

Sustainable Packaging and Green Consumer Behavior: A Life Cycle and Strategic Analysis for Environmental and Economic Resilience

¹ Levent Yildiz

¹ Department of Environmental Management, University of Warsaw, Poland

Received: 16th Dec 2025 | Received Revised Version: 26th Dec 2025 | Accepted: 07th Jan 2026 | Published: 19th Jan 2026

Volume 02 Issue 01 2026 | Crossref DOI: 10.64917/ajeti/V02I01-003

Abstract

The contemporary global market is increasingly shaped by environmental concerns, particularly in relation to packaging materials, consumer purchasing behavior, and sustainability strategies. The escalation of plastic consumption and the associated environmental degradation has underscored the necessity for integrated solutions that balance economic performance with ecological responsibility. This study explores the intersection of sustainable packaging design, green consumer behavior, and circular economy principles, emphasizing the implications of polyethylene terephthalate (PET) usage, recycling mechanisms, and alternative biodegradable materials. A comprehensive review of theoretical frameworks, life cycle assessments (LCA), and empirical studies is undertaken to analyze drivers, barriers, and opportunities for sustainable packaging adoption in both developed and developing contexts. Furthermore, the role of consumer awareness, green capabilities, and organizational strategy in promoting environmentally responsible behaviors is critically examined. Findings suggest that multi-dimensional approaches encompassing technological innovation, policy enforcement, and consumer engagement are essential for achieving triple bottom line sustainability outcomes. The study identifies gaps in current research, particularly concerning the integration of advanced recycling technologies with consumer behavioral models, offering avenues for future investigation. Overall, this research provides an exhaustive academic account of sustainable packaging practices, highlighting the implications for environmental policy, business strategy, and consumer engagement.

Keywords: Sustainable packaging, green consumer behavior, life cycle assessment, circular economy, polyethylene terephthalate, environmental sustainability, recycling strategies.

© 2026 Levent Yildiz. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). The authors retain copyright and allow others to share, adapt, or redistribute the work with proper attribution.

Cite This Article: Levent Yildiz. 2026. Sustainable Packaging and Green Consumer Behavior: A Life Cycle and Strategic Analysis for Environmental and Economic Resilience. American Journal of Engineering and Technology Innovations 2, 01, 12-16. <https://doi.org/10.64917/ajeti/V02I01-003>

1. Introduction

Global industrialization and urbanization have precipitated an unprecedented increase in plastic production and usage, particularly in the packaging sector. The environmental repercussions of plastic waste are extensive, ranging from soil contamination and waterway pollution to microplastic ingestion by humans and wildlife (Liu et al., 2019; Wojnowska-Baryla et al., 2022). Polyethylene terephthalate (PET) remains one of the most widely utilized materials for

beverage and food packaging due to its light weight, durability, and transparency. However, the environmental cost associated with PET production, disposal, and degradation has triggered a growing body of literature advocating for sustainable packaging solutions, including both material innovation and life cycle optimization (Raj et al., 2023; Guillard et al., 2018).

The concept of sustainability in packaging extends beyond mere material substitution, encompassing economic viability, environmental impact mitigation, and social

acceptance. Sustainable packaging aims to reduce carbon footprints, conserve resources, and integrate into circular economy models that emphasize material recovery and reuse (Boutros et al., 2021; Paping et al., 2014). Concurrently, green consumer behavior has emerged as a critical determinant in the adoption of eco-friendly products and packaging, driven by factors such as environmental awareness, social norms, perceived product quality, and corporate credibility (Abdullah-Al-Swidi & Saleh, 2021; Samaraweera et al., 2021).

Despite a growing corpus of research on green purchasing behavior and sustainable packaging, notable gaps persist. Specifically, the interplay between life cycle environmental assessments, recycling technologies, and consumer decision-making remains underexplored, particularly in developing countries where infrastructure, policy enforcement, and consumer literacy may constrain sustainability efforts (Kioko, 2023; Khan, 2023). Moreover, the alignment of sustainable packaging strategies with organizational performance metrics, such as market share, revenue growth, and financial accountability, warrants further scrutiny (Khantimirov, 2017; Agyapong & Attram, 2019).

This study addresses these gaps by conducting a comprehensive analysis of sustainable packaging within a framework that integrates green consumer behavior, life cycle assessment, and strategic business performance. By synthesizing empirical evidence, theoretical frameworks, and life cycle studies, this research aims to elucidate the mechanisms through which packaging sustainability can be operationalized to achieve environmental, social, and economic objectives. The study also critically evaluates the role of emerging recycling technologies, biodegradability innovations, and consumer engagement strategies in fostering a resilient circular economy.

