

Programme: BA (Hons) Business Management

Student Name: Istvan Tarjani

Student ID: 2317622

Module: International Business Communications (LCBB6023_LON)

Date: 12.12.2025

Conflict Management in US-Japan Meetings: High/Low Context Communication and Power Distance

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
CULTURAL DIMENSIONS AND HIGH/LOW CONTEXT COMMUNICATION	4
FACE, FACEWORK AND CONFLICT STYLES	4
CONFLICT AND NEGOTIATION IN US-JAPAN BUSINESS SETTINGS.....	5
ANALYSIS: CONFLICT MANAGEMENT IN US-JAPAN MEETINGS	5
U.S. CONFLICT MANAGEMENT: DIRECT, EXPLICIT AND TASK-FOCUSED	5
JAPANESE CONFLICT MANAGEMENT: INDIRECT, RELATIONAL AND FACE-SENSITIVE	6
STRATEGIES FOR MORE EFFECTIVE CONFLICT MANAGEMENT	7
1. <i>Meta-communication about norms</i>	7
2. <i>Hybrid meeting structures</i>	7
3. <i>Face-sensitive directness</i>	8
4. <i>Leadership and competence development</i>	8
CONCLUSION	9
REFERENCES.....	10

Introduction

Business interaction between American and Japanese managers is often productive but simultaneously challenging, particularly when disagreements arise. Research shows recurring misunderstanding related to directness, indirect cues, hierarchy and the expected place for addressing conflict (**Adachi, 2010; Jenkins, 2020**). Cultural orientations play a decisive role in shaping these expectations: The United States is generally a culture where people communicate clearly and directly, value personal independence, and place less importance on social rank. Japan, on the other hand, is a culture where communication often depends on shared understanding, group needs come before the individual, and social hierarchy is strongly respected.

(**Hofstede, 2011; Georgiana, 2023**). These contrasting cultural logics influence not only how messages are formulated but also how they are interpreted, creating asymmetrical expectations about what constitutes appropriate behavior during meetings. As a result, even well-intentioned managerial interactions can give rise to unintended tension when verbal and non-verbal cues are understood differently across the two cultures.

This essay evaluates conflict management in US-Japan meetings through the frameworks of high/low context communication and power distance. The central argument is that differences in these dimensions create predictable misinterpretations regarding when and how disagreement should be expressed. American managers tend to discuss problems openly during meetings, viewing transparency as essential to efficient problem-solving, while Japanese managers frequently avoid direct confrontation and prefer to handle concerns privately to maintain harmony and hierarchy (**Oetzel et al., 2001; Allan, 2015**). These divergent approaches often result in conflicting assumptions: what Americans perceive as constructive openness may be interpreted by Japanese colleagues as inappropriate or face-threatening, whereas Japanese indirectness may appear evasive or unclear from a U.S. perspective.

The following sections outline core theories on cultural dimensions, communication context and face/facework, then analyze how these frameworks explain contrasting meeting behaviors. In doing so, the essay highlights why certain patterns of misunderstanding consistently emerge in intercultural business settings. Finally, it identifies strategies that may support more effective conflict management across the two cultures, emphasizing the importance of meta-communication, adaptive leadership and culturally informed meeting structures.

Cultural dimensions and high/low context communication

Hofstede's ideas about culture, especially authority and individual versus group focus is still important for understanding how people from different cultures interact (**Hofstede, 2011**). In individualistic cultures with low power distance, such as the United States, employees are more willing to disagree and question their managers. By contrast, in collectivist cultures with higher power distance, such as Japan, social hierarchy and duty are strongly valued, and open disagreement with superiors is usually avoided. (**Jan, Alshare and Lane, 2022**).

High/low context communication closely relates to these dimensions. Low-context cultures priorities explicit verbal clarity, while high-context cultures rely on subtle non-verbal cues and shared understanding (**Georgiana, 2023; Balsmeier and Heck, 2017**). **Joyce (2012)** confirms that direct communicators expect clear statements of problems, whereas indirect communicators convey disagreement cautiously to preserve relationships. Comparative work demonstrates that misinterpretations frequently emerge when these contrasting approaches meet (**LeBaron, 2003**).

