RAIS Journal for Social Sciences | Vol. 10, No. 2, 2026
ISSN 2574-0245 (Print) | ISSN 2574-1179 (Online) | DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23097894

Food Packaging, Consumer Perception, and Nutritional Accuracy

Kayla Xu

Ridge High School, Basking Ridge, New Jersey, USA, kaylalxu@gmail.com

Abstract: Food labels and advertising do more than describe what is in a product; they shape how consumers think about food. Terms such as "organic," "low fat," "natural," and "premium" influence how people judge taste, value, and healthfulness before they evaluate the actual nutrition facts. This literature review examines how food packaging and labeling affect consumer purchasing decisions and whether the health claims on packaging accurately reflect nutritional value. Drawing on research on food advertising, package design, willingness to pay, consumer misinterpretation, and labeling regulation, this paper argues that food packaging often functions more as a persuasive marketing tool than as neutral consumer guidance. Studies suggest that consumers are often willing to pay more for products marketed as reduced-fat, whole-grain, or enriched with fruits and vegetables, even when the nutritional differences are limited. At the same time, claims such as "reduced salt," "low fat," and "natural" can create inconsistent or misleading interpretations. Overall, the research indicates that clearer and more standardized labeling is necessary to close the gap between what food labels suggest and what products actually contain.

Keywords: Food Labeling, Food Packaging, Consumer Behavior, Health Claims, Nutrition, Marketing, Perceived Healthfulness, Transparency

Introduction

Food packaging can create a gap between perceived healthfulness and actual nutritional value. Consumers may make purchasing decisions based not only on the food itself but also on how the product is presented. Packaging has become one of the most powerful tools used by food companies to attract buyers and influence what people choose to purchase. While this process may seem like a simple part of shopping, these quick decisions can have broader consequences, shaping not only spending habits but also long-term health and nutrition.

Food packaging is designed to do more than simply protect products or provide nutritional information. Companies use packaging as a marketing strategy, incorporating persuasive labels such as "organic," "low fat," "natural," and "premium" to make products appear healthier or higher quality than competitors'. These claims often shape consumers' first impressions and can influence how buyers perceive a product's taste, value, and nutritional benefits before they even try it.

Research has shown that packaging and labeling strongly affect consumer perceptions and purchasing behavior. Studies in consumer psychology and food marketing have found that external cues such as packaging design, branding, and label wording significantly influence how consumers evaluate food products, shaping their expectations of taste, satisfaction, and overall quality (Kalog et al., 2022). This body of research demonstrates that packaging can shape opinions independently of a food's actual characteristics, leading consumers to judge products by appearance and marketing rather than by nutritional content.

In addition to affecting perception, food packaging can increase consumers' willingness to purchase products by creating the impression that they offer greater health benefits. Alsubhi et al. (2023) found that in 88.5% of the studies examined, consumers were willing to pay more for foods labeled with health-related claims, particularly those marketed as reduced-fat, whole-grain, or containing additional fruits and vegetables. These findings suggest that packaging labels increase the perceived value of products and encourage consumers to spend more money when they believe a food is healthier.

The issue is that perceived healthiness and actual healthiness do not always match. Products advertised as healthy may contain high levels of sugar, sodium, or artificial ingredients despite labels suggesting otherwise. For example, a "reduced sodium" product may still be high in saturated fat, while "low-fat" items may compensate for the loss of flavor by adding extra sugar. This raises concerns about whether packaging genuinely informs consumers or simply manipulates perception to increase sales.

Because food packaging has such a strong influence on consumer buying decisions, it is important to examine both its effectiveness as a marketing tool and the accuracy of its claims. By examining how packaging shapes purchasing decisions and whether its health claims are nutritionally accurate, this research argues that food packaging functions primarily as a persuasive marketing tool rather than as honest consumer guidance, often overstating the healthfulness of products in ways that mislead buyers and undermine informed decision-making. Building on reviews of visual design (Vermeir & Roose, 2020) and willingness to pay (Alsubhi et al., 2023), this review connects these topics with evidence on nutritional quality and consumer misinterpretation to examine when labels inform consumers and when they create misleading impressions.