2. Methodology

This research employs a qualitative and integrative methodology grounded in literature synthesis, comparative life cycle assessment (LCA) analysis, and theoretical evaluation of consumer behavior models. Data sources include peer-reviewed journal articles, doctoral dissertations, and authoritative environmental reports spanning the fields of sustainability, packaging science, consumer psychology, and corporate strategy. The approach emphasizes an exhaustive examination of key variables impacting sustainable packaging adoption and green consumer behavior.

The life cycle assessment framework is used to evaluate environmental impacts associated with PET, linear low-density polyethylene (LLDPE), high-density polyethylene (HDPE), and polylactic acid (PLA) bottles. ISO 14040 and ISO 14044 standards guide the assessment methodology, ensuring consistency and reliability in evaluating the environmental implications of material production, use, and end-of-life scenarios (PN-EN ISO 14040:2009; PN-EN ISO 14044:2009). Factors analyzed include energy consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, leaching of chemical additives, biodegradation rates, and recycling efficiency (Chairat & Gheewala, 2023; Elamri et al., 2017; Ragaert et al., 2017).

In parallel, the study synthesizes findings from consumer behavior research to understand determinants of green purchasing. Constructs such as environmental awareness, green capabilities, and perceived quality are integrated into a conceptual model to examine the extent to which these factors influence consumer willingness to pay for sustainable packaging (Abdullah-Al-Swidi & Saleh, 2021; Khan, 2023; Samaraweera et al., 2021). Advanced analytics in retail and machine learning applications are reviewed to identify opportunities for targeted consumer engagement and purchase behavior prediction (Kliestik et al., 2022; Nica et al., 2022).

The methodological approach emphasizes a descriptive and critical analysis rather than numerical simulation or experimentation. Each stage of the LCA and consumer behavior synthesis is articulated in detailed narrative form, incorporating cross-contextual comparisons between developed and developing countries, policy environments, and technological adoption rates. This qualitative emphasis allows for a nuanced understanding of theoretical and practical implications, particularly where quantitative data may be scarce or context-specific.

3. Results

The analysis of sustainable packaging practices reveals several salient trends and findings. Life cycle assessments consistently indicate that PET and other conventional plastics incur significant environmental costs due to energy-intensive production, slow degradation rates, and microplastic pollution risks (Suhrhoff & Scholz-Böttcher, 2016; Liu et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2022). Open-loop and closed-loop recycling schemes mitigate these impacts to some extent, with closed-loop recycling demonstrating superior potential in reducing net carbon emissions and material waste (Chairat & Gheewala, 2023; Abedsoltan, 2023). Mechanical recycling of PET is widely implemented

but faces challenges in contamination control and additive leaching, necessitating complementary chemical recycling strategies to achieve high-purity recovery (Schade et al., 2024; Ragaert et al., 2017).

Emerging biodegradable alternatives, such as PLA and LLDPE-based films, offer promising environmental benefits, including lower greenhouse gas emissions during production and faster decomposition under controlled conditions (Singh et al., 2024; Paping et al., 2014). However, these materials present trade-offs in cost, functional durability, and scalability. Comparative life cycle analyses show that while biodegradable materials reduce landfill persistence, their overall environmental advantage depends on end-of-life management, including industrial composting or specialized recycling facilities (Dolci et al., 2024; Valentini & Dorigato, 2025).

Consumer behavior studies highlight that purchasing decisions are heavily influenced by visual cues, sustainability claims, and perceived product efficacy. Green packaging, characterized by color schemes, eco-labels, and nature imagery, enhances willingness to pay and strengthens brand loyalty (Samaraweera et al., 2021). Younger consumers in developing countries demonstrate high responsiveness to environmental messaging, although their actual purchasing behavior is moderated by price sensitivity and availability of sustainable alternatives (Abdullah-Al-Swidi & Saleh, 2021). The alignment of corporate strategy with green consumer expectations is critical for achieving both market penetration and environmental impact mitigation.

In terms of organizational performance, firms adopting sustainable packaging report mixed outcomes. On one hand, improved consumer engagement, positive brand perception, and regulatory compliance generate competitive advantages (Gustavo Jr et al., 2018; Kioko, 2023). On the other hand, implementation costs, technological constraints, and supply chain disruptions can limit financial performance if not managed strategically (Agyapong & Attram, 2019; Khantimirov, 2017). Integration of green supply chain management, coupled with data-driven decision intelligence, offers a pathway to optimize environmental outcomes without compromising economic objectives (Kliestik et al., 2022; Nica et al., 2022).

4. Discussion

The findings underscore the complexity of sustainable packaging adoption, which is shaped by a confluence of technological, behavioral, and organizational factors. While

PET remains dominant due to its functional properties and economic viability, its environmental repercussions necessitate a strategic shift toward circularity and material innovation (Raj et al., 2023; Guillard et al., 2018). Closed-loop recycling emerges as a superior practice for environmental mitigation, yet its efficacy is contingent on consumer participation, regulatory support, and investment in recycling infrastructure (Chairat & Gheewala, 2023; Schade et al., 2024).

Green consumer behavior is both an enabler and a constraint. Environmental awareness and eco-labeling significantly influence purchasing patterns, yet price sensitivity and infrastructural limitations can dampen adoption, particularly in developing economies (Abdullah-Al-Swidi & Saleh, 2021; Kioko, 2023). Behavioral interventions, such as nudging, targeted information campaigns, and gamification of recycling programs, can enhance consumer engagement and foster sustainable habits. The integration of machine learning and decision intelligence enables firms to predict purchasing patterns, customize marketing, and optimize inventory management for eco-friendly products, thereby enhancing operational efficiency (Kliestik et al., 2022; Nica et al., 2022).

The limitations of current practices are notable. Biodegradable materials, while environmentally attractive, require specialized waste management systems to realize their benefits. Without proper end-of-life treatment, these materials may contribute to environmental harm comparable to conventional plastics (Singh et al., 2024; Dolci et al., 2024). Moreover, the reliance on consumer-driven green adoption introduces uncertainty in achieving environmental targets, highlighting the need for regulatory enforcement, corporate accountability, and infrastructure development.

Future research should explore integrative models that combine life cycle assessments, consumer behavior analytics, and organizational performance metrics. Cross-country comparative studies can illuminate contextual variations in technology adoption, policy effectiveness, and consumer responsiveness. Additionally, exploration of innovative recycling technologies, such as enzymatic depolymerization or advanced chemical recycling, can provide scalable solutions for plastic waste reduction while maintaining functional and economic viability (Abedsoltan, 2023; Schade et al., 2024).

5. Conclusion

Sustainable packaging represents a critical frontier in the

pursuit of environmental resilience, circular economy integration, and strategic business performance. Polyethylene terephthalate and conventional plastics pose significant environmental challenges, yet recycling innovations, biodegradable alternatives, and green consumer engagement offer viable mitigation pathways. Achieving triple bottom line sustainability requires holistic strategies that integrate technological innovation, life cycle optimization, consumer behavior understanding, and organizational performance alignment. While current progress demonstrates promising trends, continued research, policy support, and industry commitment are essential to fully realize the environmental, social, and economic benefits of sustainable packaging practices.