Studies focusing on Japanese American business communication show predictable differences: U.S. participants rely heavily on explicit verbal messages, whereas Japanese participants use silence, implication and relational cues (**Adachi, 2010**). **Suzuki (2010)** observes similar patterns in written communication, where Japanese texts develop arguments indirectly compared to the explicit thesis-driven style in the U.S.

Face, facework and conflict styles

Face defined as one's claimed social self-image plays a critical role in intercultural conflict. **Oetzel et al. (2001)** Cultural values influence how people care about their social image. In individual-focused cultures, people mainly protect their own image, while in group-focused cultures, people are more concerned about the image of others or the shared image of the group. These orientations influence preferred conflict styles. U.S. respondents often adopt dominating or integrating approaches involving explicit disagreement, while Japanese respondents display more avoiding or obliging behaviors (**Oetzel et al., 2001**).

Neuliep and Johnson (2016) demonstrate that cultural filters influence how verbal and non-verbal behavior is interpreted during conflict. **Dai and Chen (2022)** further argue that successful intercultural conflict management requires balancing face needs with task-oriented goals.

Research on Japanese communication reinforces the centrality of face. **Shigemasu and Ikeda (2006)** find that avoiding face-threatening acts contributes to higher relationship satisfaction. **Shen et al. (2024)** highlight how Japanese communicative norms manage obligations indirectly to preserve harmony.

Conflict and negotiation in US-Japan business settings

Tinsley (1998) identifies that American managers emphasize egalitarianism and individual interests, preferring analytical problem-solving strategies. Japanese managers, in contrast, place greater emphasis on hierarchy and group cohesion, often protecting relationships even at the expense of direct task negotiation.

Adachi (2010) observes that U.S. negotiators expect explicit discussions, while Japanese negotiators prefer indirect cues and pre-meeting consultation (**nemawashi**). **Allan (2015)** notes that Japanese conflict handling is shaped by context, formality and the avoidance of public disagreement.

Yi and Chen (2021) highlight structural differences: Japanese negotiations follow more formal, ritualized processes, whereas U.S. negotiations are informal. **Kobayashi (2019)** and **Jenkins (2020)** describe how misunderstandings arise from contrasting expectations around turn-taking, relationship development and explicitness.

Case-based research, such as **Ganapathy (2019)**, illustrates that U.S. managers may mistake indirect Japanese responses for avoidance, while Japanese partners may perceive American directness as blunt or disrespectful.

Analysis: Conflict management in US-Japan meetings

U.S. conflict management: direct, explicit and task-focused

American conflict management is strongly shaped by individualism, low power distance, and a low-context communication style. Because of this, U.S. managers usually prefer open, clear and direct discussions during meetings. They see meetings as a space where problems should be addressed immediately, and where every participant is expected to speak honestly about concerns (**Hofstede, 2011; Joyce, 2012**). For many Americans, avoiding a problem or “softening” a message can seem unhelpful or even unprofessional.

Silence has a very specific meaning in the U.S. context. **Jenkins (2020)** notes that Americans often assume silence means agreement. If someone disagrees, they are expected to speak up. This reflects a cultural belief that each person is responsible for sharing their own opinion clearly.

Participation is also more equal. **Lytle and Willaby (2006)** show that American managers expect people at all levels of the organization not only senior staff to contribute ideas and

challenge suggestions. Questioning a manager or offering a different view is not considered rude; instead, it signals involvement and interest in solving the problem.

Conflict itself is not viewed negatively. Americans often believe that bringing disagreements into the open creates faster solutions and avoids future misunderstandings. Directness is linked to efficiency and honesty. The main goal is usually to complete the task, even if the discussion becomes tense.

However, these behaviors can create problems in intercultural settings. Japanese partners, who value indirect expression and respect for hierarchy, may see American openness as too strong, too fast, or too confrontational. What Americans think is “helpful clarity” may feel stressful or face-threatening to Japanese colleagues.

Japanese conflict management: indirect, relational and face-sensitive

Japanese conflict management is shaped by collectivism, hierarchy and high-context communication. Maintaining group harmony (*wa*) is a central priority, so people try to avoid open conflict during meetings, especially in larger groups (Tinsley, 1998; Oetzel et al., 2001).

Instead of saying “no” directly, Japanese managers often express disagreement indirectly or speak privately after the meeting (Allan, 2015). They choose their words carefully to avoid embarrassing others or causing loss of face. Protecting relationships is often more important than solving the issue immediately.