Hypothesis and Research Approach

This study predicts that food packaging exerts a stronger influence on consumer purchasing decisions than the products' actual nutritional content. This prediction is based on the observation that consumers frequently rely on immediate visual and textual cues, such as color schemes, branding, and health-related claims, when making quick decisions in retail environments, rather than engaging in a detailed evaluation of nutrition labels or ingredient lists. To investigate this prediction, this paper reviews and synthesizes existing literature, including peer-reviewed journal articles, statistical analyses, and research studies that examine consumer behavior, food marketing, and public health outcomes. The paper analyzes the extent to which specific packaging elements, including labeling terms such as "organic," "low fat," and "natural," design aesthetics, and branding techniques, influence consumer perceptions relative to factual nutritional information. This is a narrative review rather than a systematic review. Its sources address packaging design, health-related claims, consumer interpretation, purchasing behavior, and labeling regulation. The original search platforms, exact search terms, search dates, and formal selection criteria are not documented, which limits the reproducibility and completeness of the source selection.

The research also considers multiple perspectives: consumers who prioritize convenience and visual appeal, food companies that intentionally design packaging to maximize sales, and public health professionals who raise concerns about misleading claims and their long-term impact on dietary habits. One strength of this research is the availability of extensive scholarly evidence supporting the relationship between packaging and consumer behavior. However, a challenge is distinguishing between correlation and causation in existing studies, especially when some research may be influenced by industry interests.

Packaging as a First Impression

Some food purchases are made quickly, although consumers differ in how much time they spend comparing products and reading labels. Under time pressure, consumers may react to what catches their eye first. In those moments, packaging can become a primary source of

information, and visual cues such as color, typography, imagery, and layout can shape how a product is perceived before the fine print is read. Because people may rely on quick mental shortcuts when shopping, a strong first impression from packaging design can be the difference between a product being picked up or passed over (Vermeir & Roose, 2020).

Those visual cues do more than just attract attention. They trigger psychological responses across attention, emotion, and cognition simultaneously. Consumers use graphical elements such as colors, labels, and fonts; structural elements such as shape and material; and spatial elements such as placement and presentation to form expectations about a product's quality, taste, and healthfulness before they have even tried it (Vermeir, 2020). Most of the time, this happens without conscious awareness. When a consumer has no prior knowledge about a product, these cues carry even more weight because they become the only basis for judgment.

Certain design choices can also create perceptual biases that stick. Research by Vermeir and Roose (2020) shows that even when two products are identical, different labels such as "all natural," "low-fat," or "with stevia" can change how much enjoyment consumers expect from them. This is the halo effect in action, where one positive cue bleeds into the overall perception of the product. Packaging material works the same way. Matte packaging tends to read as more natural and higher-quality, while glossy packaging can lower perceived healthiness, showing how subtle design choices can shift consumer impressions. Color is probably the most immediate of these elements. Research summarized by Southern New Hampshire University (2024) suggests that color can influence consumers' initial judgments. Blue often reads as trustworthy and calm, while red can signal energy and excitement. These associations can shape emotional responses, but they vary depending on the product type and cultural context (Vermeir & Roose, 2020). Typography and layout matter too, even if they are less obvious. Fonts that are clean and easy to read can make label information easier to understand, while hard-to-read text can reduce consumers' interest. Clear information may also help build consumer trust (Moreira et al., 2021). A well-organized layout can help consumers process a product's presentation more easily, although responses depend on the design and product context (Vermeir & Roose, 2020). Taken together, these elements show that packaging design is doing serious work before a product is ever tasted or tested. Through color, labeling, material, and layout, packaging shapes expectations about quality, taste, and value that often drive the final decision. Consumer choices, more often than not, are rooted in perception rather than objective reality, and packaging is one of the biggest reasons why.

