Scientific and Social Research, 2026, Volume 8, Issue 4
http://ojs.bbwpublisher.com/index.php/ssr
Online ISSN: 2981-9946
Print ISSN: 2661-4332

Navigating Cross-Cultural Management Challenges: A Case-Based Analysis of Communication, Leadership, and Institutional Gaps in Global Business

Shan He*

Beijing ZWZ Tech Co., Ltd., Beijing 100000, China

Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.

Abstract: Cross-cultural management failures remain a persistent challenge in international business, often resulting from unaddressed differences in communication styles, leadership expectations, and institutional norms. Drawing on a comprehensive set of case studies and course materials from a leading business school, this paper examines the root causes of cross-cultural friction in multinational settings. It analyzes three detailed cases—the Suji-INS joint venture in Japan, the Michelin North America leadership conflict, and the Hazelton International highway project in Soronga—alongside the cross-cultural email miscommunication between a Dutch manager and his Mexican counterpart. Using Hofstede's cultural dimensions, Hall's high/low-context communication framework, and theories of cultural intelligence (CQ), the paper identifies recurring patterns of misalignment. It then evaluates alternative intervention strategies, including structured cross-cultural training, adaptive communication protocols, reciprocal adaptation programs, and feedback loops. The findings suggest that sustainable cross-cultural effectiveness requires moving beyond generic cultural awareness to institutionally embedded, reciprocal adaptation mechanisms. The paper concludes with practical recommendations for managers and outlines implications for global leadership development.

Keywords: Cross-cultural management; Cultural Intelligence; Communication styles; Leadership; Joint ventures; Institutional gaps

Online publication: May 25, 2026

1. Introduction

Globalization has made cross-cultural interaction a routine part of organizational life. Yet, as the course materials from UCL's "Managing Across Cultures" program emphasize, "failure on the part of managers to appreciate and deal with the differences in attitudes, values, and behavior of those with whom they interact

in international business transactions consistently has been shown to be a major source of difficulties." This paper explores how such difficulties manifest in real-world settings, using a collection of case studies and problem analyses to identify both causes and remedies.

The first attachment, "The Cross-Cultural Management Problem", outlines day-to-day manifestations of cross-cultural friction: communication misalignment, leadership expectation conflicts, and decision-making style variations, all of which erode trust and morale [1]. The second attachment, "Managing Across Cultures (Pre-Course Materials)", provides deeper institutional and cultural context through multiple cases: the Suji-INS joint venture (Japan-U.S.), the Michelin leadership challenge (France-U.S.), Hazelton International (Canada-Soronga), and an email conflict between a Dutch manager and a Mexican counterpart.

This paper synthesizes these materials with established cross-cultural theories to answer two research questions: (1) What are the most common and damaging cross-cultural management problems in multinational operations? (2) What intervention strategies are most effective in addressing them?

2. Literature review

2.1. Cultural dimensions and communication styles

Hofstede's (2001) cultural dimensions provide a foundational lens. In the Suji-INS case, the U.S. preference for individualism and direct communication clashes with Japan's collectivism and indirectness. Similarly, Hall's (1976) high-context versus low-context communication explains why Japanese managers' indirectness is perceived as "vague" by Americans, while American directness is seen as confrontational.

2.2. Leadership and decision-making across cultures

House et al. (2004), in the GLOBE study, found that effective leadership attributes vary significantly across cultures. The Michelin case illustrates this: Olivier Chalon, a French manager, applied a demanding, results-driven style that was effective in Europe but perceived as arrogant and demoralizing in the U.S. This aligns with Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner's (2012) distinction between universalist and particularist cultures.

2.3. Cultural intelligence (CQ)

Thomas and Inkson (2017) define cultural intelligence as the capability to function effectively across cultures. The Suji-INS case shows low CQ on both sides: the U.S. partner misinterprets the Japanese executive placement system as "retirement dumping", while the Japanese partner fails to explain the logic of amakudari (descent from heaven).

2.4. Institutional gaps and stakeholder complexity

The Hazelton International case reveals how institutional differences—between a Canadian consulting firm, a Sorongan government agency, and local Tolanese communities—create layered complexity. This reflects institutional theory's emphasis on regulatory, normative, and cognitive pillars [1].

3. Methodology

This paper uses a qualitative case-study approach. Data are drawn from the two provided attachments, which contain authentic business cases, country fact sheets, and problem descriptions used in executive education.

The cases were selected for their diversity in geographic coverage (Asia, Europe, North America), industry (consulting, manufacturing, infrastructure), and problem type (leadership, communication, institutional). Analysis is guided by the theoretical frameworks described above, following Yin's (2018) case-study methodology.

