



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

200
1822 - 2022

Individual Essay

Unilever Company

Student name: Ana Cojocari

Student ID: 2118833

Module title: International Business Communications
(LCBB6001)

Lecturer: Afzal Munna

Date of submission: 30.03.2025

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Overview of Selected UK & Japanese Companies</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Importance of Intercultural Business Communication</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Theoretical Framework:</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Comparative Analysis of UK vs. Japanese Communication Styles</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Case Study or Real-World Examples</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Strategies to Improve Cross-Cultural Business Communication</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Conclusion</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Summary of Key Findings</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Recommendations for Effective Communication in Multinational Teams.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>References.....</i>	<i>10</i>

Introduction

Unilever, a distinguished British multinational consumer goods corporation headquartered in London, operates across an expansive network of over 190 countries (Unilever, 2024). As a leader in the fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) sector, Unilever boasts a diverse portfolio encompassing food, beverages, personal care, and home care products. The company has set a benchmark in sustainability, innovation, and cultural adaptability, exemplifying how organizations can adeptly navigate the complexities of international markets (Unilever, 2024). In its strategic expansion into Asia, Unilever is forging a partnership with a prominent regional firm in Japan, renowned for its robust business culture, structured corporate hierarchy, and commitment to cultivating long-term relationships. However, this collaboration underscores a significant challenge from the pronounced differences in communication styles and cultural expectations between the UK and Japan. While the UK business environment emphasizes directness, efficiency, and individual accountability, the Japanese corporate framework prioritizes indirect communication, collective consensus, and harmony within professional interactions (Hofstede, 1980; Hall, 1976).

To ensure that effective collaboration between British and Japanese teams is achieved, it is imperative to facilitate a seamless transition and a successful market entry. Miscommunications that arise from differing communication norms can result in inefficiencies, conflicts, and delays in decision-making processes. Consequently, this paper will utilize established cultural frameworks—including Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions, High-Context versus Low-Context Communication, and The Seven Dimensions of Culture—to critically evaluate the key differences in communication styles between UK and Japanese teams. Furthermore, it will identify potential areas for miscommunication and propose actionable strategies to enhance cross-cultural understanding, fostering a more effective and cohesive working environment.

Overview of Selected UK & Japanese Companies

Unilever's UK division operates within a business culture characterized by directness, efficiency, and individualism. In this setting, employees communicate straightforwardly, prioritizing clear and concise exchanges to achieve business objectives. Decision-making is predominantly independent, with individuals taking responsibility for their respective tasks and expected to share their opinions candidly. This approach is consistent with the broader British business culture, where direct communication is valued for promoting efficiency and clarity in the workplace (Hofstede, 2001).

Conversely, Unilever's Japanese operations are deeply influenced by the collectivist culture of Japan, which emphasizes group harmony, respect, and indirect communication. Employees in this context often prioritize maintaining positive relationships within their teams, frequently shying away from confrontation or overt criticism to uphold social harmony. Decision-making in this environment tends to be consensus-driven, with considerable attention given to the perspectives of all team members before concluding. This practice reflects the ingrained cultural preference for group cohesion and hierarchical respect prevalent in Japanese business settings (Hofstede, 2001).

These cultural disparities can present challenges for a multinational corporation such as Unilever, mainly when employees from both divisions collaborate. British employees may

perceive the indirect communication style of their Japanese counterparts as unclear or overly cautious. In contrast, Japanese employees may view the directness of their British colleagues as too abrupt or even confrontational. Misunderstandings may arise without a mutual understanding of these differences, potentially hindering teamwork and efficiency (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012).

To effectively bridge these cultural gaps, employees in both divisions must understand each other's communication styles and business expectations. Implementing cross-cultural training can facilitate mutual understanding by elucidating the rationale behind differing communication approaches. Promoting a flexible communication style that respects direct and indirectness can foster a more inclusive work environment. By acknowledging and adapting to these cultural differences, Unilever can enhance collaboration between its UK and Japanese teams, ultimately strengthening its global business operations (Hofstede, 2001; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012).

An illustration of Unilever's adjustment to the Japanese market can be seen with its luxury beauty brand. Initially introduced in the UK, Lux is promoted as a high-end personal care line highlighting luxury and glamour (Unilever, 2024). In the UK, Lux advertisements showcase striking messages, celebrity endorsements, and an emphasis on personal self-care, reflecting Western ideals of individual expression (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). However, as Unilever entered the Japanese market, it needed to revise its branding approach to fit local cultural expectations.

