SPRING WHITE PAPER

Bridging the Sustainable Packaging Perception Gap

Communicating Science to Consumers, Policymakers, and Industry

By Robert Lilienfeld, Executive Director, SPRING
Sustainable Packaging Research, Information, and Networking Group | www.springpack.net

1. Speaking of Science…

Life Cycle Assessments (LCAs) are the primary scientific tool used to measure the environmental impact of materials used in packaging. Methodology and measurement have never been more rigorous. Methodologies are maturing, data sets are expanding, and computational tools make it possible to evaluate packaging decisions across dozens of environmental dimensions with genuine precision.

Yet, packaging policy is still driven largely by emotion, misinformation, and material-specific bias. Plastic is demonized. Paper is presumed virtuous. (Although growing scrutiny of chemical emissions from pulp and paper manufacturing may complicate this perception.)

Reusable and recyclable materials and containers are generally assumed to be superior: at times considered better than source reduction, which by its nature eliminates the use of materials and energy, significantly reducing waste of all types.

This gap between what LCAs demonstrate and what consumers believe, policymakers enact, and industry accepts is not a data problem. ***It is a communication and cognition problem***. The science exists. The tools exist.

What is missing is a systematic understanding of how different audiences process information; and a practical framework for translating LCA findings into messages that are simultaneously scientifically defensible, behaviorally effective, and politically durable.

2. Three Audiences, Three Cognitive Profiles

The first principle of effective science communication is that there is no universal audience. A technically rigorous LCA summary that resonates with a packaging engineer will fail with a policymaker under constituent pressure and will be completely inaccessible to a consumer choosing a product in seven seconds at the grocery shelf. Before communicating any LCA finding you must understand who you are talking to and how they process information.

Dimension	Consumers	Policymakers	Industry
Decision speed	Seconds to minutes	Days to months	Weeks to years
Primary driver	Emotion, identity, habit	Political viability, defensibility	Risk, cost, competitive position
Trust source	Peers, community, brands	Constituents, advocacy groups, media	Technical experts, regulators, data
Relationship to data	Avoidant unless simplified	Uses data to justify prior position	Engages directly but selectively
Key fear	Being deceived or judged	Making an unpopular decision	Disruption to existing investments
What moves them	Concrete outcomes, social norms	Peer jurisdictions, constituency benefit	Regulatory certainty, market differentiation

Understanding these profiles does not mean manipulating audiences. It means meeting people where they live: The same ethical obligation that any science communicator carries when translating complex findings for non-specialist readers.

3. The Relevant Social Psychology: A Practical Toolkit

Six evidence-based frameworks from social psychology are particularly useful for LCA communicators. Each is explained in plain language, with direct application to packaging science.

Mental Models

People navigate complexity by building simplified internal maps of how the world works. In packaging, the dominant mental model is ‘natural = good, synthetic = bad.’ LCAs routinely contradict this (e.g., according to a 2018 Danish Environmental Protection Agency study, a cotton tote bag must be used 149 times to offset its production footprint compared to a single-use plastic bag). However, simply presenting this data fails because it collides with an entrenched model.

The solution is not to try to eliminate mental models (which is impossible), but to offer better ones. A more accurate shortcut: 'The lightest package that fully protects the product is usually the most sustainable.' This is directionally correct, accessible, and consistent with LCA evidence.

Motivated Reasoning and Cultural Cognition

Professor Dan M. Kahan's research at Yale demonstrates that people evaluate scientific evidence through the lens of their cultural identity. Findings that threaten group values are rejected; findings that confirm them are accepted, regardless of data quality. This explains why identical LCA results can be embraced by one stakeholder and dismissed by another.

The practical implication is that ***the source of LCA communication often matters more than its content***. A plastics recycling finding delivered by an environmental organization will land differently than the same finding delivered by a municipal waste authority or a plastics trade organization, even if the underlying data is identical. For example, the public is more likely to believe a Greenpeace report than a Flexible Packaging Association report, even if the studies and results are identical.

The Affect Heuristic

Packaging materials carry strong emotional associations built over decades of marketing, media coverage, and advocacy. When something feels dangerous, data showing it is safe is discounted. When something feels virtuous, data showing it is harmful is resisted.

LCA communicators must work with these emotional valences, not against them. Instead, reframe findings in terms of outcomes audiences care about: water savings, community health, local economic benefit. The same LCA result can be presented as a loss or a gain, and the frame determines reception.

Construal Level Theory

People think about abstract, distant things differently than concrete, near ones. A global carbon figure for 2050 activates abstract, low-motivation thinking. The equivalent in gallons of water saved in your county this year activates concrete, high-motivation thinking. LCAs, by nature, produce global, multi-decade, aggregate figures. Communicators must actively translate these into local, near-term, tangible equivalents.

Social Proof and Norm Signaling

Behavior is powerfully shaped by what people believe others like them are doing. If consumers believe that 'people like me' make science-informed packaging choices, they are more likely to do so. If policymakers believe peer jurisdictions have successfully adopted LCA-based standards, adoption becomes politically safer. ***LCA-informed standards and policies succeed or fail partly on whether they become socially normative, which is a behavioral challenge as much as a science one.***

Choice Architecture

How choices are presented shapes which choices are made, independent of the information provided. LCA communicators should never present a finding as a simple verdict ('material X is better'). Trade-offs should be made visible and agency preserved: 'This material has a lower carbon footprint, but higher water use in water-stressed regions. Here is how to think about that for your specific situation.' ***Audiences that retain decision authority are more likely to accept the science underlying the choice.***

4. Translation Principles

The following principles apply regardless of the audience. They represent the minimum standards for communicating LCA findings in a way that is both scientifically honest and behaviorally effective.

