The Benefits Of Can Packaging For Beer Vs. Other Beer Packaging

Posted on October 30, 2019

Introduction

Beer packaging must protect flavor, survive filling and distribution, communicate the brand, meet safety requirements, and fit the consumer's intended use. Aluminum cans have become common in craft and mass-market beer because they block light, are lightweight, cool quickly, stack efficiently, and are accepted in many recycling systems. These advantages do not prove that canned beer always tastes better or has the lowest environmental impact in every market. Bottle color, closure quality, dissolved oxygen, storage temperature, transport distance, recycled content, return systems, and local recycling rates all affect performance.

The original essay correctly emphasizes light protection, portability, and reduced broken-glass risk. It contains several problems. Oskar Blues helped popularize modern craft beer in cans but did not invent canned beer. Cans do not cause beer to "age suitably" in every case, and an open promotional paragraph about Tonejet printing distracts from the comparative analysis. A balanced evaluation should compare cans with single-use glass, refillable glass, draft containers, and other formats across product quality, logistics, lifecycle impact, cost, and consumer experience. (Saleh, 2016)

A Brief History of Canned Beer

Commercial canned beer appeared in the United States in the 1930s, decades before the modern craft movement. Early cans were heavy steel containers and sometimes required a separate opener. Aluminum, improved seams, pull tabs, internal coatings, and high-speed filling later made the format lighter and more convenient.

Oskar Blues is significant because it helped challenge the modern assumption that cans were suitable only for inexpensive mass-market beer. Its 2002 canned craft release demonstrated that a small brewery could use the package as part of a quality and outdoor-lifestyle identity. The company was a modern pioneer, not the originator of the package.

Light Protection

Light can cause a photochemical reaction involving hop compounds, producing the familiar "lightstruck" or skunky aroma. Clear and green glass offer less protection than brown glass. An

opaque aluminum can blocks light completely when the package is intact.

This is a genuine quality advantage, especially in brightly lit stores, outdoor settings, or long distribution. Brown glass can also provide strong protection, and storage in closed cartons reduces exposure. The correct conclusion is that cans eliminate one important pathway of flavor damage, not that every canned beer automatically tastes better.

Oxygen Control

Oxygen introduced during filling or entering through the closure can cause stale flavors, reduce hop aroma, and accelerate unwanted change. Modern canning and bottling lines can achieve low dissolved oxygen when equipment is operated well. Package quality depends on purging, filling speed, seam or cap integrity, sanitation, and quality control.

A poorly seamed can can fail, just as a poorly capped bottle can leak. Small breweries need appropriate equipment and monitoring rather than assuming that a package material guarantees stability. Testing dissolved oxygen and inspecting seams are part of product quality.

Internal Can Linings

Beer does not normally contact bare aluminum. Cans use internal coatings that prevent corrosion and interaction between the metal and beverage. These linings are essential to shelf life and flavor.

Breweries and suppliers must manage chemical compliance, migration standards, and coating integrity. Public concern about packaging chemicals has encouraged development of alternative coating systems. Claims such as “the beer tastes metallic because it is in a can” often reflect expectation or drinking from the opening rather than direct metal contact, but damaged linings or contaminated equipment can create real defects.

Drinking Experience

Aroma contributes greatly to flavor. Drinking directly from a narrow can opening limits the drinker’s ability to smell the beer and observe color, clarity, or foam. Pouring either canned or bottled beer into an appropriate clean glass provides a more comparable sensory experience.

The can itself may influence perception through temperature, touch, sound, and expectation. Blind testing is more informative than judging a package by reputation. Package preference is partly sensory and partly cultural.

Weight and Transport

Aluminum cans are much lighter than single-use glass bottles. Lower package weight can reduce fuel use, freight cost, and handling strain, particularly over long distances. Cans also use space efficiently and can be packed densely on pallets and in coolers.

Transport advantage depends on the system boundary. A refillable glass bottle used many times within a local return network can perform differently from single-use glass shipped long distances. A lifecycle comparison should include production, filling, secondary packaging, transport, collection, washing, recycling, and loss rates. (Feo et al., 2022)

Breakage and Outdoor Use

Cans do not shatter into sharp fragments. This makes them suitable for many beaches, parks, boats, stadiums, campsites, and events where glass is restricted. Lower breakage can reduce product loss, injury, cleanup, and damage to equipment.

Cans can still be punctured or crushed, and littered metal remains harmful. Packaging convenience should be paired with responsible collection. “Outdoor friendly” must not become permission to leave containers in natural areas.

Cooling and Storage

A can’s thin wall and high thermal conductivity can allow it to cool quickly. Its cylindrical shape and light weight make stacking convenient. However, cooling rate also depends on package volume, starting temperature, airflow, and refrigerator conditions.

Both bottles and cans should be stored cool and protected from temperature cycling. Heat accelerates chemical reactions and can damage beer regardless of package. The cold package is not necessarily the better preserved package if it spent weeks in a hot warehouse.

Recyclability

Aluminum can be recycled repeatedly, and recovered metal has economic value. Producing secondary aluminum generally requires much less energy than producing primary metal from ore. High recycled content and effective collection can therefore improve a can’s lifecycle performance.

“Recyclable” is not the same as “recycled.” Outcomes depend on deposit laws, consumer participation, sorting systems, contamination, scrap markets, and whether recovered material returns to equivalent applications. A can discarded in a landfill does not receive the benefit promised by

circular-economy advertising.

Glass Recycling and Reuse

Glass is also recyclable and does not require an internal polymer coating. Its major disadvantages in a single-use system are weight and energy-intensive melting. Color separation, contamination, transport distance, and local demand for cullet affect recycling.