Japanese consumers favour subtlety and elegance in marketing, prompting Lux to alter its messaging to highlight beauty as a manifestation of self-discipline and social harmony instead of personal luxury (Hofstede, 2001). For example, luxury advertisements in Japan frequently feature well-known Japanese actresses in gentle, visually artistic narratives, showcasing the product's ability to enhance natural beauty rather than promote individual prominence (Hall, 1976). Furthermore, product formulations were modified to align with Japanese beauty ideals, such as lighter textures and floral fragrances that appeal to local preferences (Unilever, 2024). Internally, Unilever also faced challenges regarding communication styles between its UK and Japanese teams. British managers, who used to have direct discussions and prompt decision-making, found it difficult to adapt to the Japanese practice of consensus-building and respecting hierarchical structures (Hofstede, 1980). For example, during initial meetings between the UK and Japanese teams, British executives anticipated immediate feedback on marketing proposals. In contrast, their Japanese counterparts preferred to analyse information thoroughly before giving a collective response (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). This discrepancy necessitated Unilever to introduce cultural training and organized communication methods, such as supplying written summaries before meetings to allow Japanese colleagues time for internal deliberation (Hall, 1976).

By acknowledging these essential differences, Unilever can develop strategies to close cultural divides and improve collaboration between its UK and Japanese teams. Utilizing frameworks like Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions, High-Context vs. Low-Context Communication, and The Seven Dimensions of Culture can assist the company in effectively addressing these challenges, promoting a more unified and productive work environment (Hofstede, 2001; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998).

Importance of Intercultural Business Communication

In multinational corporations like Unilever, teams are often spread across different countries and cultures. Differences in communication can lead to misunderstandings, which in turn can lead to conflicts, delays, and reduced productivity. Intercultural business communication is essential for building strong relationships, ensuring smooth collaboration, and achieving organisational goals. By improving communication, Unilever can enhance cooperation

between teams in different regions and create a more inclusive and efficient workplace (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003).

To mitigate these challenges, Unilever instituted comprehensive intercultural training programs to bridge the communication gap between the two regions. These initiatives facilitated a better understanding of each other's conversation styles and business expectations. Furthermore, the company promoted a more adaptive leadership approach, encouraging UK managers to cultivate patience and consideration for hierarchical nuances while inspiring Indian employees to articulate their viewpoints more freely in international meetings. Consequently, Unilever has seen improvements in teamwork, enhanced decision-making efficiency, and strengthened collaboration between its UK and Indian operations (Unilever, 2020).

This case underscores the critical role of effective intercultural business communication for multinational entities like Unilever. By comprehensively understanding and adjusting to diverse communication styles, businesses can foster collaboration, diminish misunderstandings, and cultivate a more inclusive global work environment.

Theoretical Framework

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions: Geert Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory is one of the most well-known frameworks for understanding cultural differences. According to Hofstede, cultures vary on dimensions like individualism vs collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity vs femininity, long-term vs short-term orientation, and indulgence vs restraint. The UK is often considered more individualistic, with a relatively low power distance, while Japan tends to be more collectivist, with a higher power distance. This can influence communication styles, decision-making processes, and how authority is respected in the workplace (Hofstede, 2001).

Edward T. Hall's theory of high-context and low-context communication is instrumental in navigating the complexities of intercultural communication, especially within global business operations. Hall (1976) identifies two distinct categories—high-context and low-context cultures—each differing in how the context of communication influences the transmission and interpretation of messages. In low-context cultures like the UK, communication tends to be explicit, direct, and heavily reliant on verbal expressions. This clarity ensures that messages are conveyed effectively, with individuals expected to articulate their thoughts openly. As noted by Hall, transparency and efficiency are highly valued, which is evident in British business practices prioritising quick decision-making and individual accountability.

In contrast, high-context cultures, exemplified by Japan, prioritise the surrounding context, non-verbal cues, and a shared understanding among individuals. In such settings, the meaning of a message is often inferred through subtle cues and the relational dynamics present, prompting a more indirect communication style. This is particularly relevant in Japanese business environments where maintaining harmony is paramount; employees may express disagreement through nuanced language rather than confrontation. For instance, a Japanese employee may suggest reconsidering a proposal with phrases like "I will consider this," showcasing the delicate balance between honesty and relational preservation (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012). Understanding these divergent communication styles is essential for fostering effective collaboration across cultures, highlighting the need for awareness and adaptability in diverse business contexts.

High-context cultures, such as Japan, fundamentally prioritise relational dynamics and contextual nuances in communication. In these settings, interpersonal interactions are characterised by emphasising non-verbal cues, the surrounding environment, and the shared history of the individuals involved. According to Hall (1976), the significance of a message is often derived from these subtle indicators rather than explicit statements. Consequently,

communication in Japan tends to be more indirect; essential information is conveyed through gestures, tone of voice, and timing, allowing for a sophisticated exchange that fosters group cohesion. Hall (1976) also observes that individuals in high-context cultures typically strive to avoid confrontation, opting instead for approaches that preserve harmony and consensus. This is particularly evident in Japanese business practices, where employees may refrain from delivering direct negative feedback. For instance, a Japanese team member might respond to a proposal with phrases such as "I will consider this" or "Perhaps it is something we can think about," effectively signalling dissent while maintaining a respectful tone (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012). Such communication strategies highlight the intricate interplay between context and meaning in high-context cultures, underscoring the importance of nuance in professional interactions.