Health Labels and Perceived Value

Food labels are supposed to help consumers make smarter choices, but research consistently shows that the way information is presented on packaging can shape perception more powerfully than the actual contents of the product. In most grocery store settings, consumers are moving fast. They rely on quick cues like "low-fat," "high protein," or "all natural" to form an overall impression of a product, even when that product contains high levels of added sugar, sodium, or other ingredients that undercut the healthy image. Because these simplified claims are easy to process, they frequently replace real engagement with the Nutrition Facts label, letting perception drive purchases rather than information.

A big part of why this happens comes down to branding. Research on healthy food purchasing shows that brand image can shape trust, quality expectations, satisfaction, and loyalty (García-Salirrosas et al., 2024). Health-related keywords like "organic," "low-fat," and "sugar-free" create immediate positive impressions that can push consumers toward one product over another, even when the actual nutritional difference between the two is minimal. This is amplified by the halo effect, in which a single positive claim on the front of a package leads consumers to assume the entire product is healthier than it actually is.

Brand image also shapes purchasing behavior indirectly through perceived quality, trust, satisfaction, and loyalty, all of which increase the likelihood that consumers will choose the same product again. In practice, this means consumers often interpret packaging as a signal of overall health value rather than sitting down to evaluate individual nutrients. Products that look healthy based on branding alone can end up outselling nutritionally stronger alternatives that are marketed less effectively.

Willingness-to-pay research makes the financial weight of this even clearer. A systematic review of food retail studies found that in 88.5% of experiments, consumers were willing to pay more for products with health-related labels, with price premiums ranging from 5.6% to 91.5% and averaging around 30.7% (Alsubhi et al., 2023). That kind of financial response gives manufacturers a strong incentive to highlight specific nutritional benefits while quietly downplaying less appealing components like sodium or added sugars. The same review found that labels such as reduced-fat or whole grain were particularly effective at increasing willingness to pay, whereas claims about reduced salt or combined nutrient reductions yielded much more inconsistent responses. Who the consumer is also matters. Older individuals, women, people living with obesity, and those actively trying to maintain a healthy lifestyle are all more likely to pay a premium for products with health claims, while younger consumers and those with higher levels of education tend to be more skeptical (Alsubhi et al., 2023).

The influence of labeling is even stronger when a trusted institution backs the claim. Research on FDA-endorsed "healthy" labels suggests that consumers may be more willing to choose and pay for products when the claim appears institutionally credible (Fuller et al., 2026). Food labeling, therefore, has the power to nudge people toward healthier purchases, but it also has the power to mislead. The gap between what a label suggests and what a product actually contains is where the real problem lives.

Label Claims vs. Actual Nutrition

Food labels and advertising claims have a major influence on how consumers perceive the healthiness of products, even when the actual nutritional value may be poor. Terms like "low fat," "all natural," "organic," or "high in fiber" can make products seem healthier without indicating their overall levels of added sugar, sodium, and saturated fat. These claims can create a halo effect, where consumers assume a food is healthy overall because of one positive label (Hall & Grummon, 2025). Because of this, many people focus more on the front of the package instead of carefully reading the nutrition facts label.

One problem is that labels often distract consumers from unhealthy ingredients. Foods labeled "low fat" may still contain large amounts of sugar to improve flavor, while foods advertised as "natural" or "organic" can still be highly processed and unhealthy. Hall and Grummon (2025) argue that many unhealthy packaged foods display nutrition-related claims even when they are high in added sugar, sodium, or saturated fat. These kinds of labels can confuse consumers because they focus attention on a single positive detail while masking more important nutritional concerns. Studies also show that these claims directly affect consumer beliefs. When a package emphasizes a natural or healthy-sounding claim, consumers may infer that the product has broader nutritional benefits than the label actually states. Even if two products are nutritionally similar, the wording on the packaging can change how healthy people perceive them. This shows how companies can shape consumer perception through marketing rather than through actual nutrition.

