	158	85.9%	123	93.9%	191	89.7%	90	88.2%	68	94.4%	213	87.7%
No	34	10.8%	26	14.1%	8	6.1%	22	10.3%	12	11.8%	4	5.6%	30	12.3%
Snack vending machine														
Yes	65	20.6%	18	9.8%	47	35.9%	45	21.1%	20	19.6%	35	48.6%	30	12.3%
No	250	79.4%	166	90.2%	84	64.1%	168	78.9%	82	80.4%	37	51.4%	213	87.7%
Available fruit														
Yes	126	40.0%	52	28.3%	74	56.5%	82	38.5%	44	43.1%	58	80.6%	68	28.0%
No	185	58.7%	129	70.1%	56	42.7%	128	60.1%	57	55.9%	14	19.4%	171	70.4%
Don't know	4	1.3%	3	1.6%	1	0.8%	3	1.4%	1	1.0%	0	0	4	1.6%
<i>If fruit is available, is it free?*</i>														
Yes	85	67.5%	42	80.8%	43	58.1%	56	68.3%	29	65.9%	30	51.7%	55	80.9%
No	41	32.5%	10	19.2%	31	41.9%	26	31.7%	15	34.1%	28	48.3%	13	19.1%
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Available vegetables														
Yes	81	25.7%	31	16.8%	50	38.2%	47	22.1%	34	33.3%	48	66.7%	33	13.6%
No	230	73.0%	151	82.1%	79	60.3%	164	77.0%	66	64.7%	24	33.3%	206	84.8%
Don't know	4	1.3%	2	1.1%	2	1.5%	2	0.9%	2	2.0%	0	0	4	1.6%
<i>If vegetables are available, are they free?†</i>														
Yes	48	59.3%	24	77.4%	24	48.0%	29	61.7%	19	55.9%	23	47.9%	25	75.8%
No	33	40.7%	7	22.6%	26	52.0%	18	38.3%	15	44.1%	25	52.1%	8	24.2%
Don't know	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sociocultural food environment</b>														
How are lunch breaks most often spent?														
In a common break room	192	61.0%	100	54.3%	92	70.2%	138	64.8%	54	52.9%	53	73.6%	139	57.2%
Behind a desk	65	20.6%	46	25.0%	19	14.5%	44	20.7%	21	20.6%	6	8.3%	59	24.3%
Out-of-the-office	58	18.4%	38	20.7%	20	15.3%	31	14.5%	27	26.5%	13	18.1%	45	18.5%
Where is lunch most often brought from?														
Home	208	66.0%	131	71.2%	77	58.8%	142	66.7%	66	64.8%	28	38.9%	180	74.1%
Worksite cafeteria	47	14.9%	14	7.6%	33	25.2%	29	13.6%	18	17.6%	32	44.4%	15	6.2%
Purchased elsewhere	60	19.1%	39	21.2%	21	16.0%	42	19.7%	18	17.6%	12	16.7%	48	19.7%
Social norms of healthy and sustainable eating at work‡														
Mean	3.28		3.25		3.31		3.31		3.20		3.44		3.23	
SD	0.56		0.54		0.59		0.56		0.57		0.52		0.57	
Employer responsibility for employee health‡														
Mean	3.18		3.09		3.30		3.19		3.16		3.42		3.10	
SD	0.76		0.75		0.75		0.74		0.79		0.75		0.75	
<b>Economic food environment</b>														
Discounts on food or drinks														
Yes	28	8.9%	15	8.2%	13	9.9%	18	8.4%	10	9.8%	12	16.7%	16	6.6%
No	267	84.8%	157	85.3%	110	84.0%	181	85.0%	86	84.3%	54	75.0%	213	87.6%
Don't know	20	6.3%	12	6.5%	8	6.1%	14	6.6%	6	5.9%	6	8.3%	14	5.8%
Budget for lunch														
Yes	15	4.8%	7	3.8%	8	6.1%	9	4.2%	6	5.9%	5	6.9%	10	4.1%
No	287	91.1%	168	91.3%	119	90.8%	194	91.1%	93	91.2%	63	87.5%	224	92.2%
Don't know	13	4.1%	9	4.9%	4	3.1%	10	4.7%	3	2.9%	4	5.6%	9	3.7%
<b>Policy food environment</b>														
Company food policy														
Yes	26	8.3%	7	3.8%	19	14.5%	13	6.1%	13	12.7%	16	22.2%	10	4.1%
No	263	83.4%	161	87.5%	102	77.9%	180	84.5%	83	81.4%	49	68.1%	214	88.1%
Don't know	26	8.3%	16	8.7%	10	7.6%	20	9.4%	6	5.9%	7	9.7%	19	7.8%
Health promotion programmes														
Offered	59	18.7%	22	12.0%	37	28.2%	37	17.4%	22	21.6%	21	29.2%	38	15.6%
Not offered	256	81.3%	162	88.0%	94	71.8%	176	82.6%	80	78.4%	51	70.8%	205	84.4%

Table 1 Continued

	Total		< 50 employees		≥ 50 employees		Most employees work on-site		Most employees work off-site		With a worksite cafeteria		Without a worksite cafeteria	
	n 315		n 184		n 131		n 213		n 102		n 72		n 243	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Employee-initiated food initiatives														
Yes	55	17.5%	17	9.2%	38	29.0%	28	13.2%	27	26.5%	23	31.9%	32	13.2%
No	226	71.7%	149	81.0%	77	58.8%	156	73.2%	70	68.6%	39	54.2%	187	76.9%
Don't know	34	10.8%	18	9.8%	16	12.2%	29	13.6%	5	4.9%	10	13.9%	24	9.9%

\*Measured by one item only shown to respondents who indicated having fruit available (*n* 126).

†Measured by one item only shown to respondents who indicated having vegetables available (*n* 81).

‡Measured by statements indicated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree'.

Table 2 Multiple logistic regression analyses with five indicators of the physical food environment as dependent variables

	Reference category	OR	95% CI	P
Soft drink vending machine				
Number of employees	≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	2.71	1.59, 4.61	< 0.001
Location of work	Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	1.38	0.78, 2.45	0.27
Worksite cafeteria	Yes c.t. No (ref.)	4.37	2.42, 7.89	< 0.001
Coffee and tea vending machine				
Number of employees	≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	2.29	0.98, 5.36	0.06
Location of work	Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	1.35	0.63, 2.89	0.45
Worksite cafeteria	Yes c.t. No (ref.)	1.95	0.64, 5.93	0.24
Snack vending machine				
Number of employees	≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	3.95	2.08, 7.51	< 0.001
Location of work	Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	1.69	0.86, 3.32	0.13
Worksite cafeteria	Yes c.t. No (ref.)	5.38	2.83, 10.24	< 0.001
Available fruit				
Number of employees	≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	2.39	1.42, 4.03	0.001
Location of work	Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	1.16	0.66, 2.03	0.60
Worksite cafeteria	Yes c.t. No (ref.)	8.76	4.50, 17.06	< 0.001
Available vegetables*				
Number of employees	≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	1.89	1.04, 3.46	0.04
Location of work	Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	0.71	0.38, 1.32	0.28
Worksite cafeteria	Yes c.t. No (ref.)	10.29	5.49, 19.31	< 0.001

\*Four participants were excluded from the analyses because they answered don't know on the dependent variable.

†c.t. = compared to; (ref.) = reference category.

had food procurement policies (*n* 14, 19.4%). Most SMEs did not offer health promotion programmes (*n* 256, 81.3%) nor employee-initiated food initiatives (*n* 226, 71.7%). The most prevalent food initiatives that were present were initiatives regarding treats/celebrations or no-waste initiatives (both *n* 20, 6.3%). Having fifty or more employees significantly increased the likelihood of the presence of company food policies (OR = 2.82, 95% CI 1.09, 7.29), health promotion programmes (OR = 2.54, 95% CI 1.38, 4.67) and food initiatives (OR = 3.41, 95% CI 1.76, 6.60) (Table 5) compared to having less than fifty employees. In addition, the likelihood of the presence of company food policies (OR = 5.04, 95% CI 2.08, 12.20) and food initiatives (OR = 2.26, 95% CI 1.14, 4.46) was significantly higher when a worksite cafeteria was present than when no worksite cafeteria was present. Company food policies were reported to be present significantly more by employers than by employees, who more often did not know

whether policies were present. No significant difference was reported in health promotion programmes and employee-initiated food initiatives based on job position (Appendix 4).

## Discussion

This study showed that the majority of SMEs did not have a worksite cafeteria and most SMEs did not have facilities such as vending machines nor offered lunch, fruit and vegetables. At SMEs, lunch was often brought from home and lunch breaks were most often spent in a common break room. Most SMEs neither offered lunch discounts nor provided a lunch budget to their employees. Furthermore, most SMEs lacked health promotion programmes, company food policies and employee-initiated food initiatives.

**Table 3** Multiple multinomial logistic regression analyses with two indicators of the sociocultural food environment as dependent variables

Reference category	Lunch breaks spent behind a desk v. lunch spent in a common break room*			Lunch breaks spent out-of-the-office v. lunch spent in a common break room*		
	OR	95 % CI	P	OR	95 % CI	P
<b>How are lunch breaks most often spent?</b>						
Number of employees ≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	0.53	0.28, 1.00	0.049	0.54	0.28, 1.03	0.06
Location of work Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	0.67	0.36, 1.26	0.21	0.40	0.22, 0.75	0.004
Worksite cafeteria Yes c.t. No (ref.)	0.30	0.12, 0.77	0.01	0.79	0.38, 1.65	0.53
Reference category	Lunch brought from a worksite cafeteria v. lunch brought from home‡			Lunch purchased elsewhere v. lunch brought from home‡		
	OR	95 % CI	P	OR	95 % CI	P
<b>Where is lunch most often brought from?</b>						
Number of employees ≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	2.39	1.12, 5.11	0.02	0.85	0.46, 1.58	0.62
Location of work Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	1.11	0.52, 2.35	0.80	1.12	0.60, 2.11	0.72
Worksite cafeteria Yes c.t. No (ref.)	11.18	5.24, 23.86	< 0.001	1.70	0.79, 3.67	0.18

\*Reference group = employees spent lunch in a common break room.

†c.t. = compared to; (ref.) = reference category.

‡Reference group = employees bring lunch from home.

**Table 4** Linear regression analyses with two combined mean scales as dependent variables; the combined mean scale from six indicators of the sociocultural food environment and the combined mean scale from five indicators of responsibility employer

Reference category	Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficients			95 % CI for B Lower bound, upper bound
	B	Std. error	β	t	P	
<b>Social norms of healthy and sustainable eating at work*</b>						
Number of employees ≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.30	0.77	-0.11, 0.15
Location of work Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	0.14	0.07	0.12	2.11	0.04	0.01, 0.28
Worksite cafeteria Yes c.t. No (ref.)	0.23	0.08	0.17	2.97	0.003	0.08, 0.38
<b>Employer responsibility for employee health*</b>						
Number of employees ≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	0.16	0.09	0.11	1.81	0.07	-0.01, 0.34
Location of work Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	0.07	0.09	0.05	0.82	0.41	-0.10, 0.25
Worksite cafeteria Yes c.t. No (ref.)	0.27	0.11	0.15	2.61	0.01	0.07, 0.48

\*Measured by statements indicated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree'.

†c.t. = compared to; (ref.) = reference category.

Additionally, company characteristics were significantly associated with food environment influences of SMEs.

Our findings show a stronger social norm of healthy and sustainable eating at work when employees work on-site and a worksite cafeteria is present compared to when no worksite cafeteria is present and employees work mostly off-site. As suggested by Escoffery and colleagues, this can be attributed to the dependency on external food outlets in proximities of SMEs (e.g. supermarkets and bakeries) or on-the-go options (e.g. petrol stations and restaurants), if employees do not have a worksite cafeteria or work off-site and do not bring their lunch from home<sup>(28)</sup>. Such outlets predominantly offer less healthy food options<sup>(45)</sup>, and the reduced proximity to healthy food options can cause employees during working hours, to perceive unhealthy food consumption as common and appropriate<sup>(41)</sup> and thus shape unhealthier social norms<sup>(41)</sup>.

Our study showed that SMEs with fewer employees were less likely to have health promotion programmes, company food policies and employee-initiated food initiatives compared to their larger counterparts. This is in line with a systematic review by McCoy et al.<sup>(29)</sup>, finding that fewer small businesses adopt health promotion programmes compared to larger businesses. Small businesses may face barriers such as costs, lack of employee interest, a lack of management support and expertise that hinder the implementation of health promotion programmes. Also, managers' fear of 'paternalistic' image and avoiding stigmatising individuals have been observed as reasons that hindered the implementation of health promotion programmes in smaller businesses<sup>(29)</sup>. These findings may indicate that healthy lifestyles (e.g. eating behaviours) are more often supported by larger than smaller SMEs. However, in our study, we observed that

**Table 5** Multiple logistic regression analyses with two indicators of the economic food environment as dependent variables and three indicators of the policy food environment as dependent variables

	Reference category	OR	95 % CI	P
<b>Economic food environment</b>				
<b>Discounts on food and drink*</b>				
Number of employees	≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	0.93	0.41, 2.13	0.86
Location of work	Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	0.99	0.43, 2.28	0.98
Worksite cafeteria	Yes c.t. No (ref.)	3.02	1.29, 7.08	0.01
<b>Budget for lunch‡</b>				
Number of employees	≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	1.42	0.48, 4.21	0.53
Location of work	Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	0.78	0.27, 2.28	0.65
Worksite cafeteria	Yes c.t. No (ref.)	1.55	0.49, 4.95	0.46
<b>Policy food environment</b>				
<b>Company food policy§</b>				
Number of employees	≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	2.82	1.09, 7.29	0.03
Location of work	Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	0.58	0.25, 1.38	0.22
Worksite cafeteria	Yes c.t. No (ref.)	5.04	2.08, 12.20	< 0.001
<b>Health promotion programmes</b>				
Number of employees	≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	2.54	1.38, 4.67	0.003
Location of work	Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	0.89	0.48, 1.64	0.71
Worksite cafeteria	Yes c.t. No (ref.)	1.66	0.87, 3.18	0.13
<b>Food initiatives  </b>				
Number of employees	≥ 50 c.t. < 50 (ref.)†	3.41	1.76, 6.60	< 0.001
Location of work	Mostly on-site c.t. Mostly off-site (ref.)	0.57	0.30, 1.08	0.09
Worksite cafeteria	Yes c.t. No (ref.)	2.26	1.14, 4.46	0.02

\*Twenty participants were excluded from the analyses because they answered don't know on the dependent variable.

†c.t. = compared to; (ref.) = reference category.

‡Thirteen participants were excluded from the analyses because they answered don't know on the dependent variable.

§Twenty-six participants were excluded from the analyses because they answered don't know on the dependent variable.

||Thirty-four participants were excluded from the analyses because they answered don't know on the dependent variable.

required employer responsibility for employee health was similar among all SME sizes. This might raise the issue of environmental injustice at the work floor, which defines the lack of equal access to a healthy environment in which to live, learn and work<sup>(46)</sup>. This is further accentuated by the evident disparity in other health-promoting features of the workplace food environment (e.g. the lack of availability of fruits and vegetables).

From the results, it is notable that the location of work only impacted features of the sociocultural food environment (social norms and where lunch was spent), whereas no considerable differences in the physical, economic or policy food environment were observed between SMEs where employees primarily worked on-site *v.* off-site. Based on findings of Seward *et al.*<sup>(32)</sup>, that showed that employees working off-site generally have access to fewer health promotion programmes compared to those working on-site, it could be hypothesised that on-site work environments prioritise employee health more substantially than off-site work environments and would therefore have more policies and initiatives available. However, we did not confirm this hypothesis with this study. It should however be noted that the adoption of food environment supportive policies or economic incentives was relatively low in the entire included sample of SMEs.

Our study highlighted the different work food environment perceptions between employers and employees. Employers were found to be better aware of the available

workplace amenities, as indicated by their higher reported availability of company food policies and discounts compared to employees. However, employers rated stronger social norms in favour of healthy and sustainable eating at work compared to employees and thought employees spent lunch breaks more frequently outside. This may suggest that employers are not necessarily aware of the practices at the actual work floor. Yet, it should be acknowledged that employers and employees participating in this study do not all represent the same company, and the majority of participants comprised employees. Nevertheless, these observations require additional understanding of the gap between employers and employees, not just in terms of awareness of organisational policies but also in the day-to-day dynamics that shape the workplace experience.

Whilst conducting our research, Castro and colleagues<sup>(14)</sup> developed a more specific model for the organisational food environment. This model does reflect that the infrastructure of an organisation can allow employees to take food from home and thus shape the food environment when no food is commercially offered, which is a valuable addition for SMEs. However, the sociocultural food environment as observed in our study, where social norms of healthy and sustainable eating also play a role in the SME food environment, is currently not integrated in this model by Castro. Therefore, our findings contribute to expanding Castro's conceptualisation of the



organisational food environment by proposing the inclusion of the sociocultural food environment in this model.

Since the survey was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic in the Netherlands, the consequential working from home may have influenced the workplace food environment and eating practices. Although the results show that only a minority (about 16%) of the participants reported changes in eating facilities and practices at work, it is essential to acknowledge this when interpreting the results. Moreover, it is arguable that trends such as increased remote work may have lasting effects on the workplace food environment<sup>(47)</sup>. However, to gain a deeper understanding, further research is needed to explore the lasting impact of COVID-19 and remote work on the workplace food environment.

While this study has noteworthy strengths, such as its relatively large study sample and variety of businesses included, it is not without its limitations. Given the cross-sectional nature of the data, no causal relationships can be identified. All outcome measures were self-reported which may have caused recall bias. However, given that the study primarily revolved around the presence of items such as policies and snack machines, rather than behavioural aspects, the data should remain reliable. Finally, in the study, we recruited 'employees and employers of SMEs who were (co)responsible for the 'food and drink' within their company. This may have resulted in an underrepresentation of SMEs that offer no food or drinks at all. However, since most companies have coffee and tea available, participants solely responsible for coffee procurement were included, and coffee services are commonly provided in the Netherlands, even if food policy or catering is absent<sup>(48)</sup>.

Future research should focus on which existing strategies in the food environments in Dutch SMEs are most effective in addressing eating practices and feasible to implement in the different SME company types. Additionally, future research should explore the lasting impact of COVID-19 and remote work on the workplace food environment.

### **Conclusion**

Given the fact that more than 99% of all companies in the Netherlands and the EU are classified as SMEs, creating food environments in SMEs that stimulate healthy and sustainable eating behaviour is crucial. In SMEs, an overall comprehensive picture of the food environment points to its limited active encouragement of healthy food choices, particularly so in small SMEs without a worksite cafeteria. Additionally, the location of work was only found to influence features of the sociocultural food environment and made no significant difference to the physical, economic or policy food environment. Therefore, future research should focus on which existing strategies in the food environments in Dutch SMEs are most effective in addressing eating

practices and feasible to implement in the different SME company types.

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors wish to thank Flycatcher for their assistance with recruitment. Additionally, we want to thank the participants for their participation.

### **Financial support**

The research described in this paper was financially supported by Regio Deal Foodvalley (grant no. 162135). This is a collaboration between the Dutch government, the provinces of Utrecht and Gelderland, eight local municipalities, educational and knowledge institutions, and entrepreneurs within this region<sup>(49)</sup>. Regio Deal Foodvalley had no role in the design, analysis or writing of this article.

### **Conflict of interest**

None for all authors (L.G., E.D.V., F.R. and M.P.)