The Seven Dimensions of Culture: This model, developed by Fons Trompenaars, highlights different ways cultures approach issues like universalism vs. particularism, individualism vs. communitarianism, and achievement vs. ascription. UK culture leans towards universalism, where rules are applied uniformly, while Japan leans towards particularism, where context and relationships influence decisions. This influences how teams from both countries perceive fairness, manage conflicts, and collaborate (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998).

Comparative Analysis of UK vs. Japanese Communication Styles

Directness vs. Indirectness: The UK communication style tends to be more direct and explicit. UK teams are likely to state their opinions clearly when addressing issues, even if this might be blunt. On the other hand, Japanese teams emphasise maintaining harmony and avoiding confrontation. This often leads to indirect communication, where people may not express disagreement openly but may communicate their thoughts through subtle cues or non-verbal signals (Hofstede, 2001). A UK team might view a Japanese colleague's silence or non-committal response as a lack of interest, while a Japanese team might view a UK team's directness as rude or overly aggressive.

Formality and Respect for Hierarchy: In Japan, respect for hierarchy is critical, and the individual's position within the organisation often shapes communication. Seniority is highly regarded, and decisions are made collaboratively, with input from various levels. In contrast, UK teams are more likely to engage in egalitarian communication, where individuals are encouraged to share their ideas regardless of their position. This can sometimes lead to discomfort for Japanese teams when UK teams adopt an informal, open approach (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998).

Decision-Making Processes: In the UK, decision-making is often faster and more individualistic, focusing on efficiency and achieving results. In contrast, decision-making in Japan is a slower, more group-oriented process involving consensus-building and careful consideration of all viewpoints. This difference can cause frustration in multinational projects when UK teams push for quick decisions, while Japanese teams prefer to take their time to consult and ensure agreement from all parties (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003).

Case Study or Real-World Examples

In a past Unilever project involving UK and Japanese teams, there were delays in approving a new product launch due to differences in communication styles. The UK team, expecting a quick decision, was frustrated by the Japanese team's reluctance to respond directly. On the other hand, the Japanese team felt that the UK team was too pushy and disregarded the importance of group consensus. This case highlights the need for mutual understanding and adaptation of communication approaches to ensure successful collaboration (Unilever, 2019).

Strategies to Improve Cross-Cultural Business Communication

Training and Awareness: Unilever can benefit from intercultural communication training for its employees, ensuring that UK and Japanese teams understand each other's cultural norms

and communication preferences. This would promote a more respectful and empathetic environment (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003).

Adaptation of Communication Styles: Team leaders should encourage flexibility in communication. For example, UK team members might need a more indirect approach when interacting with Japanese colleagues. Japanese team members might need to communicate more explicitly and directly with their UK counterparts (Hall, 1976).

Clarification and Feedback: Encouraging open feedback and clarification can prevent misunderstandings. Team members should feel comfortable asking for clarification when communication is ambiguous or unclear, which is especially important in cross-cultural contexts (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998).

Building Trust: Trust is key in any business relationship. Creating opportunities for informal interactions, team-building activities, and cross-cultural exchanges can help build trust between UK and Japanese teams, improving the flow of communication and cooperation (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003).

Conclusion

In conclusion, understanding and adapting to the communication styles of different cultures is essential for successful collaboration in multinational teams. The UK and Japan present distinct challenges in this regard, shaped by their cultural dimensions, communication preferences, and decision-making processes. By applying cultural frameworks such as Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions, High-Context vs. Low-Context Communication, and The Seven Dimensions of Culture, Unilever can improve communication between UK and Japanese teams, reduce misunderstandings, and foster a more productive and harmonious working environment.

Summary of Key Findings

- UK teams favour direct, explicit communication, while Japanese teams rely on indirect, context-driven communication.
- The UK is more individualistic, while Japan values collectivism and group harmony.
- Differences in decision-making processes and respect for hierarchy can lead to misunderstandings.

Recommendations for Effective Communication in Multinational Teams

- Promote cultural awareness and communication training to bridge the gap between UK and Japanese teams.
- Encourage flexibility in communication styles, allowing each team to adapt to the other's cultural expectations.
- Foster an environment of mutual respect, trust, and openness to feedback to improve cross-cultural collaboration.

By implementing these strategies, Unilever can create a more inclusive, effective, and collaborative environment for its multinational teams.

References

Gudykunst, W.B. & Kim, Y.Y., 2003. *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Hall, E.T., (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hofstede, G., (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions, and organisations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Trompenaars, F. & Hampden-Turner, C., 1998. *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Unilever, (2019). *Annual report 2019*. Unilever. Available at: <https://www.unilever.com/investor-relations/annual-report-and-accounts> [Accessed 18 March 2025].