Research has also found that health claims on packaging are not always connected to healthier foods. A study of nearly 600 grocery products found no major relationship between the number of health claims on packaging and the actual nutritional quality of the food (Venkatesh et al., 2025). Products labeled "gluten-free," "high protein," or "immune support" were often no healthier than those without such claims. Instead, the actual food category

was a much better predictor of healthiness. Fruits and vegetables generally scored as healthier than snacks, sweets, and sugary foods, regardless of how many claims were printed on the package.

Organic labeling also influences how consumers judge food products. Since consumers cannot easily verify if foods are truly organic or healthier, they rely heavily on labels, packaging, and certifications when making decisions (Nagy et al., 2022). Packaging often uses earthy colors, pictures of farms, or words associated with nature to make products appear healthier and more trustworthy. However, organic foods can still contain unhealthy amounts of sugar, sodium, or calories. Many consumers may assume that organic automatically means nutritious, even though that is not always true.

Overall, food labels often influence perception more than they communicate accurate nutritional information. Companies highlight a single positive feature to make unhealthy foods appear healthier than they are. This can make it difficult for consumers to make informed choices and may contribute to unhealthy diets over time. Stronger labeling regulations and clearer nutrition information could help reduce confusion and allow consumers to better understand the actual nutritional value of the foods they buy.

Consumer Misinterpretation

A common issue regarding food labeling relates not to the information itself, but to the assumptions consumers make about a product. Multiple studies have shown that people tend to generalize and make an assumption about the general well-being associated with consuming this product based on only one positive claim or visual aspect of the label. This tendency toward overgeneralization is not necessarily indicative of inattention or a lack of understanding; instead, it is a common response to the rapid information processing required in typical supermarket environments. Part of the reason for this tendency lies in how people's memory and prior knowledge interact with the labels of products. According to Hodgkins et al. (2019), if claims mention any nutrient familiar to people, such as calcium, vitamin C or omega-3, participants used their associations related to these nutrients to supplement information provided on the package, even though this association was not covered by the label at all. For instance, a person who was aware of the benefits of omega-3 for brain functions may perceive a statement like "Source of Omega-3" as a functional health claim. Moreover, this impact can be further increased by means of the visuals used in packaging, especially those involving images relating to health placed on the front of the product. In a study with two experiments, Delivett et al. (2022) had participants view fabricated foods accompanied by written nutrition claims that either contained health images or not. After that, the participants had to report what claims they remembered reading. Those who observed health-related images remembered some claims that were not there in reality. A single health-related image had the power to influence people more than direct and factual information.

Another issue to consider is the general lack of understanding of what food labels are really saying to consumers. According to Moreira et al. (2021), when surveying 308 consumers, they found that although the majority of respondents viewed the required information on food labels as important and credible, almost the same number of respondents admitted having difficulties in comprehending the label information. Such disharmony is problematic indeed, for a person who trusts information on a label yet fails to comprehend the label message will definitely rely on any easily understandable claim or picture.

What makes both studies related is that overgeneralization is not the occasional mistake of an absent-minded consumer. It is rather a predictable outcome of the current manner of presentation of health information on food labels. Given the lack of consumer familiarity with nutrients, false memory effects, and comprehension gaps, it is very hard to believe that consumers can fix this problem alone through becoming better informed.

The Need for Transparency

While it is true that labeling food is supposed to inform consumers, this is only possible if the information given is accurate and comprehensive. The fact is that the wording on the product package often reflects marketers' efforts to make consumers buy the product rather than the nutritional value it contains, and thus two items making almost identical statements on the label end up being totally different in the back of the package.

The reason for this is economic, and while there is nothing wrong with trying to earn more money, food producers do not really have an interest in giving information that might decrease their sales, and that is why governmental regulation comes into play where the market cannot or will not (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service [USDA ERS], 2026). When left on their own, companies tend to emphasize positive aspects and leave out negative ones. This is crucial since few consumers read all panels of food products before placing them in their shopping carts. They are observing the front of the packaging, and when the claims made on it are unclear or inaccurate, the purchase will be made based on incorrect information. It is not the fault of consumers; the current system of labels does not always force manufacturers to provide clear and accurate information.