- **Be relevant to your audiences**. Personal relevancy is the most important factor governing reader interest, involvement and desire to act. Relevancy is generally based on closeness in terms of time, physical distance, danger involved, and impact on family and friends.

- **Start with context, not content.** People use emotional cues to enter a relationship. Then they use facts to support their interest, decision making process, and actions.

- **Lead with outcomes, not methodology.** No audience except specialists cares how an LCA was conducted. Every audience cares what it means for something they value.

- **One headline per communication.** Cognitive overload is the enemy of uptake. The most important finding should be the only one in the headline. Supporting evidence belongs in the body or appendix.

- **Acknowledge trade-offs explicitly.** Intellectual honesty is your credibility asset. An LCA communicator who acknowledges what the data does not cover is trusted more than one who overstates certainty.

- **Match the time horizon to the audience's decision cycle.** Consumers act in the present. Policymakers think in election cycles. Industry plans in investment cycles. Align your time horizon accordingly.

- **Choose messengers, not just messages.** Who delivers the finding is as important as what the finding says. Map trusted voices for each audience before designing the communication.

- **Make the local case.** Global averages are accurate but ineffective. Where possible, translate LCA outputs into regional or local equivalents that connect to the audience's lived experience.

5. The LCA Communication Checklist

Use this tool before communicating any LCA-based finding to any audience. It is not a substitute for scientific rigor, since it assumes the underlying LCA is sound. It is a pre-flight check for the communication itself.

Question to Ask Before Communicating	Principles	Strategies	Tactics
What prior belief or heuristic is my audience likely to bring to this?	Mental models	Offer a better shortcut, not a lecture. ('Less weight = less waste' may be truer than 'paper = good')	Identify the industry or political assumption being protected and address it directly.
Does this finding conflict with the audience's group identity or cultural values?	Motivated reasoning / Cultural cognition	Use a trusted community messenger, not a faceless study. Source matters as much as data.	Frame findings in terms of shared goals (economic competitiveness, regulatory certainty) not just environmental outcomes.
How does this topic make people feel? Is the emotional valence working for or against the science?	Affect heuristic	Reframe away from feared materials toward desired outcomes: water savings, local jobs, cleaner communities.	Acknowledge the emotional weight of disruption; then provide a credible path forward.
Is the impact I'm describing abstract and distant, or concrete and near?	Construal level theory	Translate global metrics into local equivalents: gallons of water saved, truckloads of waste avoided.	Use near-term regulatory and competitive scenarios rather than 2050 climate targets.
Can I demonstrate that 'people like my audience' already accept this science?	Social proof / norm signaling	Cite adoption by recognizable brands or communities the audience trusts.	Reference peer companies or jurisdictions that have acted on this LCA evidence.
Is my framing of choices fair, or does it create a false binary?	Choice architecture	Show the trade-off honestly: 'This material scores better on carbon but worse on water use in your region.'	Present scenarios, not verdicts. Decision-makers accept science better when they retain agency.
Am I burying the lead in technical language or an executive summary?	Cognitive load / attention	One headline finding per communication. Put the human outcome first, the data second.	Lead with the policy or business implication, then provide the LCA evidence in an appendix.
Does this communication invite dialogue or deliver a verdict?	Trust and credibility	Use questions and invitations, not declarations. 'Here's what the science shows. What do you think?”	Acknowledge what the LCA does not cover. Intellectual honesty builds more credibility than overreach.

Scoring and Interpretation

Work through each question for your specific communication. For any row where you cannot give a clear answer, treat it as a gap to close before publishing or presenting. A well-prepared LCA communication should be able to answer every question — differently for each audience — before it goes out.

You do not need to use all eight principles in every communication. A consumer-facing label might activate only two or three. A policymaker briefing might require five. The checklist helps you identify which principles are load-bearing for your specific situation.

6. What We Still Need to Know

While social psychology has much to offer LCA communication, the direct application of these frameworks to packaging science is understudied. Here are some areas of study that can significantly increase our understanding of how best to communicate scientific information to each of our three audiences of consumers, policymakers, and industry:

- Which mental model substitutions are most durable across consumer segments and geographies?
- How does the Affect heuristic around specific packaging materials vary by generation, income level, and cultural context?
- What trusted messenger archetypes exist for each of the three audiences, and how do they differ by region and political environment?
- How can LCA findings be embedded in product labeling that is simultaneously accurate, legally defensible, and behaviorally effective?
- What communication formats (narrative, data visualization, comparison, scenario) produce the most durable understanding of trade-offs among non-specialist audiences?

7. A Final Thought

The sustainable packaging community does not lack scientific evidence. ***It lacks a shared discipline for communicating that evidence in ways that match how people actually think, decide, and act***. The frameworks in this paper are not theoretical luxuries. They are practical necessities for anyone who wants LCA findings to influence real-world outcomes rather than gather dust in technical reports or belittled in social media platforms.

The question is not whether the science is good enough. It is. The question is whether we are willing to communicate it with the same rigor we use to produce it: Meeting each audience where it lives, choosing the right messengers, and framing trade-offs with the intellectual honesty that builds lasting credibility, interest, and motivation to act.

About SPRING

SPRING (Sustainable Packaging Research, Information, and Networking Group) is a virtual think tank founded and led by Bob Lilienfeld. Our mission is to help policymakers, business leaders, the media, and thought leaders make effective, science-based decisions about the creation, use, and regeneration of packaging. SPRING operates on principles of sound science, material neutrality, transparency, and respect. We accept no advertising or donations. Our Subject Matter Experts contribute on a pro bono basis.

SPRING welcomes collaboration with researchers, communicators, and practitioners who are working on these questions. If you have relevant data, expertise, or a project in progress, we would like to hear from you. Join us at www.springpack.net and www.linkedin.com/in/boblilienfeld.