Refillable glass changes the comparison. A standardized bottle collected, washed, inspected, and reused many times can spread manufacturing impact over multiple fills. Performance depends on return rate, washing energy, bottle loss, and delivery distance. The question is not “glass or can” in the abstract but which complete system is operating.

Lifecycle Assessment

Peer-reviewed lifecycle assessments show that packaging results vary by geography, package size, electricity mix, recycled content, return system, and modeling choices. Studies comparing aluminum, glass, and plastic often find single-use glass performs poorly in transport and energy categories because of its mass. Some studies find cans competitive or preferable, while others identify trade-offs across water, toxicity, resource use, and end-of-life assumptions. (“International Organization for Standardization”, n.d.)

A company should not select one favorable study and claim universal environmental superiority. It should use a functional unit—such as delivering a specified volume of beer to a consumer—define system boundaries, test sensitivity to recycling rates, and disclose assumptions.

Primary Aluminum and Mining

Aluminum’s low weight and high recycling value should not hide the impact of primary production. Bauxite mining affects land and communities, refining produces red mud, and smelting requires large amounts of electricity. The carbon footprint varies greatly with the power source.

Increasing recycled content, using lower-carbon electricity, reducing can weight safely, and improving recovery can reduce impact. Responsible sourcing should include labor, community, and biodiversity considerations, not carbon alone.

Water and Cleaning

Single-use cans and bottles require cleaning and sanitation during manufacturing and filling. Refillable

bottles require repeated washing, which uses water, heat, and chemicals but avoids production of a new container for every fill.

Breweries should consider local water scarcity and wastewater treatment. A package with a lower carbon footprint may create other environmental pressures. Multi-criteria assessment is therefore preferable to one indicator.

Draft Beer and Kegs

Kegs are reusable bulk packages and can reduce packaging per serving when return logistics, cleaning, and product turnover are efficient. Draft service also creates quality risks: dirty lines, incorrect temperature, poor gas balance, or slow sales can damage the beer.

Kegs suit bars, restaurants, events, and refill systems but are not convenient for every household or distribution channel. They should be part of the comparison because the best package may differ by occasion.

Product Freshness and Shelf Life

Freshness depends on beer style and brewery intent. Highly aromatic hop-forward beer may be best consumed quickly, while some strong or mixed-fermentation beers can develop with time. Packaging should protect the intended profile.

Date coding, cold-chain management, stock rotation, and distributor education may have more influence on actual freshness than package stereotypes. A can kept hot for months can be less fresh than a properly handled bottle.

Economics for Breweries

Canning equipment, mobile canning services, minimum order quantities, printed cans, labels, storage, and quality testing affect cost. Cans may reduce outbound freight and breakage but require space and reliable supply. Bottles may be easier for some small producers to source in flexible quantities.

The decision should use total cost rather than container price alone. Packaging affects line speed, labor, losses, secondary packaging, warehouse use, retailer requirements, and returns.

Branding and Communication

The can offers a large printable surface and supports distinctive illustration, labels, sleeves, or direct printing. This can help a small brewery communicate style, ingredients, legal information, and

identity. Good design should remain readable and should not appeal primarily to minors.

Branding technology is a means, not the central benefit of beer packaging. The original essay's promotional focus on one printing supplier should be removed unless the assignment specifically evaluates that supplier. Comparative analysis should remain independent.

Consumer Safety and Accessibility

Packages need clear alcohol content, volume, allergens where required, deposit information, and responsible-consumption messages. Opening force, sharp edges, grip, and readability affect accessibility. Some consumers find cans easier to handle; others prefer resealable or larger formats.

Neither can nor bottle prevents harmful alcohol use. Packaging analysis should not make health claims or imply that convenience is an unqualified benefit. Beer is an alcoholic beverage, and marketing and distribution must comply with age restrictions and applicable law.

Decision Framework

A brewery should define the beer, market, distance, shelf-life requirement, venue restrictions, expected recycling system, and sales volume. Cans are often strong for light protection, weight, stacking, and outdoor safety. Brown glass may support brand tradition and can perform well in local refill systems. Kegs are efficient for high-volume on-premise service.

The business should validate quality through dissolved-oxygen testing, seam or closure inspection, sensory panels, package integrity tests, and shelf-life trials. Environmental claims should reflect the actual supply chain rather than general properties of the material.

Conclusion

Aluminum cans offer substantial benefits for beer: complete light protection, low weight, efficient transport and storage, rapid cooling, strong graphics, and reduced broken-glass risk. They can also achieve favorable lifecycle performance where recycled content and recovery rates are high. These advantages explain their growth in craft and mainstream markets.

Cans are not universally superior. Flavor depends on filling quality and storage, while environmental results depend on primary metal, electricity, transport, collection, and recycling. Refillable glass or reusable kegs may perform better in suitable local systems. The correct packaging decision is therefore contextual. Breweries should compare the complete system, protect product quality with evidence, communicate honestly, and choose the package that delivers the beer safely with the lowest practical total impact.

References

Saleh, Y. (2016). Comparative life cycle assessment of beverages packages in Palestine. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 131*, 28–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.05.080

De Feo, G., Ferrara, C., & Minichini, F. (2022). Comparison between the perceived and actual environmental sustainability of beverage packagings in glass, plastic, and aluminium. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 333*, 130158.

International Organization for Standardization. *ISO 14040 and ISO 14044: Life Cycle Assessment*.

Bamforth, C. W. (2009). *Beer: Tap into the Art and Science of Brewing*. Oxford University Press.