Label standardization could solve this problem. Front-of-package labeling systems using easy-to-understand visual claims have proven successful in helping consumers evaluate products more effectively. The Food and Drug Administration took the initiative to change the Nutrition Facts Labeling system back in 2016 and update it to make information more understandable and accurate (USDA ERS, 2026). This means that even required labels should be adjusted to the latest nutritional knowledge. With uniform labels, consumers can compare products based on actual nutrition, not just marketing language.

However, the benefits of transparency extend even further. If there are mandatory disclosure requirements in place, then the manufacturer may improve the actual product and not just its packaging. An example of that is labeling of trans fats: after labeling requirements came into effect, trans fat content became lower over time, meaning that the manufacturer was forced to make some changes and not just to change labels (USDA ERS, 2026). As a result, consumers would see real improvements in products that meet the health requirements.

Such policies would provide consumers with greater protection because they would know what is being put on them. Moreover, stricter labeling requirements, correct terminology, mandatory disclosures on packages and advertisements, and a higher evidentiary standard for advertising claims would create greater accountability. Consumers have a right to be sure that the information provided is truthful. Therefore, such labels could really serve their purpose.

Limitations and Implications

Because this paper is based on a literature review rather than an original consumer experiment, its conclusion is limited by the scope and quality of the studies it analyzes. Future research could test the argument more directly by asking participants to choose between products with identical nutrition facts but different front-of-package labels, color schemes, or health claims. That type of experiment would make it easier to separate the effect of packaging from the effect of actual nutrition. Future research could also compare different consumer groups, since previous studies suggest that age, education, health goals, and trust in institutions can affect how people respond to labels.

A second limitation is that the paper focuses mainly on health claims and visual packaging cues. Other factors, such as price, income, food access, culture, and time pressure, also shape what people buy. Comparing this paper's findings with research on sustainability labeling and production claims shows that labels can communicate ethical or environmental value as well as health value, which makes consumer interpretation even more complicated

(Cook et al., 2023; Lim & Page, 2022). More research could examine how these different types of claims interact on the same package.

Overall, the next step is not only to ask whether labels influence consumers, because the evidence already suggests that they do. The more important question is which labeling systems reduce confusion most effectively. Studies could compare standardized front-of-package labels, color-coded nutrition ratings, clearer definitions for terms such as "natural" and "healthy," and stricter rules about when companies can use health-related claims. This would help determine whether transparency policies actually improve consumer decisions or simply add more information to packages.

Conclusion

Throughout this essay, there is one common denominator from all the research presented: food packaging goes far beyond simply relaying information about nutritional value of foods. Labels can inform consumers, but visual design and selective claims can also create impressions that do not reflect overall nutritional quality. The use of health claims in food marketing reinforces this notion. One single word placed on the front of the packaging, such as "organic" or "natural," can convey a sense of healthiness, even though it does not establish the overall nutritional value of the product.

This research shows the impact of such claims on consumers. Consumers are often willing to pay more for products with health-related claims, although willingness to pay does not by itself establish whether a product is nutritionally better (Alsubhi et al., 2023). The research related to consumer misinterpretation helps explain this gap. Health-related images can lead consumers to remember claims that were not present (Delivett et al., 2022). In the grocery products examined by Venkatesh et al. (2025), the number of health claims was not significantly associated with nutritional quality, while food category was a better predictor.

Highlighting only one positive aspect can divert attention from less favorable nutritional facts, but these findings do not establish that all manufacturers deliberately deceive consumers. Standardized front-of-package labeling, clearer definitions for terms such as "natural" or "healthy," and better enforcement of labeling requirements could help consumers compare products more accurately. These possible improvements, while promising, require further evaluation rather than being guaranteed solutions.

Because this narrative review is limited by its source selection and the varied methods and contexts of the studies examined, it cannot generalize that packaging always outweighs nutritional information. Food labeling can provide useful guidance, but that guidance depends on both the accuracy of the information presented and consumers' interpretation of these labels.