4. Case analyses

4.1. Suji-INS K.K.: Joint venture governance and personnel decisions

The Suji-INS joint venture in Japan represents a classic cross-cultural governance conflict. INS, a U.S. technology firm, holds one-third equity; Suji, a Japanese manufacturer, holds two-thirds. Following the sudden death of the joint venture's president, Suji nominates Kenzo Satoh, a senior staff executive near retirement. INS's president, Mike Flynn, objects, perceiving the nomination as using the joint venture as a retirement posting. Flynn instead proposes Takao Toray, a younger marketing manager.

The conflict reflects divergent institutional logics. In Japan, the practice of amakudari (placing senior executives in subsidiaries) is a legitimate part of lifetime employment systems [2]. From a U.S. perspective, however, it appears nepotistic and undermines meritocracy. Flynn's attempt to impose U.S.-style merit-based promotion disregards the Japanese expectation that age and seniority confer authority. The resulting standoff—Suji rejects Toray as "unheard of"—demonstrates how institutional misalignment can paralyze joint ventures

4.2. Leading across cultures at Michelin: French management in the U.S.

Olivier Chalon, a successful French executive, moves to lead a Michelin business unit in South Carolina. Six months into the role, he discovers that his U.S. subordinates perceive him as arrogant, cold, and demoralizing—a stark contrast to his reputation in Europe.

This case exemplifies the difference between French and American leadership expectations. In France, hierarchical authority and intellectual rigor are respected; managers are expected to challenge subordinates to achieve excellence [3]. In the U.S., effective leaders are expected to be approachable, to give positive feedback, and to balance task demands with relationship-building [4]. Chalon's withholding of praise—intended to prevent complacency—was read by Americans as a lack of appreciation. His refusal to discuss personal matters was seen as coldness, not professionalism.

The case also highlights the subtlety of language fluency: Chalon spoke English but missed the emotional and relational cues embedded in American workplace interactions (Meyer, 2014). The suggestion that he consult a cross-cultural advisor reflects a growing recognition that CQ must be deliberately developed [5].

4.3. Hazelton International: Force account and stakeholder complexity

The Hazelton International case involves a Canadian consulting firm supervising a highway reconstruction project in Soronga (a fictional country resembling Indonesia). The project is funded by an international aid agency and executed on a "force account" basis, meaning government employees do the construction. Hazelton's role is advisory, yet it is blamed for delays.

The problems are multiply layered. First, there are cultural tensions between Hakonese supervisors and Tolanese workers, rooted in colonial history and religious differences [6]. Second, the budgeting process is rigid and annual, preventing flexible resource allocation. Third, the client (Sorongan Highway Department)

lacks construction experience and reassigns trained counterparts arbitrarily. Fourth, expatriate staff are underutilized due to changing project parameters.

This case illustrates the concept of "institutional voids" and the challenge of operating in politically sensitive, post-colonial environments [7]. It also shows that cross-cultural management problems are not merely interpersonal but are embedded in institutional arrangements.

4.4. Johannes van den Bosch sends an email: Communication and hierarchy

This brief case presents an email from a Dutch manager (Johannes) to a Mexican counterpart (Pablo), demanding a detailed status report on overdue financial statements. The tone is blunt, direct, and implicitly critical. From a Dutch perspective, this is efficient and transparent; from a Mexican perspective, it is aggressive and disrespectful of hierarchy [8].

The case is a microcosm of low-context (Dutch) versus high-context (Mexican) communication [9]. Mexicans expect relationship-building before task-focused demands; direct confrontation is avoided. Johannes's email, without prior relationship or face-saving language, would likely be perceived as an attack, further delaying cooperation.

4.5. Synthesis of findings across cases

Across all cases, three cross-cutting themes emerge:

Unspoken cultural assumptions—about leadership, time, hierarchy, and communication—operate beneath the surface until a conflict erupts.

Institutional frameworks (Japanese lifetime employment, French educational elitism, Sorongan post-colonial governance) shape behavior in ways that outsiders misinterpret.

Interventions focused solely on individual behavior are insufficient; structural and institutional adaptations are required.

5. Alternative approaches and recommended interventions

The first attachment proposes three intervention categories: structured cross-cultural training, adaptive communication protocols, and regular cross-cultural feedback loops [10]. The course materials expand on these.

5.1. Structured cross-cultural training

Traditional cross-cultural training often focuses on country-specific facts. However, the Michelin case shows that even experienced global managers (like Chalon) need deeper, reflective training that addresses unconscious assumptions [11]. Training should include:

Self-assessment of CQ (as in the course's CQ assessment, Stening, 2025, p. 13).

Simulation exercises that expose participants to different communication and leadership norms.

Case-based learning that highlights the relational logic behind seemingly irrational behaviors [12].

5.2. Adaptive communication protocols

The Suji-INS and Johannes van den Bosch cases point to the need for explicit communication protocols. These might include:

A rule that negative feedback should be delivered in person or via phone, not email.

Use of "culture brokers"—bicultural staff who interpret between parties.

Standardized reporting formats that leave less room for misinterpretation (as Flynn attempted, albeit too late).