Silence also has a different meaning. It usually does not show agreement. It may indicate discomfort, hesitation, or the need to think quietly (Allan, 2015). Silence helps maintain harmony by giving people time to reflect without forcing a direct answer.

Hierarchy also matters. Junior employees may avoid speaking in front of seniors, even when they disagree. They might expect others to understand their concerns through subtle cues or later informal conversations. Shen et al. (2024) note that Japanese communication relies heavily on shared context and mutual sensitivity.

These norms often confuse American managers. U.S. directness can seem aggressive to Japanese colleagues, while Japanese indirectness may appear vague or passive to Americans (Ganapathy, 2019; LeBaron, 2003). As a result, both sides may misunderstand each other’s intentions.

Strategies for more effective conflict management

1. Meta-communication about norms

Teams working across cultures should take time to openly discuss their communication expectations before any serious work begins. This step is important because people often assume that their own style is “normal” for everyone, when in reality different cultures follow different rules. These rules include the meaning of silence, how disagreement should be expressed, who should speak first, how much detail is expected, and whether sensitive issues should be discussed privately or in the main meeting (**Neuliep and Johnson, 2016**).

Talking about these expectations early helps team members understand each other's behavior instead of guessing. For example, Americans may think silence means agreement, while Japanese colleagues may use silence to show hesitation or politeness. If this is not clarified, the team can easily reach the wrong conclusion. Meta-communication meaning communication about communication helps avoid these false assumptions and builds shared understanding (**Dai and Chen, 2022**). It also reduces stress because everyone knows the “rules of the game” before complex discussions begin. In the long term, this makes meetings smoother, clearer and more respectful for both cultures.

2. Hybrid meeting structures

A hybrid meeting structure combines useful elements from both Japanese and American communication styles, helping teams work together more effectively. One important Japanese practice is **nemawashi**, which means discussing ideas privately with key people before the main meeting. This allows concerns to be raised quietly, without pressure, and helps maintain group harmony. It also ensures that employees who prefer indirect communication feel safe sharing their opinions.

On the American side, clear summaries and explicit action points at the end of the meeting help everyone understand what was decided and who is responsible for each task (**Adachi, 2010; Allan, 2015**). This reduces confusion and prevents tasks from being misunderstood or forgotten.

By combining these two approaches, misunderstandings become less likely. Japanese-style pre-meetings support relationship building and create a comfortable space for concerns, while American-style summaries ensure transparency and clarity. Hybrid structures also reduce cultural frustration: Japanese participants feel respected because harmony is protected, while American participants feel satisfied because decisions are clearly documented. Together, both sides benefit from a process that balances context, clarity and respect.

3. Face-sensitive directness

Face-sensitive directness means communicating clearly but in a way that does not embarrass or insult the other person. This approach is very helpful when managing conflict in U.S.- Japan settings, because direct communication is common in the U.S., while protecting face is very important in Japan. Instead of giving blunt criticism, managers can choose softer forms that still deliver the message. Examples include asking a question (“Could we look at another option?”), suggesting possibilities (“Maybe we could try a different method?”), or inviting the other person’s view (“What do you think about adjusting this step?”).

These small changes make the conversation feel less threatening and help maintain dignity for everyone involved (Dai and Chen, 2022). Ganapathy (2019) explains that when direct feedback is delivered in a respectful way, it avoids unnecessary tension and leads to better cooperation. This method also encourages more honest responses from Japanese colleagues, who may feel uncomfortable with blunt feedback but will respond more openly when the message is phrased gently.

Face-sensitive directness therefore bridges the gap between clarity and harmony. It allows American managers to communicate efficiently while showing cultural awareness, and it helps Japanese colleagues feel valued and respected. Over time, this leads to stronger relationships and fewer misunderstandings.

4. Leadership and competence development

Leaders have a powerful influence on how intercultural teams handle conflict. When leaders understand cultural differences and set the right tone, the whole team becomes more comfortable and confident in communication. One effective approach is **intercultural competence training**, which teaches employees how to recognize different communication styles, interpret behaviors correctly, and avoid quick or inaccurate judgments (Lundula, 2024).