References

Alsubhi, M., Blake, M., Nguyen, T., Majmudar, I., Moodie, M., & Ananthapavan, J. (2023). Consumer willingness to pay for healthier food products: A systematic review. *Obesity Reviews, 24*(1), Article e13525. https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.13525

Cook, B., Costa Leite, J., Rayner, M., Stoffel, S., van Rijn, E., & Wollgast, J. (2023). Consumer interaction with sustainability labelling on food products: A narrative literature review. *Nutrients, 15*(17), Article 3837. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu15173837

Delivett, C. P., Farrow, C. V., Thomas, J. M., & Nash, R. A. (2022). Front-of-pack health imagery on both "healthy" and "unhealthy" foods leads people to misremember seeing health claims: Two memory experiments. *Appetite, 174*, Article 106013. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2022.106013

Fuller, K., Sharib, J. R., Fan, B., Pomeranz, J. L., Mozaffarian, D., & Cash, S. B. (2026). U.S. consumer preferences for FDA healthy vs. generic healthy food labels: The influence of trust. *Food Quality and Preference, 144*, Article 105898. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2026.105898

García-Salirrosas, E. E., Escobar-Farfán, M., Veas-González, I., Esponda-Perez, J. A., Gallardo-Canales, R., Ruiz-Andia, R., Fernandez-Daza, V. M., & Zabalaga-Davila, R. F. (2024). Purchase intention of healthy foods: The determinant role of brand image in the market of a developing country. *Foods, 13*(20), Article 3242. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods13203242

Hall, M. G., & Grummon, A. H. (2025). The case for stronger regulation of deceptive nutrition-related claims on unhealthy food. *PLOS Medicine, 22*(8), Article e1004724. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1004724

Hodgkins, C. E., Egan, B., Peacock, M., Klepacz, N., Miklavec, K., Pravst, I., Pohar, J., Gracia, A., Groeppel-Klein, A., Rayner, M., & Raats, M. M. (2019). Understanding how consumers categorise health related claims on foods: A consumer-derived typology of health-related claims. *Nutrients, 11*(3), Article 539. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11030539

Kalog, G. L. S., Kasim, F., Anyebuno, B., Tei, S., Kubuga, C. K., Mogre, V., & Aryee, P. A. (2022). Food advertisement influences food decision making and not nutritional status: A study among university students in Ghana. *BMC Nutrition, 8*, Article 72. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40795-022-00571-2

Lim, K. H., & Page, E. T. (2022, March 7). *Consumers' interpretation of food labels with production claims can influence purchases*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. https://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2022/march/consumers-interpretation-of-food-labels-with-production-claims-can-influence-purchases

Moreira, M. J., García-Díez, J., de Almeida, J. M. M. M., & Saraiva, C. (2021). Consumer knowledge about food labeling and fraud. *Foods, 10*(5), Article 1095. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods10051095

Nagy, L. B., Lakner, Z., & Temesi, Á. (2022). Is it really organic? Credibility factors of organic food–A systematic review and bibliometric analysis. *PLOS ONE, 17*(4), Article e0266855. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0266855

Southern New Hampshire University. (2024, November 6). *Design choice and their impact on consumer decisions*. https://in.snhu.edu/blogs/design-choice-and-their-impact-on-consumer-decisions

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. (2026, August 3). *Food labeling*. https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/food-choices-health/consumer-information-and-labeling/food-labeling

Venkatesh, S., Steinberg, J., & Ryan, C. (2025). Do food packaging health claims depict healthiness or mislead patients? *PRiMER, 9*, Article 41. https://doi.org/10.22454/PRiMER.2025.586640

Vermeir, I. (2020). How visuals affect food choice. *Foods, 9*(12), Article 1835. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods9121835

Vermeir, I., & Roose, G. (2020). Visual design cues impacting food choice: A review and future research agenda. *Foods, 9*(10), Article 1495. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods9101495