References

1. Abdullah-Al-Swidi, A., & Saleh, R. M. (2021). How green our future would be? An investigation of the determinants of green purchasing behavior of young citizens in a developing country. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, (1), 1-33.
2. Agyapong, D., & Attram, A. B. (2019). Effect of owner-manager's financial literacy on the performance of SMEs in the Cape Coast Metropolis in Ghana. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(1), 67.
3. Enakirerhi, L. I., & Ighosewe, F. E. (2024). Growth in revenue and earnings management practices in Nigeria pre-and post-IFRS adoption periods. *International Journal of Applied Economics, Finance and Accounting*, 18(1), 88-97.
4. Guillard, V., Gaucel, S., Fornaciari, C., Angellier-Coussy, H., Buche, P., & Gontard, N. (2018). The next generation of sustainable food Packaging to preserve our environment in a circular economy context. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, 5(1), 1-21.
5. Gustavo Jr, J. U., Pereira, G. M., Bond, A. J., Viegas, C. V., & Borchardt, M. (2018). Drivers, opportunities and barriers for a retailer in the pursuit of more sustainable Packaging redesign. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 187, 18-28.
6. Hopkins, D. L. (2022). There is no relationship between lamb particle size and consumer scores for tenderness, flavour, juiciness, overall liking or quality rank. *Meat Science*, 188, 108808.
7. Khan, S. A. R. (2023). Green capabilities, green purchasing, and triple bottom line performance: Leading toward environmental sustainability. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 32(4), 2022-2034.
8. Khantimirov, D. (2017). Market share as a measure of performance: Conceptual issues and financial accountability for marketing activities within a firm. *Journal of Research in Marketing*, 7(3), 587-592.
9. Kioko, B. M. (2023). *Green Supply Chain Management Practices Among Public Universities in Kenya* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi). <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke>
10. Kliestik, T., Zvarikova, K., & Lăzăroiu, G. (2022). Data-driven machine learning and neural network algorithms in the retailing environment: Consumer engagement, experience, and purchase behaviors. *Economics, Management and Financial Markets*, 17(1), 57-69.
11. Nica, E., Poliak, M., Popescu, G. H., & Pârvu, I. A. (2022). Decision intelligence and modeling, multisensory customer experiences, and socially interconnected virtual services across the metaverse ecosystem. *Linguistic and Philosophical Investigations*, 21, 137-153.
12. Samaraweera, M., Sims, J. D., & Homsey, D. M. (2021). Will a green color and nature images make consumers pay more for a green product? *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 38(3), 305-312.
13. Chairat, S., & Gheewala, S. H. (2023). Life cycle assessment and circularity of polyethylene terephthalate bottles via closed and open loop recycling. *Environmental Research*, 236, 116788.
14. Elamri, A., Zdiri, K., Harzallah, O., & Lallam, A. (2017). Progress in polyethylene terephthalate recycling. In *Polyethylene Terephthalate: Uses, Properties and Degradation*. Nova Science Publishers: Hauppauge, NY, USA.
15. Raj, B., Rahul, J., Singh, P. K., Rao, V. V. K., Kumar, J., Dwivedi, N., Kumar, P., Singh, D., & Strzalkowski, K. (2023). Advancements in PET Packaging: Driving Sustainable Solutions for Today's Consumer Demands. *Sustainability*, 15, 12269.
16. Moharir, R. V., & Kumar, S. (2021). Structural characterization of LDPE films to analyse the impact of heavy metals and effect of UV pre-treatment on polymer degradation. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 298, 126670.
17. Suhrhoff, T. J., & Scholz-Bottcher, B. M. (2016). Qualitative impact of salinity, UV radiation and turbulence on leaching of organic plastic additives from four common plastics—A lab experiment. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 102, 84-94.
18. Liu, C., Li, J., Zhang, Y., Wang, L., Deng, J., Gao, Y., Yu, L., Zhang, J., & Sun, H. (2019). Widespread distribution of PET and PC microplastics in dust in

- urban China and their estimated human exposure. *Environment International*, 128, 116-124.
19. Abedsoltan, H. (2023). A focused review on recycling and hydrolysis techniques of polyethylene terephthalate. *Polymer Engineering and Science*, 63, 2651-2674.
 20. Ragaert, K., Delva, L., & Van Geem, K. (2017). Mechanical and chemical recycling of solid plastic waste. *Waste Management*, 69, 24-58.
 21. Schade, A., Melzer, M., Zimmermann, S., Schwarz, T., Stoewe, K., Kuhn, H. (2024). Plastic waste recycling—A chemical recycling perspective. *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering*, 12, 12270-12288.
 22. Wojnowska-Baryła, I., Bernat, K., & Zaborowska, M. (2022). Plastic waste degradation in landfill conditions: The problem with microplastics, and their direct and indirect environmental effects. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19, 13223.
 23. Yu, F., Wu, Z., Wang, J., Li, Y., Chu, R., Pei, Y., & Ma, J. (2022). Effect of landfill age on the physical and chemical characteristics of waste plastics/microplastics in a waste landfill sites. *Environmental Pollution*, 306, 119366.
 24. Canopoli, L., Coulon, F., & Wagland, S. T. (2020). Degradation of excavated polyethylene and polypropylene waste from landfill. *Science of the Total Environment*, 698, 134125.
 25. Singh, A., Malshe, V., Raje, R., & Choudhari, R. (2024). Life cycle assessment of biodegradable linear low-density polyethylene (LLDPE) manufactured in India. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 372, 123120.
 26. Papon, S., Malakul, P., Trungkavashirakun, R., Wenunun, P., Chom-in, T., Nithitanakul, M., & Sarobol, E. (2014). Comparative assessment of the environmental profile of PLA and PET drinking water bottles from a life cycle perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 65, 539-550.
 27. Dolci, G., Puricelli, S., Cecere, G., Tua, C., Fava, F., Rigamonti, L., & Grosso, M. (2024). How does plastic compare with alternative materials in the packaging sector? A systematic review of LCA studies. *Waste Management Research*, 43, 339-357.