Training can include case studies, role play activities, real examples from international business, and reflection sessions. These help managers and employees learn how to adjust their approach in different situations. For example, a leader might learn when to be more direct, when to slow down, when to ask open questions, or when to give more context. This flexibility makes communication smoother and reduces conflict in diverse teams.

Usquiano et al. (2025) emphasize that intercultural competence is not a one time skill but an ongoing process. Managers improve over time as they gain more experience working with other cultures. When leaders model patience, curiosity and respect, their teams are more likely to follow the same behaviors. Good leadership therefore creates a safe environment where people feel comfortable expressing their views, even during disagreements.

Conclusion

Conflict management in US Japan meetings reflect deeper cultural patterns shaped by communication context, power distance and face concerns. U.S. norms encourage openness, clear statements and direct problem-solving, while Japanese norms place greater value on harmony, hierarchy and indirect expression (**Hofstede, 2011; Tinsley, 1998; Oetzel et al., 2001**). Because these expectations differ so sharply, the same behavior such as silence, hesitation or direct criticism can be understood in completely different ways. Americans may see silence as agreement, while Japanese colleagues may use silence to show caution or respect. Likewise, American directness may feel too strong or abrupt, and Japanese indirectness may appear unclear or non-committal (**Allan, 2015; Jenkins, 2020**). These contrasting interpretations make misunderstandings not only possible but predictable in cross-cultural meetings.

For this reason, effective intercultural management requires intentional effort from leaders and teams. Strategies such as meta-communication, where teams openly discuss communication expectations, help reduce false assumptions. Hybrid meeting processes that combine Japanese-style private consultation with American-style clear summaries support both relationship needs and task clarity. Face sensitive directness allows managers to communicate clearly while still protecting dignity and avoiding unnecessary tension. Finally, leadership training and intercultural competence development help managers understand cultural signals, adapt their style and guide their teams more effectively (**Dai and Chen, 2022; Usquiano et al., 2025**).

Overall, successful conflict management in US Japan meetings depends on recognizing cultural differences not as obstacles but as resources. When clarity and harmony are balanced, and when both sides adapt with awareness and respect, cultural differences can be transformed into complementary strengths that improve collaboration and decision-making in international business contexts.

References

Adachi, Y. (2010). Business Negotiations between the Americans and the Japanese. *Global Business Languages*. Available at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1018&context=gbl> (Accessed: 27 November 2025).

Adair, W., Brett, J., Lempereur, A., Okumura, T., Shikhirev, P., Tinsley, C. and Lytle, A. (2004). Culture and Negotiation Strategy. *Negotiation Journal*, 20(1), pp.87-111. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1571-9979.2004.00008.x> (Accessed: 27 November 2025).

Allan, J. (2015). (PDF) *Japanese Conflict Resolution: Cultural Differences, Contrasts, and Styles*. [online] ResearchGate. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276205023_Japanese_Conflict_Resolution_Cultural_Differences_Contrasts_and_Styles. (Accessed: 27 November 2025).

Pheng, L.S. and Leong, C.H.Y. (2000). Cross-cultural project management for international construction in China. *International Journal of Project Management*, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0263-7863\(99\)00027-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0263-7863(99)00027-7) (Accessed: 27 November 2025).

Dai, X. and Chen, G.-M. (2022). *Conflict Management and Intercultural Communication*. Routledge eBooks. Routledge. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003252955>. (Accessed: 28 November 2025).

Ganapathy, N. (2019) 'An American in Japan - A case study in cross-cultural management', in *Cases in Management*, Vol. VIII, pp. 109-116.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Neetu-Ganapathy/publication/368880223_James_Schubert_An_American_in_Japan_-_A_Case_Study_in_Cross-Cultural_Management/links/6406d54eb1704f343fadb21c/James-Schubert-An-American-in-Japan-A-Case-Study-in-Cross-Cultural-Management.pdf
(Accessed: 28 November 2025).

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: the Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, [online] 2(1), pp.1-26. doi:<https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014> (Accessed: 28 November 2025).

Jan, J., Alshare, K.A. and Lane, P.L. (2022). Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions in Technology Acceptance models: a meta-analysis. *Universal Access in the Information Society*. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10209-022-00930-7.pdf> (Accessed: 29 November 2025).

Jenkins, S. (2020). Understanding the Impact of Cross-Cultural Communication Between American and Japanese Businesses. *Senior Theses*, [online] pp.1-28. Available at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/senior_theses/374/ (Accessed: 29 November 2025).

Joyce, C. (2012) *The impact of direct and indirect communication*. [online] Available at: <https://conflictmanagement.org.uiowa.edu/sites/conflictmanagement.org.uiowa.edu/files/2020-01/Direct%20and%20Indirect%20Communication.pdf> (Accessed: 29 November 2025).

Kobayashi, J. (2019). Transition in Intercultural Communication Competence: Business Communication between Japanese and Americans. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 10(4). doi:<https://doi.org/10.30845/ijbss.v10n4p19> (Accessed: 29 November 2025).

Lundula, N. (2024). *Influence of Leaders' Conflict Management Skills on Multicultural Team Management - ProQuest*. [online] Available at: <https://www.proquest.com/openview/94e4c01bf1d9adae0110d0ab8a13e14a/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y> (Accessed: 29 November 2025).

Lytle, A.L. and Willaby, H.W. (2006). Intracultural and Intercultural Negotiations. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.905462> (Accessed: 29 November 2025).

Marcia, D. (2015). The Impact of Cultural Difference on International Business Negotiations. *Academic Leadership Journal in Student Research*, [online] 3, p.4. Available at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=aljsr> (Accessed: 30 November 2025).

Mehra, N. (2025). Bridging Business Cultures: Japan's Relationship-Driven Model vs. the West's Transactional Approach. *SSRN*. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5167932> (Accessed: 30 November 2025).

Shandru and Saravanakumar, A.R. (2023) '*cross cultural conflict resolution styles: an extensive literature review*

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dr-saravanakumar-2/publication/372831900_CROSS_CULTURAL_CONFLICT_RESOLUTION_STYLES_AN_EXTENSIVE_LITERATURE_REVIEW/links/64ca301340a524707b8c2352/CROSS-CULTURAL-CONFLICT-RESOLUTION-STYLES-AN-EXTENSIVE-LITERATURE-REVIEW.pdf (Accessed: 30 November 2025).

Neuliep, J.W. and Johnson, M. (2015). A cross-cultural comparison of Ecuadorian and United States face, facework, and conflict styles during interpersonal conflict: An application of face-negotiation theory. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 9(1), pp.1-19. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2016.1120844> (Accessed: 30 November 2025).

Oetzel, J., Ting-Toomey, S., Masumoto, T., Yokochi, Y., Pan, X., Takai, J. and Wilcox, R. (2001). Face and facework in conflict: a cross-cultural comparison of China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Communication Monographs*, [online] 68(3), pp.235-258. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750128061> (Accessed: 30 November 2025).

Shen, Z., Pang, B., Li, X. and Chen, Y. (2024) 'An exploration of Japanese cultural dynamics communication practices through social pragmatics', *Journal of Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*, 3(1), pp. 60-72. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Zijun-Shen/publication/379931914_An_Exploration_of_Japanese_Cultural_Dynamics_Communication_Practices_through_Social_Pragmatics/links/662a82a108a54017ac072e7/An-Exploration-of-Japanese-Cultural-Dynamics-Communication-Practices-through-Social-Pragmatics.pdf (Accessed: 30 November 2025).

Shigemasu, E. and Ikeda, K. (2006). Face threatening act avoidance and relationship satisfaction between international students and Japanese host students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30(4), pp.439-455. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.10.002> (Accessed: 30 November 2025).

Suzuki, S. (2010). Forms of written arguments: A comparison between Japan and the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34(6), pp.651-660. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.02.005> (Accessed: 1 December 2025).

Usquiano, M.M. et al. (2025) 'Intercultural competence acquisition: a formative perspective', *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 15(11), pp. 3489-3497. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Maria-Usquiano-Piscoya/publication/397352564_Intercultural_Competence_Acquisition_A_Formative_Perspective/links/690cfc9aa404d65709a3a69c/Intercultural-Competence-Acquisition-A-Formative-Perspective.pdf (Accessed: 1 December 2025).

Yi, Y. and Chen, X. (2021). Comparison of the Formality of Business Negotiations in the United States and Japan. *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Public Relations and Social Sciences (ICPRSS 2021)*, 586. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211020.308> (Accessed: 1 December 2025).