### **Authorship**

L.G., E.D.V., F.R. and M.P. designed the study. L.G. oversaw the data collection and led the data analysis with contributions from E.D.V., F.R., and M.P. L.G., E.D.V., F.R., and M.P. assisted in data interpretation. L.G. wrote the manuscript, and all authors provided feedback and approved the final manuscript.

### **Ethics of human subject participation**

This study was conducted according to the guidelines laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki, and all procedures involving research study participants were approved by the Social Sciences Ethics Committee (SEC) of Wageningen University. Written informed consent was obtained from all the participants. Additionally, participation was anonymous and non-invasive.

### **Supplementary material**

For supplementary material accompanying this paper visit <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980024000946>



## References

1. Willet W, Rockström J, Loken B *et al.* (2019) Food in the Anthropocene: the EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *Lancet* **393**, 447–492.
2. Brouwer ID, McDermott J & Ruben R (2020) Food systems everywhere: improving relevance in practice. *Glob Food Sec* **26**, 100398.
3. Brink E, Van Rossum C, Postma-Smeets A *et al.* (2019) Development of healthy and sustainable food-based dietary guidelines for the Netherlands. *Public Health Nutr* **22**, 2419–2435.
4. Swinburn B, Egger G & Raza F (1999) Dissecting obesogenic environments: the development and application of a framework for identifying and prioritizing environmental interventions for obesity. *Prev Med (Baltim)* (Internet) **29**, 563–570. <http://www.idealibrary.comon>
5. Carins J, Pang B, Willmott T *et al.* (2021) Creating supportive eating places: a systematic review of food service initiatives. *Health Promot Int* (Internet) **36**, 1368–1392. <https://academic.oup.com/heapro/advance-article/doi/10.1093/heapro/daaa155/6128458>
6. OECD (2022) OECD Employment Outlook 2022: Building Back More Inclusive Labour Markets (Internet). OECD; 2022 Sep. (OECD Employment Outlook). [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/employment/oecd-employment-outlook-2022\\_1bb305a6-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/employment/oecd-employment-outlook-2022_1bb305a6-en) (accessed 8 November 2022).
7. Clohessy S, Walasek L & Meyer C (2019) Factors influencing employees' eating behaviours in the office-based workplace: a systematic review. *Obes Rev* (Internet) **20**, 1771–1780. <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.ezproxy.library.wur.nl/doi/full/10.1111/obr.12920>
8. Corvo P, Fontefrancesco MF & Matacena R (2020) Eating at work: the role of the lunch-break and canteens for wellbeing at work in Europe. *Soc Indic Res* (Internet) **150**, 1043–1076. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11205-020-02353-4>
9. Lassen A, Hansen KS & Trolle E (2007) Comparison of buffet and à la carte serving at worksite canteens on nutrient intake and fruit and vegetable consumption. *Public Health Nutr* **10**, 292–297.
10. Oldenburg B, Sallis JF, Harris D *et al.* (2002) Checklist of Health Promotion Environments at Worksites (CHEW): development and measurement characteristics. *Am J Health Promot* **16**, 288–299.
11. McDonald CM, Karamlou T, Wengle JG *et al.* (2006) Nutrition and exercise environment available to outpatients, visitors, and staff in children's hospitals in Canada and the United States. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* **160**, 900–905.
12. Shimotsu ST, French SA, Gerlach AF *et al.* (2007) Worksite environment physical activity and healthy food choices: measurement of the worksite food and physical activity environment at four metropolitan bus garages. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* (Internet) **4**, 1–8. <http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/4/1/17>
13. Swinburn B, Friel S, Hawkes C *et al.* (2013) INFORMAS (International Network for Food and Obesity/non-communicable diseases Research, Monitoring and Action Support): overview and key principles. *Obes Rev* **14**, 1–12.
14. de Castro IRR & Canella DS (2022) Organizational food environments: advancing their conceptual model. *Foods* **11**, 993.
15. Schliemann D, McKinley M & Woodside JV (2019) The impact of a policy-based multicomponent nutrition pilot intervention on young adult employee's diet and health outcomes. *Am J Health Promot* **33**, 342–357.
16. Alinia S, Lassen AD, Krogholm KS *et al.* (2011) A workplace feasibility study of the effect of a minimal fruit intervention on fruit intake. *Public Health Nutr* **14**, 1382–1387.
17. Naicker A, Shrestha A, Joshi C *et al.* (2021) Workplace cafeteria and other multicomponent interventions to promote healthy eating among adults: a systematic review. *Prev Med Rep* **22**, 101333.
18. Hendren S & Logomarsino J (2017) Impact of worksite cafeteria interventions on fruit and vegetable consumption in adults: a systematic review. *Int J Workplace Health Manag* (Internet) **10**, 134–152. [www.emeraldinsight.com/1753-8351.htm](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/1753-8351.htm)
19. Reynolds JP, Ventsel M, Kosite D *et al.* (2021) Impact of decreasing the proportion of higher energy foods and reducing portion sizes on food purchased in worksite cafeterias: a stepped-wedge randomised controlled trial. *PLoS Med* (Internet) **18**, e1003743. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003743>
20. Vermeer WM, Steenhuis IHM, Leeuwis FH *et al.* (2011) Small portion sizes in worksite cafeterias: do they help consumers to reduce their food intake?. *Int J Obes* **35**, 1200–1207. <https://www.nature.com/articles/ijo2010271>
21. Meeusen REH, van der Voorn B & Berk KA (2023) Nudging strategies to improve food choices of healthcare workers in the workplace cafeteria: a pragmatic field study. *Clin Nutr ESPEN* **53**, 126–133.
22. Velema E, Vyth EL, Hoekstra T *et al.* (2018) Nudging and social marketing techniques encourage employees to make healthier food choices: a randomized controlled trial in 30 worksite cafeterias in the Netherlands. *Am J Clin Nutr* **107**, 236–246.
23. European Commission SME Definition (n.d.) (Internet). [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/sme-definition\\_nl](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/sme-definition_nl) (accessed 18 February 2022).
24. European Commission (2023) Entrepreneurship and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 5]. Available from: [https://single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/smes\\_en](https://single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/smes_en)
25. CBS (2021) Dutch small and medium-sized enterprises compared with Europe (Internet). <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/longread/diversen/2021/het-nederlandse-midden-enkleinbedrijf-europees-vergeleken?onpage=true> (accessed 21 June 2023).
26. van Werkhoven S (2017). Worksite Cafeteria: are they going to disappear? (Internet). <https://www.missethoreca.nl/catering/artikel/2017/03/bedrijfsrestaurant-gaat-het-verdwijnen-101261867> (accessed 22 November 2021).
27. Onufrak SJ, Watson KB, Kimmons J *et al.* (2018) Worksite food and physical activity environments and wellness supports reported by employed adults in the United States, 2013. *Am J Health Promot* **32**, 96–105.
28. Escoffery C, Kegler MC, Alcantara I *et al.* (2011) A qualitative examination of the role of small, rural worksites in obesity prevention. *Prev Chronic Dis* (Internet) **8**, A75. [http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2011/jul/10\\_0185.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/pcd/issues/2011/jul/10_0185.htm)
29. McCoy K, Stinson K, Scott K *et al.* (2014) Health promotion in small business: a systematic review of factors influencing adoption and effectiveness of worksite wellness programs. *J Occup Environ Med* (Internet) **56**, 579.
30. CBS (2018) The SME does not exist (Internet). <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/maatwerk/2018/26/het-mkb-bestaat-niet> (accessed 15 December 2020).
31. Lemke MK, Houghtaling B, Winkler MR *et al.* (2023) Rethinking efforts to improve dietary patterns among long-haul truck drivers: transforming truck stop retail food environments through upstream change. *Am J Health Promot* **37**, 755–759.
32. Seward MW, Goldman RE, Linakis SK *et al.* (2019) Showers, culture, and conflict resolution a qualitative study of employees' perceptions of workplace wellness opportunities. *J Occup Environ Med* **61**, 829–835.
33. Hulsegge G, de Vroome EMM & Teeuwen PJ (2022) Employers Labour Survey 2021 - Results at glance



- (Internet). Leiden. [www.monitorarbeid.tno.nl](http://www.monitorarbeid.tno.nl) (accessed 12 January 2024).
34. CBS Statline (2023) SME - Companies; company size and legal form (Internet). <https://mkbstatline.cbs.nl/#/MKB/nl/dataset/48034NED/table?ts=1702561755084> (accessed 12 January 2024).
  35. Glanz K, Sallis JF, Saelens BE *et al.* (2005) Healthy nutrition environments: concepts and measures. *Am J Health Promot* **19**, 330–333.
  36. Almeida LFF, Novaes TG, Pessoa MC *et al.* (2021) Socioeconomic disparities in the community food environment of a medium-sized city of Brazil. *J Am Coll Nutr* **40**, 253–260.
  37. Kraa KO, de Vroome EMM, van der Zee FA *et al.* (2019) Employers Labour Survey 2019 - Methodological report (Internet). <https://www.monitorarbeid.tno.nl/nl-nl/onderzoeken/wea/> (accessed 25 March 2021).
  38. Green SH & Glanz K (2015) Development of the perceived nutrition environment measures survey. *Am J Prev Med* **49**, 50–61.
  39. The Netherlands Nutrition Centre (n.d.) Checklist for the Food Environments Guidelines (Internet). <https://www.voedingscentrum.nl/professionals/gezonde-eetomgeving/de-richtlijn-gezondere-eetomgevingen.aspx> (accessed 22 September 2022).
  40. Van Rongen S, Poelman MP, Thornton L *et al.* (2020) Neighbourhood fast food exposure and consumption: the mediating role of neighbourhood social norms. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* (Internet) **17**, 1–9. <https://ijbnpa.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12966-020-00969-w>
  41. The Netherlands Nutrition Centre. (n.d.) Healthy and sustainable eating with the Wheel of Five [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jan 12]. Available from: <https://www.voedingscentrum.nl/nl/gezond-eten-met-de-schijf-van-vijf.aspx>
  42. Sallis JF & Glanz K (2009) Physical activity and food environments: solutions to the obesity epidemic. *Milbank Q* **87**, 123–154.
  43. Saito J, Odawara M, Takahashi H *et al.* (2022) Barriers and facilitative factors in the implementation of workplace health promotion activities in small and medium-sized enterprises: a qualitative study. *Implement Sci Commun* **3**, 23.
  44. McCleary K, Goetzel RZ, Roemer EC *et al.* (2017) Employer and employee opinions about workplace health promotion (Wellness) programs: results of the 2015 Harris Poll Nielsen survey. *J Occup Environ Med* **59**, 256–263.
  45. Poelman MP, Dijkstra SC, Djojosoeparto SK *et al.* (2021) Monitoring the healthiness of the offer and promotions of supermarkets and out-of-home chains: Insight into the current state of affairs and recommendations for setting up a national monitor (Internet). <https://research.wur.nl/en/publications/27431082-3616-48e4-b7a5-060a18d94463> (accessed 18 September 2023).
  46. United States Environmental Protection Agency Environmental Justice (2024) Environmental Justice. (Internet). <https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice> (accessed 17 August 2023).
  47. de Haas M, Hamersma M & Faber R (2022) Has COVID led to structurally different travel behavior? (Internet). Den Haag. <https://www.kimnet.nl/publicaties/publicaties/2022/07/26/heeft-covid-geleid-tot-structureel-ander-reisgedrag> (accessed 21 January 2024).
  48. Tramper A & de Jongh J (2018) National coffee and tea survey (Internet). <https://files.enflow.nl/51f20288-d7e0-4002-80ea-e1015aee96e5/7a6d8056-600e-4ff7-9f5b-3f346432563d/mediacenter/onderzoeken/koffiethetee-nationaal-koffieentheeteonderzoek2018-rapport-def.pdf> (accessed 16 January 2024).
  49. Regio Deal Foodvalley. (n.d.). *Regio Deal Foodvalley; About us*. Retrieved September 20, 2022, from <https://www.regiofoodvalley.nl/over-ons>