5.3. Reciprocal adaptation programs

The Hazelton case suggests that adaptation cannot be one-sided. Reciprocal adaptation means both parties adjust their behaviors and expectations. In the Hazelton context, this would require the expatriate team to better understand Tolanese historical grievances, while the Sorongan authorities would need to align their budgeting and staffing practices with project realities. This is consistent with the concept of "biculturalism" in joint ventures [13].

5.4. Regular cross-cultural feedback loops

The first attachment recommends quarterly "culture check-ins" and anonymous surveys [14]. In the Michelin case, such a mechanism could have surfaced dissatisfaction earlier. In Suji-INS, it might have allowed Flynn to understand the rationale for Satoh's nomination before issuing a rejection.

6. Discussion and practical implications

The cases analyzed reveal that cross-cultural management problems are rarely purely "cultural" in the narrow sense. They are compounded by institutional constraints, power asymmetries, and historical legacies. The Suji-INS conflict, for example, cannot be resolved without acknowledging the Japanese corporate governance system. The Hazelton project cannot succeed without addressing the colonial-era mistrust between Hakonese and Tolanese.

For practitioners, several principles emerge:

Do not assume fluency equals cultural competence. Chalon's fluent English did not protect him from misreading American relational norms.

Understand the institutional context. In Japan, personnel decisions follow a logic distinct from Western meritocracy.

Create structural mechanisms for adaptation. Relying on individual goodwill is insufficient; systems for feedback, communication, and joint decision-making must be codified.

Invest in pre-departure and in-country training. The UCL course's emphasis on pre-course preparation reflects best practice [15].

7. Conclusion

This paper has examined cross-cultural management problems through the lens of real-world cases. It demonstrates that such problems are multi-causal, involving cultural, institutional, and interpersonal dimensions. Solutions must therefore be multi-pronged, combining individual CQ development with organizational-level adaptations. The case materials from UCL and the problem-solution framework from the first attachment provide a rich basis for both academic analysis and managerial action. As global business complexity increases, the ability to navigate cultural differences will remain a critical leadership capability.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Yi LF, Liu ST, Song J, et al., 2021, Employee Cultural Value Orientation, Cross-cultural Interaction Ability and Innovation Performance: An Empirical Study Based on Multinational R&D Enterprises in Shanghai. Journal of East China Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), 53(1): 155–168 + 174.

[2] Zhou AJ, 2024, Cross-cultural Adaptation Strategies for International Communication Talents: An Analysis Based on Hofstede's Cultural Dimension Theory. Journal of Zhongzhou University, 41(2): 87–92.

[3] Sun QH, 2024, Research on the Cross-cultural Adaptation of International Students from the Perspective of International Chinese Language Education: Based on Hofstede's Cultural Dimension Theory. Journal of Tianjin University of Applied Technology, 2024(5): 92–96.

[4] Xu XS, 2024, Challenges and Countermeasures of Cross-Cultural Management in Enterprises in the Era of Globalization. Modernization of Shopping Malls, 2024(7): 101–103.

[5] Hou Ql, 2024, Discussion on Strategies and Paths for Chinese Enterprises to Implement Cross-Cultural Management in the African Market. Enterprise Reform and Management, 2024(1): 111–113.

[6] Gan Xl, 2024, Research on the Optimization Strategies of Cultural Management of Multinational Enterprises in China under the Background of the "Belt and Road Initiative". Investment and Entrepreneurship, 35(18): 97–99.

[7] Wang CZ, 2024, Analysis of the Demand for Business Management Talents in Private Enterprises in Guangdong Province under the Background of the "Belt and Road Initiative" and Countermeasures for Their Cultivation. Industrial Innovation Research, 2024(17): 168–174.

[8] Wu MB, Gong ZZ, 2023, Cross-cultural Integrated Communication Facilitates Enterprises to Steadily "Go Global". Enterprise Management, 2023(S1): 274–275.

[9] Xu GG, 2025, Symbiotic Key Cross-cultural Integration. Enterprise Management, 2025(5): 14–19.

[10] Yang WY, 2023, Discussion on Cross-cultural Communication Issues of Overseas Managers. Foreign Economic and Trade Practice, 2023(5): 112–115.

[11] He PP, 2021, Challenges and Countermeasures of Cross-Cultural Communication in Multinational Corporations. Jiangsu Business Review, 2021(8): 103–105.

[12] Song XL, 2022, Research on Cross-Cultural Management of Multinational Companies in China: A Comparative Analysis of Swedish Company Y and American Company J as Examples. National Circulation Economy, 2022(16): 40–42.

[13] Wang J, 2022, Research on Cultural Conflict and Integration in Cross-Cultural Management, thesis, Renmin University of China.

[14] Lu Y, 2022, Research on Cross-cultural Human Resource Management of CNOOC Iraq Project, thesis, China University of Petroleum (Beijing).

[15] Li M, 2023, Research on Cross-cultural Integration Strategies in Cross-border Mergers and Acquisitions of Chinese Enterprises, thesis, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics.