

National Research University Higher School of Economics

as a manuscript

**Bultseva Maria**

**Intercultural contacts and cross-cultural competence as factors of Russian students' creativity**

PhD Dissertation Summary

for the purpose of obtaining academic degree

Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology

Academic supervisor:

Nadezhda Lebedeva

Professor, Doctor of Science

Moscow 2020

## GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DISSERTATION

### **The relevance of the research problem**

Creativity can be understood as the creation of a product that is useful and novel in terms of the existing social context (Batey, 2012). Products can be created not only in the framework of some creative or technological industries, but also in the social domain as some form of social innovation. Such innovations help people to adapt to the new conditions of a changing environment. On the individual level creativity may serve as a path toward flourishing and achieving psychological well-being (Conner, DeYoung, Silvia, 2018). In a more general sense, creativity is usually associated with success, ability to follow current trends, to cope with novelty and uncertainty, and to keep up with progress (KEA, 2009). In this regard understanding creativity and its predictors is incredibly important for human progress (Hennessey, Amabile, 2010). Increasing the level of creativity is important not only for individuals, but also for the successful functioning of society as a whole. Therefore, some managerial practitioners think that creativity and innovation are competencies that must be developed by educational programs aimed at adults (Rusmussen, 2012). Some international educational organizations expand this notion and state that stimulating the creativity of their students is an additional task for all educational organizations (KEA, 2009). Nevertheless, there is no consensus about the influence of an educational environment on creativity. Some scientists and practitioners claim that the educational environment with all its strict rules, formal requirements and limitations hinders creative abilities (Robinson, 2001). While others believe that school or college, as an important socializing institute, plays a large role in shaping creativity (Amabile, 1996; Csikszentmihalyi, 1999). The second belief is mainly about an extended understanding of the educational environment, referring to the ideas of Csikszentmihalyi that interaction with the environment, considered in the unity of its cultural and social components, stimulates creativity. However, studies show that the educational environment – understood in a very narrow sense as the curriculum itself – has only a slight influence on students' creativity (Marquis et al., 2017). So there should be some additional factors in an university environment which can stimulate creativity. The

multicultural context of the educational environment can contribute to the creativity stimulation.

### **Problem of the research**

In general, intercultural contacts covering various direct and indirect interactions with representatives or elements of other cultures (Dunne, 2017), can provide intercultural learning (either formal, through learning courses, or informal, through intercultural communication), and activate certain cognitive mechanisms associated with creativity growth (Leung et al., 2008). However, Rich's comment on the article about intercultural experience and creativity (2009) shows that the research focus is rather limited. Previous studies have established interrelations between intercultural experience and creativity in cases of "Big M" (profound forms of multicultural experience) - significant intercultural experience, mainly among migrants and sojourners; probably we also can place here expatriates and students abroad. While intercultural contacts and cultural learning are possible even in the case of "Little M" (mild forms of multicultural experience), the relationship between creativity and this type of multicultural experience have not been studied sufficiently (Rich, 2009; Maddux et al., 2009). This research emphasize the role of "Little M" which can take place at home country. The research addresses intercultural context of the home country university as possible resource of creativity growth and aims to investigate how intercultural experience in the university affects creativity.

### **The degree of scientific development of the problem**

In modern foreign studies, the question of the socio-psychological factors of creativity is inevitably raised (Meshkova, 2015). Russian researchers also consider creativity as a complex, even socioculturally determined phenomenon, for example, in Vygotsky (1998), Petrovsky (1992), Shadrikov (2007), Bogoyavlenskaya (2007). Culture, as an important aspect of the social environment, can also affect creativity. However, globalization is increasing the relevance of considering creativity not just in its cultural aspect, but in the context of intercultural interactions (Dunne, 2017).

Numerous studies have shown that creativity is higher for migrants (Simonton, 1992), children from intercultural families (Chang et al., 2012), workers (Fee & Gray,

2014), and students (Russel et al., 2011) who spent a long time abroad. Cultural diversity is also a resource for the development of creativity, provided that integration trends prevail in intercultural interaction (Maddux, Galinsky, 2009): when positive attitudes towards diversity and openness to new experience are formed (Leung, Chiu, 2008), when there is a bicultural identity (Tadmor et al., 2009; Tadmor et al., 2012) when an individual successfully adapts to a new cultural environment (Leung et al., 2008). In addition to the personality characteristics of the individual, the determining factors in this process are an open and deep dialogue between cultures (Maddux, Galinsky, 2010), a comparison of cultures, an emphasis on their differences (Cheng, Leung, 2012), and deep functional cultural learning (Maddux, Galinsky, 2010).

A few studies on the relationship between intercultural interactions and the creativity of the host majority have shown that at the group level, creativity is higher within culturally heterogeneous small groups (Paulus et al., 2016), especially when there are deep cultural differences (Stahl et al., 2010), and the context allows the minimization of conflicts arising due to cultural differences and freely expressing one's own ideas (Bouncken et al., 2013). Creativity is also higher at the individual level, for those whose communication network is more ethnically diverse (Chua, 2018), or who are involved in friendships or romantic relationships with members of other cultures (Lu et al, 2017). The theoretical model of Crisp & Turner (2011) suggests that diversity will have positive effects if it stimulates the overcoming of existing stereotypes. If a person manages to overcome the stress of acculturation – and the host population is also experiencing it (Bochner, 2003) – and successfully adapt, then the level of creativity can increase due to the combination of diverse new cultural information and increased cognitive flexibility.

Cross-cultural (or intercultural) competence may be an indicator of adaptability. Cross-cultural competence is manifested in the ability to live, work and relax in the context of intercultural differences that exist in everyday life (Matsumoto, 2003). Cross-cultural competence has a complex structure. Modern science uses more than 300 terms and a large number of models related to them (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). Most of these models include the same core components (Crajevski, 2011).

Most often, cross-cultural competence includes attitudes, knowledge and skills that facilitate effective communication and interaction with representatives of other cultures (Chiu, Lonner, Matsumoto & Ward, 2013). Cultural intelligence, often considered synonymous with cross-cultural competence, is an important element of generative creative processes (Yunlu, Clapp-Smith & Shaffer, 2017). Given this fact and the general importance of cross-cultural competence, we assume that it can be directly related to creativity.

An important fact is that cultural learning and intercultural contacts are the main predictors of cross-cultural competence (Barrett, 2012). Cross-cultural competence can be developed through intercultural learning (Klak & Martin, 2003), through the study of one or more foreign languages (Olson & Kroeger, 2001), through direct experience of intercultural interaction (attending international schools and multicultural institutions that have a non-discriminatory environment) or intense communication with people from other countries (Zhai & Scheer, 2004). On the basis of such information we suppose that cross-cultural competence may be not only an independent factor of creativity, but a mediating mechanism of the relationship between intercultural contacts and creativity.

Features of adaptation to another culture and attitudes toward foreigners and their cultures – and thus, the general attitude to the maintenance of cultures and the desirability of intercultural contact – are also reflected in the Berry acculturation model. In our study, this theory of the host population seems to be especially important, as it includes not only ideas about how the host population itself should behave with representatives of other cultures, but also speculations of the host populations about how cultural minorities themselves should behave. Berry noted that where cultural differences are large and lead to a deep conflict of values, the best strategy for mutual adaptation is “integration”, while “marginalization” is the least adaptive and most likely associated with acculturation stress (Berry, 2013). The theoretical model of inclusion in the second culture of Tadmor and Tetlock (2009) indirectly suggests there is a connection between integration and cognitive complexity (which is connected

closely with creativity). Thus, we additionally state the research question about the role of acculturation attitudes in creativity of Russian students.

### **The aim of the research**

In general, this study is aimed at investigating how the internationalization of modern higher education is associated with the creativity of students. Speaking at the level of specific manifestations of such a possible internationalization, it can be said that the purpose of the study is to identify the relationship between intercultural contacts at the university, cross-cultural competence and the creativity of Russian students.

Within the university context we can talk not only about the existence or intensity of the contacts, but also about the conditions under which intercultural contacts are happening. Taking into consideration the results of previous studies, conditions such as the cultural heterogeneity of the study groups and possibility for a formal cultural learning offered by the institution of higher education may be important.

The cultural approach applied to creativity understanding and the results obtained also raised additional questions about role of acculturation expectations and the perception of foreigners and cross-cultural competence by Russian students. The initial research was extended, and the final research structure included the theoretical part and several empirical studies conducted from a mixed-method perspective in order to specify and interpret the results. Each of the studies had its own lower-order aims.

### **Objectives of the research:**

1) To conduct an analytical review of literature on the subject of creativity in the context of intercultural interactions, as well as consider intercultural contacts and cross-cultural competence in this context;

2) To study the dynamics of creativity of Russian students studying in different conditions in terms of the possibility of intercultural contacts and the availability of cultural learning;

3) To determine the relationship of intercultural contacts and the conditions for their implementation with creativity, as well as the role of cross-cultural competence and acculturation expectations;

4) To identify the features of the Russian students' perception that are significant for explaining the relationships of the studied concepts in the context of intercultural relations with foreign students at the university.

The research **object** is the creativity of Russian students as a host population in the context of intercultural interactions. The research **subject** is the association of intercultural contacts, cross-cultural competence and creativity of Russian students.

### **Hypotheses:**

In the framework of this study, the following hypotheses were formulated:

Hypothesis 1: Studying in culturally heterogeneous groups stimulates creativity of Russian students;

Hypothesis 2: Participation in a learning course on interactions of cultures stimulates creativity of Russian students

Hypothesis 3: Intercultural contacts at the university are positively associated with the creativity of Russian students.

Hypothesis 4: Cross-cultural competence is positively associated with the creativity of Russian students.

Hypothesis 5: Cross-cultural competence mediates the relationship between intercultural contacts at the university and the creativity of Russian students.

Intercultural contacts at the university are determined by the intensity of friendly contacts with foreigners and the conditions for making contacts: the degree of heterogeneity of the study group and the amount of formal cultural learning (as participation on learning courses on topics related with cultures and intercultural interactions). Cross-cultural competence includes knowledge, attitudes towards representatives of other cultures, changing behavior in communication with representatives of other cultures, and awareness (awareness of the cultural conditionality of what is happening).

Due to the use of the cultural theory of creativity as a theoretical basis, as well as the theoretically and empirically revealed high significance of attitudes towards other cultures in connection with the openness to new experience and new knowledge (Flynn, 2005; Galego, Pardos, 2014), we decided to include analysis of acculturation expectations of the host population. In particular, the following research questions were posed:

QR1. Do acculturation expectations of Russian students towards foreign students relate to their creativity?

QR2. What role do acculturation expectations towards foreign students play in the relationship of intercultural contacts and creativity of Russian students?

To interpret the results of the study of the relationship between intercultural contacts and the conditions for their implementation, intercultural competence and acculturation expectations with creativity, an additional analysis of the perception by Russian students of intercultural differences and needful competencies, as well as expectations in relation to foreign students, was necessary. Therefore, the research methodology was mixed (mix-method methodology) including both quantitative and qualitative methods. Qualitative methods were used to find the answer to the following research question:

QR3. Are there differences in the perception of cultural differences, the necessary cross-cultural competencies and acculturation expectations of more creative and less creative Russian students?

### **Theoretical and methodological basis of the research**

The theoretical and methodological basis of the thesis was composed of works on creativity and creativity factors (Russian authors such as Bogoyavlenskaya D. B., Vygotsky L. S., Petrovsky V. A., Shadrikov V. D., Meshkova N. V. etc and foreign authors such as T. Amabile, B. Hennessey, M. Runco etc), works devoted to the consideration of creativity in an intercultural context (such foreign authors as A. Leung, V. Maddux, A. Galinsky, R. Crisp, R. Turner, S. Tadmor etc), works on cross-cultural competence (such foreign authors like D. Matsumoto, M. Barrett, J. Berry, B. Spitzberg, J. Changnon etc).

## **Methods of the research**

Three empirical studies were conducted to test hypotheses and answer research questions.

The first study is a quasi-experiment that allows you to consider the change in the level of creativity of students depending on the availability of cultural learning and the possibility of intercultural contacts in the group. We compared the levels of creativity at the beginning and end of the academic year for students studying in culturally heterogeneous or culturally homogeneous study groups who attended or did not attend a course on intercultural interactions. The final sample used for analysis included 72 Russian students of social sciences direction, aged 18 to 29 years. All respondents participated in the pre-test and post-test, none of them visited other countries during the study period. The possibility of intercultural contacts was determined through cultural heterogeneity or group homogeneity, that is, through the presence or absence of foreigners in the group. Cultural learning was determined through the presence or absence in the curriculum of a course on intercultural interactions (the same course on cross-cultural psychology). To assess the level of creativity in both the first and second studies, the task for creative thinking “Many examples” from the battery of tests for creative thinking M. Runko was translated into Russian and adapted as a result of cognitive interviews (CTS, 2018).

The second study had a cross-section single-sample design, and was aimed at modeling and analyzing the relationships between the studied variables. In particular, the interrelations of the intensity of intercultural contacts at the university, the degree of cultural heterogeneity of the study group and the creativity of students, as well as the role of components of cross-cultural competence and acculturation expectations as factors of creativity and mediators of intercultural communication and creativity were studied. The sample of this study included 273 Russian students of various fields of study aged 17 to 35 years (average age 21 years), 61% women, 56% - bachelors, 64% - had experience living abroad, 58.8% - were involved in intercultural universities contacts. The degree of heterogeneity was determined by the number of cultures represented in the study group (the number of different countries from which foreign

students came). The volume of cultural education was determined by the number of learning courses related to the subject of intercultural interactions and various cultures in general. The intensity of intercultural contacts and acculturation expectations were evaluated using special methods of the same name from the MIRIPS project (Berry et al, 2014), adapted by the author for the situation of interactions with foreign students (as temporary migrants). To assess the level of intercultural competence, a test of intercultural skills was used from the methodology “Assessment of intercultural competence” (Fantini, Tirmizi, 2006), translated into Russian and adapted by the author for the host population.

To process and analyze the data obtained in the first and second studies in the SPSS 22.0 and AMOS 22.0 programs, such statistical procedures as analysis of descriptive statistics, correlation and regression analysis, Student t-test, one-way analysis of variance, analysis of variance with repeated measurements, path analysis (SEM).

Finally, a third research, inherently exploratory, was conducted using a qualitative methodology to analyze data from structured interviews. This study was aimed at identifying the features of perception by Russian students of both cultural differences in general, and their expectations regarding the behavior of foreign students at a Russian university, and the competencies required by Russian students. Perceptual characteristics were used to explain and interpret the previously obtained results of two quantitative studies. The sample of this study included 30 students: 15 more creative and 15 least creative respondents of the second study, selected from the general pool who agreed to participate in the interview - students of different fields of study, aged 19 to 32 years, 70% were women.

### **Scientific novelty**

The studies conducted as part of the thesis have scientific novelty. There are one of the first in which the dynamics of creativity of the host population in the context of intercultural interactions, as well as the relationship of creativity with intercultural contacts and cultural learning, are theoretically and empirically substantiated. In addition, cross-cultural competence and acculturation expectations are seen as factors

in creativity. Secondly, the obtained results are also characterized by novelty. For the first time, the key role of cultural education in comparison with cultural heterogeneity in the dynamics of creativity of the host population was revealed. At the same time, the intensity of intercultural contacts and the conditions for their implementation were also associated with creativity. Components of cross-cultural competence, contrary to theoretical models, turned out to be ambivalently associated with creativity, and, as a mediator, both contributed and hindered creativity. It was shown for the first time that a strong change, adjustment of one's behavior in a situation of intercultural interaction is negatively associated with the creativity of Russian students. Finally, the importance of setting the preservation of their cultures by foreigners for the creativity of the host population was revealed. Combining this result with the results of a qualitative study on the perception of cultural differences and the revealed negative relationship between behavioral changes in intercultural interactions with creativity, we can draw a non-trivial conclusion about the general significance of culture for creativity both in the context of preserving its own identity and the safe adoption of other people's cultural characteristics.

### **Theoretical and practical significance**

The results of this study can contribute to the theoretical enrichment of the existing range of studies on both creativity and cross-cultural competence. Filling research gaps regarding the creativity of the host population and its factors will help to better understand the features and mechanisms of the influence of intercultural contacts on creativity, and can also contribute to the fact that universities will pay more attention not only to the work of adapting foreign students to new cultural realities, but also to development students - representatives of the host population - competencies of intercultural communication with a simultaneous increase in creativity.

### **Basic ideas of the dissertation to be defended:**

Based on the obtained results several general conclusions were made.

1) The presence in the curriculum of courses on the interaction of cultures contributes to an increase in creativity both in a culturally homogeneous and culturally heterogeneous educational environment. The cultural heterogeneity of the student

group contributes to the growth of creativity when it is accompanied by cultural learning. Otherwise, cultural heterogeneity can have a negative effect on creativity.

2) Intensive friendly interactions with foreigners, a high degree of cultural heterogeneity of the study group and a significant amount of cultural learning contribute to the creativity of Russian students.

3) Positive intercultural attitudes of Russian students involved in intense intercultural contacts contribute to their greater creativity. At the same time, their strong change in their behavior in the situation of intercultural interactions limits the potential of intercultural contacts in relation to creativity.

4) Acculturation expectations in relation to foreign students related to the preservation of their cultures tend to contribute to the creativity of Russian students. Acculturation expectations regarding foreign students related to the loss of their cultures or the impossibility of demonstrating them hinder the creativity of Russian students.

5) Recognition of cultural differences promotes creativity when accompanied by a positive attitude towards these differences and cultural diversity in general.

### **Approbation of research results**

The results of the research were reported at 5 scientific conferences:

1) The Migration Conference 2019 (Bari, Italy, 06/18/2019). Report: The Role of Intercultural Competence in the Relationship of Home Country Intercultural Experience and Creativity among Russian Students;

2) XI Sankt-Peterburgskiye sotsiologicheskiye chteniya «Mezhdistsiplinarnyy podkhod v issledovanii sovremennykh etnicheskikh problem» [XI St. Petersburg sociological readings “Interdisciplinary approach in the study of modern ethnic problems”] (St. Petersburg, 04/18/2019). Report: Vzaimosvyaz' akkul'turatsionnykh ustanovok s kreativnost'yu rossiyskikh studentov v usloviyakh internatsionalizatsii vysshego obrazovaniya [The relationship of acculturation expectations with the creativity of Russian students in the context of the internationalization of higher education];

3) VI International Conference "Culture in Society, between Groups and across Generations" (Moscow, 04/05/2019). Report: "Little M" Experience in the Home Country University, Cultural Competence and Creativity of Russian Students;

4) Psikhologiya tvorchestva i odarennosti [Psychology of creativity and talent] (Moscow, 04/20/2018). Report: Vzaimosvyaz' kul'turnoy kompetentnosti i kreativnosti v monokul'turnykh i polikul'turnykh studencheskikh gruppakh [Interrelation of cultural competence and creativity in monocultural and multicultural student groups];

5) V International Research Conference "Culture in Society, Between Groups and Across Generations" (Moscow, 04/12/2018). Report: Relationship of intercultural experience and intercultural competence with creativity of Russian students from culturally homogeneous and culturally heterogeneous study groups.

In addition, studies conducted as part of this dissertation were discussed at discussions on three summer schools organized by the Center for Sociocultural Research (formerly International Laboratory for Socio-Cultural Research):

1) VII Summer School "From Proposal to Submission: Design of Cross-Cultural Study", June 11-14, 2017;

2) VIII Summer School "Design of Cross-Cultural Study", June 18-21, 2018;

3) IX Summer School "Design of Cross-Cultural Study", June 27-30, 2019.

### **Structure of the dissertation**

The dissertation consists of an introduction, two chapters, conclusion, a list of references - all presented on 173 pages, as well as additional appendices. The first chapter, theoretical one, includes 5 paragraphs. The second chapter includes 4 paragraphs; also 18 tables and 5 figures are presented in it. The list of references consists of 262 sources, of which 62 are in Russian. The application includes the tools and additional tables with results which are not crucial for hypotheses testing.

## MAIN CONTENT OF THE DISSERTATION

The **Introduction** presents the relevance of the research problem, the degree of scientific elaboration of the problem, the goal, objectives and hypotheses of the study. The research methodology and selection are briefly described, the main results are presented in the form of provisions to be defended, the novelty of the work, its theoretical and practical significance are formulated.

The first chapter “**Theoretical and methodological foundations for the study of creativity and its factors in the context of a small multicultural experience**”, consists of five sections.

The first paragraph “**Approaches to the study of creativity**”, discusses the basic approaches for understanding and researching creativity in domestic and foreign studies. In order to systematize all existing foreign approaches to creativity, M. Rhodes (Rhodes, 1961) proposed a system of four “P” (Batey, 2012): “personality,” “process,” “product,” and the so-called “press” (press or environmental impact). Based on the four general approaches presented in it, an integrative definition of creativity as an interaction of individual abilities, a specific process and various environmental influences was derived, leading to the production of a product that is both useful and new from the point of view of the existing social context (Plucker, Beghetto, Dow, 2004). This systematization is still applied to later works, although some authors believe that it needs to be reviewed and supplemented (Gruszka, Tang, 2017).

To some extent, the ideas of domestic researchers can also be very roughly correlated with creativity model 4 “P”, although the understanding of creativity as a process of thinking or ability implemented in a particular activity was often enriched by additional factors and, on the whole, was more systemic. In the Russian tradition, creativity studies were conducted mainly within the framework of sociocultural and activity schools, and the approach was often multi-faceted. Teplov connects creativity not only with the aspect of knowledge and skills but also with motivational and affective processes (Teplov, 1961). In the works of S.L. Rubinstein the creativity is also considered not only in the context of the realization of abilities to achieve but also from

the point of view of motivation, its direction (Rubinstein, 2003). The systemic models of creativity include the points of view of D.B. Bogoyavlensky and A.V. Brushlinsky. At V.A. Petrovsky (1992), creativity is non-adaptive (that is, not necessary in terms of survival) and supra-situational (that is, associated with personal growth and development) activity. In the concept of V.D. Shadrikov (2004) creativity is studied as the ability to carry out creative activity through the realization of spiritual abilities, “creativity as an attitude, an attitude of a person expressed in highlighting a problem in a new light, freedom from stereotypes, openness and striving for non-trivial solutions”. E.B. Starovoitenko considers the mental attitudes of a creative person, emphasizes the special integral role of an orientation toward creativity realized in new ideas, models and innovations, in the task of “an individual circuit of creativity in cultural dynamics” (Starovotenko, 2009).

At the end of the paragraph conclusion is made about relevance of studying not only individual, but also social and cultural factors of creativity.

The second paragraph “**The Cultural Theory of Creativity**” examines the approaches and theories regarding the sociocultural conditioning of creativity. The deep relationships between creativity and culture lie in the very definition of creativity. Both of its components: novelty (originality) and usefulness (relevance) reflect a comparison with the already traditionally defined culture, as well as the inclusion of this new in the sociocultural context and its use to maintain and enrich the culture (Shamaeva, 2014). In the works of L.S. Vygotsky, development (including creativity) occurs through the internalization of cultural instruments and social interaction and subsequent externalization (Vygotsky, 1998). Thus, creativity allows us to transform and realize the accumulated experience and internalized cultural values in a creative product that will contribute to the development of society and culture (Larionova, 2009).

Numerous studies showed that there is no single universal understanding of creativity and its basic attributes (Hollman, 1970; Westwood, Low, 2003; Mpofu et al., 2006; Nijstad et al., 2010; etc). In general, implicit theories of creativity that are prevalent in certain cultures are dominated by culturally-approved personality traits (Runco and Johnson, 2002). Thus, creativity arises not only in isolation “inside” a

person but in the interaction of human conscious with a sociocultural context. Therefore, it is generally unfair and incorrect to focus on the peculiarities of only Western cultures (Westwood, Low, 2003) and to disseminate the results of creativity studies obtained on samples of Western countries to the whole world without taking into account the cultural differences of other regions. In connection with this, more and more works appear related to the criticism of individualistic Western theories of creativity (Hennessey, 2016); consideration of differences between eastern and western concepts of creativity (Niu, Sternberg, 2006); and cross-cultural studies of creativity.

Cross-cultural comparisons showed that there are differences in the level of creativity among representatives of different cultures (for example, Saeki, Fan, Van Dusen, 2001; Kharkhurin, Motalleebi, 2008). Therefore, the second direction of research in the framework of the cultural theory of creativity is to identify the causes of such differences, that is, the study of the relationship of cultural factors and creativity. Some cultural values can generate intolerance and extremism that impede creativity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996). At the same time, representatives of individualistic, non-hierarchical, and uncertain cultures (Shane, 1992, Hofstede, 2001, Rinne et al., 2013) are more creative, giving priority to the values of Openness to change, and not to the values of Conservation (Rank, Pace, Frese, 2004; Dollinger, Burke, Gump, 2007; Sousa, Koelho, 2011; Cherkasova, 2013; Lebedeva, Bushina, 2015). Moreover, along with universal patterns of the relationship between values and creativity or innovation, of which creativity is an integral element, there are also culturally specific ones (Lebedeva, 2012).

Finally, the third direction of the cultural theory of creativity examines the relationship of creativity and intercultural experience in general, and intercultural contacts in particular. In a broad sense, any contact between cultures at the level of its representatives or products is creative, as it facilitates the exchange of ideas and enrichment, including in different domains of creativity (Montuori, Stephenson, 2010). Therefore, acquaintance with a new culture can help expand the conceptual boundaries established in a person's culture, inspire him to be free from his / her cultural attitudes, and initiate creative thinking. According to the theory of motivated cultural knowledge,

people are not just a passive object of cultural influences (Chiu, et al., 2000), on the contrary, they consider ideas from different cultural traditions as intellectual resources (Chiu, Hong, 2005), combining which can effectively solve the emerging tasks.

Existing studies also postulate the stimulating effect of intercultural contacts. Thus, creativity is higher in children from mixed families (Chang et al., 2014), expats (Fee, Gray, 2012) or students studying abroad (Russel, DeVries, DeYoung, 2011), immigrants of the first and second generation (Simonton, 1997), among bilinguals (Simonton, 1999; Kharkhurin, 2009, 2010) and within ethnically and culturally heterogeneous groups (McLeod et al, 1996; Simonton, 2003; Bouncken, Brem, Kraus, 2016). At the same time, creativity in mixed groups increases under conditions of tolerance and ease of expression of different opinions (Leung, Chiu, 2010).

Researchers identify factors that can influence creativity in a multicultural environment, such as experience living abroad (Maddux et al, 2009), cultural learning and openness to change (Leung, Chiu, 2008), the diversity of the communication network (Chua, 2018), and friendly contacts with foreigners (Lu et al, 2017), cultural distance (Cheng, Leung, 2013; Goclovska, Crisp, 2014), etc. Researchers also consider such mechanisms that can lead to an increase in creativity, such as the formation of bicultural and increasing integrative complexity (Tadmor et al, 2009, 2012), switching a cultural frame (Lee, Therriault, Linderholm, 2012), destabilizing routine knowledge structures and enriching behavior patterns (Leung et al, 2008). The works describing the influence on creativity by such mechanisms as acculturation, adaptation, and overcoming cultural stress (Tadmor, Tetlock, 2006; Crisp, Turner, 2011) are considered as the most related to intercultural relations and relevant to the goals of this work.

The next paragraph, **“The Relationship of Cross-Cultural Contacts, Cross-Cultural Competence and Acculturation Expectations with Creativity”**, explores approaches to understanding cross-cultural competency. There is no unified theory of what cross-cultural competence is, what are its components and what approach should be applied to its study (Mascardi et al, 2017). More than 300 terms and a large number of models are presented in modern science, which B. Spitsberg and G. Channon (Spitzberg and Changnon, 2009) divided into five types (coordinate models,

evolutionary models, adaptation models, compositional models and models of intercultural skills). In general, the majority of modern studies on cross-cultural competence consider it in terms of compositional models and defines it as a set of attitudes, knowledge and skills that promotes effective communication and interaction with representatives of other cultures (Chiu et al, 2013; Lebedeva, 2003, Krajewski, 2011, Barrett, 2012). In the framework of this thesis, the model of intercultural skills Fantini and Tirmizi (Fantini & Tirmizi, 2006) is used, which includes knowledge (meta-knowledge about how, in principle, to study other cultures and languages, plus general knowledge about other cultures), attitudes (manifested as a willingness to engage in various types of interactions with representatives of other cultures, to reflect on the consequences of such interactions and cultural differences), skills (or, what is closer in meaning when translated into Russian, change in behavior in the process of communication with representatives of other cultures – so further we mainly call this subscale as change in behavior), and awareness (as self-reflection in a culturally diverse world and not just knowledge about cultures and their differences, but also their deep understanding, awareness of cultural conditioning in the process of intercultural contacts).

The formation of intercultural competence in general and its components in particular is influenced by various factors, the main of which can be considered cultural learning and involvement in intercultural contacts (Barrett, 2012). At the same time, cross-cultural competence may be associated with creativity. Cultural intelligence, seen as a synonym for cross-cultural competence, in particular its knowledge-related components, is assumed to be an important element of creative processes (Yunlu et al, 2017). Also in the text of PhD there are explanation of how intercultural contacts may stimulate development of each cross-cultural competence component, as well as explanation of how each component of cross-cultural competence may be related to creativity. The conclusion is done that intercultural competence can be considered as an independent factor in creativity, and as part of a socio-psychological mechanism that explains the relationship between creativity and intercultural contacts. Moreover, the

results of empirical studies allow us to formulate hypotheses about the positive role of cross-cultural competence.

Features of adaptation to another culture were also reflected in the D. Berry acculturation model, which is relevant to this study, since it reflects the attitude to cultural differences and cultures as a whole. Consideration of attitudes reflecting the recognition of cultural identity and, thus, the novelty and complexity of the multicultural context, may be important in the study of creativity in connection with intercultural contacts. Based on ideas about the importance of culture for creativity and the importance of attitudes towards other cultures in connection with openness to new experience and new knowledge (Flynn, 2005; Galego, Pardos, 2014), we can assume that acculturation expectations will be significant for creativity in conditions intercultural contacts.

The fourth paragraph, **“Contextual Features of the Educational Environment”**, considers the university as an environment relevant for studying the influence of intercultural contacts on the creativity of representatives of the host population. Russian educators and researchers, as well as the European community (KEA, 2009, Rasmussen, 2012), recognize the importance and fundamental possibility of developing and stimulating creativity during studies at the university. Moreover, the age period corresponding to the time of study at the university is considered especially important for the development of professional and social creativity (Myagkova, 2011). It is believed that for the development of creativity, the university environment should be unregulated, with democratic relations between participants in university interactions, and teachers themselves should be creative, as students use them as role models (Myagkova, 2011). Partially even the topic of cultural conditionality of creativity is affected. So it is taken into account that the university cannot be value-neutral, and the peculiarities of the organizational culture and climate of the university affect both the development of students' values and motivation, as well as their achievements, including creative ones, their perception of cultural and social differences (Moroz, Sakharova, 2018). However, the issues of intercultural contacts in the university environment were not given the necessary attention

At the same time, the very issue of managing cultural diversity in the university environment is becoming increasingly relevant. The number of foreign students in Russia is growing in absolute and proportional number due to the drop in the number of Russian applicants. About a third of all foreign students study at universities in Moscow and St. Petersburg; these same cities are the most popular for foreign students from countries culturally distant from Russia (Gromov, 2016). Studies of cultural diversity in the context of Russian higher education mainly consider the adaptation of foreign students in Russia (for example, Dorozhkin, Mazitova, 2007) and the features of teaching and psychological and pedagogical support of the educational process when working with foreign students (for example, Sergeeva, 2017). At the same time, the direction of research on the conditions for the formation of cross-cultural competence among students of Russian universities is actively developing. Universities offer their students the opportunity to gain not only great multicultural experience through international internships; but also of small multicultural experience (“Little M experience”) through interactions with representatives of other cultures or cultural products without direct involvement in a foreign culture, staying in your own country, for example, through training courses on cultural diversity or organization of intergroup discussions (King et al., 2013).

Thus, the Russian university environment is not characterized by the presence of specific barriers to the development of students' creativity, and at the same time provides them with opportunities for intercultural contacts in a non-discriminatory environment and the development of cross-cultural competence. At the same time, the characteristics of the university, as an educational organization undergoing changes due to globalization and internationalization, set the conditions for intercultural contacts that can, as foreign studies show, influence creativity, such as cultural heterogeneity (Paulus, Zee, Kenworthy, 2016) and functional cultural education (Maddux, Galinsky, 2010). They can also contribute to the development of cross-cultural competence (Gregersen-Hermans, 2015; Tuncel, Paker, 2018)

The fifth paragraph, “**Hypotheses and research questions formulated in this paper**” presents the basic basic assumptions of empirical research:

(1) Creativity is a complex phenomenon, largely determined by the sociocultural context. Cultural characteristics and values can both stimulate and frustrate creativity, and interaction with new cultures and their representatives can increase creativity provided that a person copes with the stress of acculturation, successfully adapts and does not reject new culturally specific information.

(2) Although past studies have focused on studying the consequences of “great multicultural experience”, theoretically, cultural minorities are also able to influence the creativity of the dominant majority in conditions where representatives of the majority come in contact with representatives of other cultures and accept their cultural differences.

(3) One of the sites offering optimal conditions for intergroup and, therefore, intercultural contacts are universities. Such conditions as the presence of cultural education and its volume, as well as the degree of heterogeneity of the study group, may be important.

(4) Cross-cultural competence, which serves as an indicator of adaptation and the ability to effectively and comfortably interact in the context of cultural differences, develops under the influence of intercultural contacts, cultural learning and cultural heterogeneity.

(5) Accultural expectations reflect attitudes towards other cultures, the desirability of cultural diversity, and intercultural contacts.

(6) An additional aspect, already indirectly touched upon earlier in the dissertation, but which is important at the planning stage of the research design, is situationality and cultural conditioning of perception. In this regard, it seems important to use a mixed-methodology to study the perception of cultural differences and success factors of intercultural interactions at the university (as the operationalization of intercultural competence) by more creative and less creative Russian students to clarify and explain the results.

Based on these assumptions, hypotheses and research questions of empirical research were formulated.

The second chapter, **“Empirical studies of the associations of intercultural contacts, cross-cultural competence, acculturation expectations and creativity of Russian students”**, examines the stages of the study, describes the methods used, presents the characteristics of the sample and descriptive statistics of the variables, analyzes the main results, discusses them and conclusions of the study.

At the beginning of the section, a description is given of each of the three empirical studies carried out with a brief description and justification of the design. So, a quasi-experimental study was aimed at finding out whether there is a change in the level of creativity of Russian students involved in intercultural contacts; cross-sectional one-sample correlation study was designed to simulate and analyze the relationship of intercultural contacts and the conditions for their implementation, cross-cultural competence and acculturation expectations with the creativity of Russian students in statics; Qualitative exploratory research was aimed at identifying the perceptions of Russian students as cultural differences.

In the subparagraph **“Dynamics of creativity of Russian students depending on the possibility of intercultural contacts in the group and the presence of cultural learning”**, all aspects of the first empirical study are consistently presented. The research procedure is described and justified, key methods are described, and the general characteristics of the sample are presented. The study was conducted with pre-test and post-test measurements. The following were considered as manipulations (influencing factors): (1) cultural heterogeneity of study group (promoting possibility to have some contacts with foreigners) and / or (2) conditions for the implementation of intercultural contacts: the presence of cultural learning. Respondents were asked to fill out a questionnaire consisting of the following methods: Creativity was measured using the “Many Instances” game from a battery of tests for creative thinking by M. Runko (CTS, 2018). The assignment was translated into Russian in accordance with the direct and reverse translation procedure, then adapted during the pre-test (five cognitive interviews to understand the assignment and clarify the wording, a correlation analysis was conducted with another methodology for measuring creativity to establish validity) and showed good internal consistency. Creativity of the study participants from the control

group (students from a culturally homogeneous study group and without cultural training) and three experimental groups (students studying in (1) a culturally heterogeneous study group but without cultural learning, (2) in a culturally homogeneous study group but with cultural learning, (3) in a culturally heterogeneous study group and with cultural learning, it was measured twice: at the beginning and at the end of the school year, each group consisted of 16 to 20 people aged 18 to 30 years).

The results showed differences in the influence of cultural heterogeneity, which provides opportunities for direct contacts with representatives of other cultures, and formal cultural learning, which provides opportunities for indirect contact with other cultures through the acquisition of new knowledge and analysis of cultural products, on the creativity of Russian students. Students from a culturally homogeneous study group who were not involved in formal cultural education did not experience any significant changes in creativity rates by the end of the academic year. Students from a heterogeneous cultural group who were not involved in formal cultural learning even showed a decrease in originality; other components of creativity also showed a negative trend, but turned out to be statistically insignificant. Students from a culturally homogeneous group who were involved in formal cultural studies increased fluency by the end of the school year; they also ended up giving more original answers to the creative assignment compared to the first two groups. Finally, students from a culturally heterogeneous group who were involved in formal cultural learning showed an increase in originality; they also ended up giving more different answers to the creative assignment compared to the first two groups.

Thus, it can be assumed that, in general, cultural diversity, and the intercultural contacts associated with it, contribute to the growth of creativity only when a person knows how to cope with it. Otherwise, cultural heterogeneity can even have a detrimental effect on creativity.

The paragraph **“Association between intercultural contacts, cross-cultural competence, acculturation expectations and creativity of Russian students”** presents a study aimed at examining the relationship of acculturation expectations with creativity and at studying the role of acculturation expectations in the relationship

between intercultural contacts at the university and creativity. The study had a cross-sectional one-sample design with one single measurement. Each participant completed a task to assess creative thinking, and then filled out a questionnaire about their experience of intercultural contacts at the university and beyond, components of cross-cultural competence and acculturation expectations.

Standard statistical procedures were used in the IBM SPSS 22.0 program for analyzing descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analysis, constructing multiple linear regressions, and additional comparisons (using the Student t-test and one-way analysis of variance). Regression models with a latent variable in creativity and track models were built in the SPSS AMOS 22.0 program, an analysis of mediation effects was also performed there. The sample included 272 students aged 17 to 35 years, the average age of the respondents was 21 years.

The following methods were used in this part of the study: Methodology for measuring creativity is “Many Instances” game from the battery of tests for creative thinking by M. Runko (CTS, 2018). To measure intercultural contacts, the methodology from MIRIPS (Berry, 2014), which measures the intensity of friendly contacts with foreigners, was adapted to the university context. Cross-cultural competency was measured using the intercultural skills scale from the methodology “Assessing Intercultural Competence” by A. Fantini and A. Tirmisi (2006), translated into Russian, modified for the host population and adapted as a result of the pre-test. Acculturation expectations were measured using the methodology from MIRIPS, previously validated in the Russian sample (Lebedeva, Tatarko, 2009).

For data processing, standard statistical procedures were used in the IBM SPSS 22.0 program for analyzing descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analysis, constructing multiple linear regressions, and additional comparisons (using Student's t-test and one-way ANOVA). Regression models with a latent variable in creativity and track models were built in the SPSS AMOS 22.0 program, an analysis of mediation effects was also performed there.

Despite the fact that the participants in this study clearly preferred communication with Russian students rather than foreigners (average intensity scores were 2.61 versus

9.55,  $t = 14.94$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), the results still showed that the intensity of friendly intercultural contacts was positively associated with creativity of Russian students. Moreover, although past research suggests a non-linear relationship between creativity and degree of cultural heterogeneity (Paulus, Zee, Kenworthy, 2017), a direct positive relationship was found in this study. A direct relationship was also found between cultural learning, measured through the number of training courses related to different cultures and their interactions. Moreover, it was revealed that involvement in certain types of intercultural contacts at the university is associated with the cross-cultural competence of Russian students. So, among students from culturally heterogeneous groups, only some components of cross-cultural competence were more pronounced, in particular, positive attitudes towards representatives of other cultures and behavior adapted to the situation of intercultural interaction. We obtained a rather unusual result, demonstrating that the cultural diversity of the learning environment did not contribute to the additional exchange of information and cultural learning, leading to the formation of a deeper knowledge of other cultures and cultural awareness. We assume that, firstly, in general, cultural learning occurs subject to fairly close relations between representatives of different cultures (Lu et al., 2017), and students in culturally heterogeneous groups generally communicate less with each other than students from culturally homogeneous groups (Wright, Lander, 2003), and, moreover, are more willing to communicate with representatives of their own culture because of emotional attachment (Volet, Ang, 1998).

It was found that positive attitudes towards representatives of other cultures were related to the creativity of Russian students, and partially mediate the relationship of creativity with cultural heterogeneity and the intensity of friendly contacts with representatives of other cultures. Thus, attitudes are especially significant in situations of direct interactions with representatives of other cultures, and not in contact with culturally specific information or cultural products, as, for example, during learning.

The degree of behavior change, on the contrary, was negatively associated with creativity, both as an independent predictor and as a mediator. A strong change in

behavior in a situation of intercultural interactions serves as a barrier to the effects of the intensity of friendly contacts and the volume of cultural learning on creativity.

Speaking about acculturation expectations regarding the behavior of foreign students in Russia, we found that the intensity of friendly contacts with foreigners in our group is positively associated with the acculturation expectation of multiculturalism (that is, the integration of foreign students into the life of the host society while preserving their culture), which generally coincides with ideas of the contact hypothesis (Berry, 2013). At the same time, not only acculturation expectation of multiculturalism turned out to be positively connected with the creativity of Russian students, but segregation as well. Thus, creativity is positively related not only to involvement in intercultural contacts and the exchange of culturally specific information, but also the very willingness to allow others to preserve their culture, to be different.

Finally, it was revealed that only the expectation of multiculturalism partially mediates the relationship between friendly contacts with foreigners at the university and the creativity of Russian students. That is, only integration, as a preservation of cultures in conditions of active interactions, can strengthen the influence of intercultural friendship on the creativity of students from the dominant group, since in this acculturation expectation there is an implicit “cultural exchange”, cultural learning that develops and enriches both sides.

Finally, in this study, the experience of living in another country was used as a control variable, and this study found a direct relationship between “great” intercultural experience and creativity. The more time Russian students spent in other countries, the higher their creativity.

In the section **“Perception by Russian students of intercultural differences and the necessary competencies, as well as expectations in relation to foreign students”**, the study substantiates how Russian students perceive cultural differences with foreigners and components of intercultural competence through a qualitative analysis method, a structured interview.

The study involved 30 respondents aged 19 to 32 participating in previous studies. In total, 21 women and 9 men were interviewed, all of them were students in different

areas of study. Each respondent was personally interviewed using a list of questions compiled on the basis of a model of intercultural competence, including knowledge, attitudes, behavior (changing behavior), as well as several questions regarding foreign students in order to study the perception of cultural differences. The answers received during the interview were transcribed, then the received texts were processed using content analysis. Since the interview was conducted according to a specific script, enlarged topics were formed around the topics of the questions, categories and codes and were allocated in accordance with the content analysis procedure (Erlingsson, Brysiewicz 2017) according to the responses of each of the respondents, which were further analyzed and presented in terms of attitude to cultural diversity and frequency of occurrence (Smith, 2009) in each of the respondent groups: more or less creative students.

The results of a qualitative study showed that more or less creative Russian students have different ideas about the content of cross-cultural competence and acculturation expectations regarding the need for culturally specific knowledge and skills, positive attitudes, reasons to behave in a certain way, a positive attitude towards foreigners can preserve and demonstrate their cultural characteristics in behavior. The recognition of the importance of culturally specific knowledge is more likely to be characteristic of more creative students. More creative students are also prone to prioritizing behavioral patterns rather than knowledge. Moreover, in behavioral patterns, the vast majority of both creative and less creative respondents focus on general, rather than culturally specific, behavioral patterns. The general conclusion of this part of the study is that recognition of the existence or importance of differences is positive for cross-cultural competence, acculturation expectations aimed at maintaining cultural identity, and creativity only in those cases when it is accompanied by a positive perception of these differences and diversity in general.

In the paragraph **“General discussion of the results of studies of intercultural contacts, cross-cultural competence and acculturation expectations as factors in the creativity of Russian students”**, the rationale for the results is presented in stages. In this work, creativity was considered as a complex phenomenon, the understanding

and development of which is largely culturally determined (for example, Glavenue, 2010, 2016; Lubart, 2010, Chua, Roth, Lemoine, 2015 and others). The purpose of the work was to identify the relationships between intercultural contacts at the university, cross-cultural competence and creativity of Russian students. The analysis of theoretical information allowed us to put forward four hypotheses regarding the interconnections of the studied concepts and formulate three research questions. In this section of the dissertation, all the results obtained are aggregated and considered in a wider context.

The 1st and the 2nd hypotheses of this dissertation dealt with the creativity of Russian students in dynamics and suggested that possibility of intercultural contacts during studying in the university and the presence in the curriculum of a course on the interaction of cultures stimulate creativity. The first hypothesis was rejected, the second one was confirmed. It turned out that cultural learning is always associated with the growth of certain aspects of creativity. At the same time, the cultural heterogeneity of the group, suggesting opportunities for intercultural contacts, is associated with an increase in creativity only when it is accompanied by cultural learning.

The 3rd hypothesis dealt with the creativity of Russian students in statics and suggested that the intensity of intercultural contacts at the university and the conditions for their implementation, determined by the degree of heterogeneity of study groups and the amount of formal cultural learning, are positively related to the creativity of Russian students. This hypothesis was fully confirmed and somewhat clarified the results of testing the first hypothesis. So, not only the presence of foreigners and intercultural contacts, considered as a whole, turned out to be significant for creativity, but it was close friendly communication.

Cross-cultural competence and its relationship with creativity were addressed in the 4th hypothesis. It was assumed that the components of cross-cultural competence, such as culturally specific knowledge, positive attitudes towards foreigners, changes in one's own behavior in the context of intercultural contacts, and awareness of the cultural conditionality of what is happening will be positively associated with creativity. The hypothesis was only partially confirmed in part about attitudes. Knowledge and

awareness turned out to be unrelated to the creativity of Russian students, while a change in behavior was negatively associated with creativity.

The results of testing the 5th hypothesis about the mediating role of components of cross-cultural competence were also similar: positive attitudes play the role of a mediator, while changing behavior is more likely to partially block the positive effects of intercultural contacts on creativity.

The **“Conclusion”** summarizes the main results of the study, lists its limitations, describes the prospects for further study of this topic.

## **GENERAL FINDINGS OF THE STUDY**

The studies conducted within the framework of this dissertation were aimed at filling the identified gaps in knowledge by studying intercultural contacts and the conditions for their implementation, cross-cultural competence and acculturation expectations as factors of creativity. Based on the results of three empirical studies conducted by the author of the dissertation, a number of conclusions can be made.

Firstly, the dynamics of creativity depends on the conditions for the inclusion of Russian students in intercultural contacts at the university. The presence of cultural learning - that is, the presence in the curriculum of courses on the interaction of cultures - contributes to an increase in creativity both in a culturally homogeneous and culturally heterogeneous educational environment. At the same time, cultural heterogeneity per se, like the presence of foreigners in the study group and the fundamental possibility of making intercultural contacts, contributes to the growth of creativity when it is accompanied by cultural learning. Otherwise, cultural heterogeneity can have a negative effect on creativity. At the same time, intercultural contacts at the university and the conditions of involvement in them (the degree of cultural heterogeneity and the amount of cultural learning), considered in statics and without taking into account their possible interaction with each other, contribute to the creativity of Russian students.

Secondly, the different components of cross-cultural competence are interconnected in different ways with the creativity of Russian students: positive intercultural attitudes contribute to creativity, but a strong change in behavior (skills

subscale) in a situation of intercultural interaction does not contribute to creativity. The negative relationship between the degree of change in behavior and creativity of Russian students can be based on the attitude of Russian students to cultural differences and their tendency to “unify” their behavior in intercultural interactions. For the most part, Russian students adhere to the idea of the need to unify their behavior and adhere to the “universal” standards of behavior and politeness in the context of intercultural interactions. So, the relationship between knowledge and creativity, as well as the relationship between truly culturally specific adaptation of behavior and creativity require further study. At the same time, at least partially, the mechanism of the relationship between intercultural contacts at the university and the conditions for being involved in them with creativity is explained by the accompanying level of components of cross-cultural competence.

Finally, the assumption of the possibility of preserving, and possibly demonstrating by foreigners their cultures is of great importance for the creativity of Russian students. At the same time, at least partially, the mechanism of the relationship between intercultural contacts at the university with creativity is explained by the expectation that foreign students will integrate into Russian society.

Based on the foregoing, we can conclude that the general significance of culture for creativity is both in the context of preserving its own identity and the safe adoption of other people's cultural characteristics. Therefore, it can be assumed that Russian students, as the host population, will be encouraged by a university environment that will simultaneously support the formation of openness and willingness to contact with representatives of other cultures, a positive attitude towards them, and at the same time will provide them with a certain share of autonomy and a sense of security - the ability to “be yourself” and not significantly change your behavior in situations of intercultural interaction, to preserve and enrich your own culture. In general, this echoes the idea that cultural learning (namely, it primarily stimulates creativity) is best implemented in the conditions of transparency of the process of mutual learning and mutual acceptance of each other by the participants (Pietilä, 2010).

**The work was done** in the Department of Psychology of the Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education “National Research University Higher School of Economics”.

**The main provisions of the study are reflected in the publications of the author:**

The content of the dissertation is reflected in 4 published scientific publications (3 strictly related to the the topic, one indirectly related to the theoretical part) and 1 accepted for publication:

1) Bultseva M. A., Lebedeva N. M. Rol' individual'nykh tsennostey i motivatsii v literaturnoy produktivnosti poetov i prozaikov [The role of individual values and motivation in the literary productivity of poets and prose writers] // Psychology. Journal of the Higher School of Economics. - 2018 - T. 15, No. 4 S. 675-694. This article uses information from a theoretical review of creativity presented in a dissertation (empiricism - on a related topic).

2) Bultseva M. A., Lebedeva N. M. Mezhkul'turnyye kontakty i kreativnost': analiz zarubezhnykh podkhodov [Intercultural contacts and creativity: analysis of foreign approaches] // Sovremennaya zarubezhnaya psikhologiya - 2018 - T. 4 S. 15-21. In this article, the results of the theoretical chapter of the dissertation are summarized in many respects; hypotheses are made

3) Bultseva M. A., Lebedeva N. M. Vzaimosvyaz' mezhkul'turnoy kompetentnosti i kreativnosti u rossiyskikh studentov [The relationship of intercultural competence and creativity among Russian students] // Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost' - 2018 - T. 6 S. 31-44. This article checks the relationship between the two variables studied (elements from the correlation study presented in the second chapter of the dissertation)

4) Bultseva M.A., Lebedeva N.M. Vzaimosvyaz' opyta mezhkul'turnykh vzaimodeystviy, akkul'turatsionnykh ozhidaniy i kreativnosti u rossiyskikh studentov [The Relationship of Intercultural Experience, Acculturation Expectations and Creativity among Russian Students] // Cultural-historical psychology. - 2019 - T. 15.

No. 3. P. 51-59. This article also examines the relationship between the intensity of contacts with representatives of other cultures, acculturation expectations (another type of cross-cultural competency model) and creativity.

5) Bultseva M.A. *Vospriyatiye kul'turnykh razlichiy i mezhkul'turnoy kompetentnosti rossiyskimi studentami s raznym urovnem kreativnosti* [Perception of cultural differences and intercultural competence by Russian students with different levels of creativity] // *Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost'*. - 2020 - T. 1. In print. This article discusses the results of a qualitative study.

The results of the study are used in the course “Cross-Cultural Psychology” for masters of the program “Applied Social Psychology” at the Higher School of Economics.

### References

1. Barrett M. Intercultural competence // EWC Statement Series. Oslo, Norway: European Wergeland Centre. 2012. Vol. 2. Pp. 23–27.
2. Berry J.W. Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation // *Applied psychology*. 1997, Vol. 46 (1). Pp. 5-34.
3. Bochner S. Culture shock due to contact with unfamiliar cultures // *Online readings in psychology and culture*. 2003. Vol. 8 (1). Article 7. Pp. 1-12.
4. Bouncken R., Brem A., Kraus S. Multi-cultural teams as sources for creativity and innovation: The role of cultural diversity on team performance // *International Journal of Innovation Management*. 2016. Vol. 20(1). Pp. 1650012-1 -1650012-34.
5. Chang J.H., Hsu C.C., Shih N.H., Chen H.C. Multicultural families and creative children // *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2014. Vol. 45(8). Pp. 1288-1296.
6. Chen H. The research in behavioral psychology of foreign students’ sociocultural adaptation in China // *Journal of Beijing Normal University*. 2003. Vol. 6. Pp. 135–142.
7. Cheng C.Y., Leung A.K. Revisiting the multicultural experience–Creativity link: The effects of perceived cultural distance and comparison mind-set // *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. 2013. Vol. 4 (4). Pp. 475-482.

8. Cherkasova L. L. Sfery kreativnosti i individual'nyye tsennosti SH. Shvartsa [Problems of individual differences] // APRIO- RI. Seriya: Gumanitarnyye nauki. 2013. № 2. S. 1–20.
9. Chiu C. Y., Lonner W. J., Matsumoto D., Ward C. Cross-cultural competence: Theory, research, and application // Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 2013. Vol. 44 (6). Pp. 843–848.
10. Chiu C.-Y, Hong Y. Cultural competence: Dynamic processes // In, Handbook of motivation and competence. / Ed. by A. Elliot and C. S. Dweck. New York: Guilford. 2005. Pp. 489–505.
11. Chua R. Y., Roth Y., Lemoine J. F. The impact of culture on creativity: How cultural tightness and cultural distance affect global innovation crowdsourcing work // Administrative Science Quarterly. 2015. Vol. 60(2). Pp. 189-227
12. Crisp R.J., Turner R.N. Cognitive adaptation to the experience of social and cultural diversity // Psychological bulletin. 2011. Vol. 137 (2). Pp. 242.
13. Csikszentmihalyi M. Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention. New York: Harper, 1996.
14. Dollinger S. J., Burke P. A., Gump N. W. Creativity and values // Creativity Research Journal. 2007. Vol. 19. Pp. 91–103.
15. Dorozhkin YU. N., Mazitova L.T. Problemy sotsial'noy adaptatsii inostrannykh studentov [Problems of social adaptation of foreign students]// Sotsiologicheskiiye issledovaniya. 2007. № 3. C. 73–77.
16. Erlingsson C., Brysiewicz P. A hands-on guide to doing content analysis. // African Journal of Emergency Medicine. 2017. Vol. 7(3). Pp. 93–99.
17. Fantini A., Tirmizi A. Exploring and assessing intercultural competence. Final Report of a Research Project conducted by the Federation of The Experiment in International Living with funding support from the Center for Social Development at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, 2006. [Electronic source]. URL: [http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=worldlearning\\_publications/](http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=worldlearning_publications/)

18. Fee A., Gray S.J. The expatriate-creativity hypothesis: A longitudinal field test // *Human Relations*. 2012. Vol. 65 (12) Pp. 1515-1538.
19. Flynn F. J. Having an open mind: the impact of openness to experience on interracial attitudes and impression formation // *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 2005. Vol. 88(5). Pp. 816-826.
20. Gallego A., Pardos-Prado S. The big five personality traits and attitudes towards immigrants // *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 2014. Vol. 40(1). Pp. 79–99.
21. Glăveanu V. P. Paradigms in the study of creativity: Introducing the perspective of cultural psychology // *New ideas in psychology*. 2010. Vol. 28 (1). Pp. 79-93.
22. Goclovska M.A., Crisp M.J. How Dual-Identity Processes Foster Creativity // *Review of General Psychology*. 2014. Vol. 18(3). Pp. 216-236.
23. Gregersen-Hermans J. The impact of exposure to diversity in the international university environment and the development of intercultural competence in students // *The European higher education area*. Springer, Cham, 2015. Pp. 73-92.
24. Gromov A.D. Akademicheskaya mobil'nost' inostrannykh studentov v Rossii [Academic mobility of foreign students in Russia]// *Fakty obrazovaniya*. 2016. № 7. S. 1-13.
25. Gruszka A., Tang M. The 4P's creativity model and its application in different fields // *In Handbook of the management of creativity and innovation: Theory and practice* / Ed. by M. Tanng, K.H. Werner, , 2017. Pp. 51-71.
26. Hallman R.J., Toward a Hindu theory of creativity // *Educational Theory*. 1970. Vol. 20(4). Pp. 368-376.
27. Hennessey B. A. Creative Behavior, Motivation, Environment and Culture: The Building of a Systems Model // *The Journal of Creative Behavior*. 2016. Vol.
28. Hofstede G. *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2001.
29. KEA European Affairs. The impact of culture on creativity. A Study prepared for the European Commission (Directorate-General for Education and Culture). 2009. [Electronic Resource] // URL: <http://www.keanet.eu/docs/impactculturecreativityfull.pdf>

30. Kharkhurin A. V. Sociocultural differences in the relationship between bilingualism and creative potential // *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2010. Vol. 41. Pp. 776–783.
31. Kharkhurin A. V. The role of bilingualism in creative performance on divergent thinking and invented alien creatures tests // *The Journal of Creative Behavior*. 2009. Vol. 43. Pp. 59–71.
32. Kharkhurin A. V., Motalleebi S. N. S. The impact of culture on the creative potential of American, Russian, and Iranian college students // *Creativity Research Journal*. 2008. Vol. 20(4). Pp. 404-411.
33. King P.M., Perez R.J., Shim W. How college students experience intercultural learning: Key features and approaches // *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. 2013. Vol. 6 (2). Pp. 69-83.
34. Klak T., Martin P. Do university-sponsored international cultural events help students to appreciate “difference”? // *International journal of intercultural relations*. 2003. Vol. 27(4). Pp. 445–465.
35. Krajewski S. Developing intercultural competence in multilingual and multicultural student groups // *Journal of Research in International Education*. 2011. Vol. 10(2). Pp. 137–153.
36. Larionova L. I. Model' intellektual'noy odarennosti i kul'turno-psikhologicheskoye faktory yeye razvitiya [Model of intellectual giftedness and cultural and psychological factors of its development] // *Sibirskiy psikhologicheskoye zhurnal*. 2005. №. 21. S. 157-161
37. Lebedeva N. M. Tsennosti kul'tury i implitsitnyye teorii innovativnosti [The values of culture and implicit theory of innovativeness] // *Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost'*. 2012. №. 5. S. 25-40.
38. Lebedeva N. M., Bushina Ye. V. Vliyaniye tsennostey i motivatsii lichnosti na kreativnoye povedeniye i otnosheniye k innovatsiyam [Influence of values and personality motivation on creative behavior and attitude to innovations]// *Psikhologiya v ekonomike i upravlenii*. 2015. T. 7. № 1. S. 26–35.

39. Lebedeva N.M. Mezhkul'turnyy dialog: trening etnokul'turnoy kompetentnosti [Intercultural dialogue: ethnocultural competency training]/ N.M. Lebedeva, O.V. Luneva, T.G. Stefanenko. M.: RUDN, 2003.
40. Lebedeva N.M., Tatarko A.N. Strategii mezhetnicheskogo vzaimodeystviya migrantov i naseleniya Rossii. [Strategies of interethnic interaction of migrants and the population of Russia] M.: RUDN, 2009.
41. Lee K.S., Therriault D.J., Linderholm T. On the Cognitive Benefits of Cultural Experience: Exploring the Relationship between Studying Abroad and Creative Thinking // *Applied Cognitive Psychology*. 2012. Vol. 26. Pp. 768–778
42. Leung A.K., Chiu C.-Y. Interactive Effects of Multicultural Experiences and Openness to Experience on Creativity // *Creativity Research Journal*. 2008. Vol. 20. Pp. 376–382.
43. Leung A.K., Chiu C.-Y. Multicultural experience, idea receptiveness, and creativity. // *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2010. Vol. 5–6. Pp. 723–741.
44. Leung A.K., Maddux W.W., Galinsky A.D., Chiu C.-Y. Multicultural experience enhances creativity: The when and how // *American Psychologist*. 2008. Vol. 3. Pp. 169–181.
45. Lu J.G., Hafenbrack A.C., Eastwick P.W., Wang D.J., Maddux W.W., Galinsky A.D. “Going out” of the box: Close intercultural friendships and romantic relationships spark creativity, workplace innovation, and entrepreneurship // *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2017. Vol. 102 (7). Pp. 1091-1108.
46. Lubart T. Cross-cultural perspectives on creativity // In *The Cambridge handbook of creativity* / Ed. by J.C. Kaufman, R.J. Sternberg. Cambridge University Press, 2010. Pp. 265-278.
47. Maddux W. W., Galinsky, A. D. Cultural borders and mental barriers: The relationship between living abroad and creativity // *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 2009. Vol. 96(5). Pp. 1047.-1061.
48. Maddux W.W., Adam H., Galinsky A.D. When in Rome... Learn why the Romans do what they do: How multicultural learning experiences facilitate creativity // *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2010. Vol. 36 (6). Pp. 731-741.

49. Maddux W.W., Leung A.K.Y., Chiu C.Y., Galinsky A.D. Toward a More Complete Understanding of the Link Between Multicultural Experience and Creativity // *American Psychologist*. 2009. Vol. 64 (2). Pp. 156-158.
50. Marquis E., Radan K., Liu A. A present absence: undergraduate course outlines and the development of student creativity across disciplines // *Teaching in Higher Education*. 2016. Vol. 22(2). Pp. 222-238.
51. Mascadri J., Brownlee J.J., Walker S. Alford J. Exploring intercultural competence through the lens of self-authorship // *Early Years*. 2017. Vol. 37 (2). Pp. 217-234.
52. McLeod P. L., Lobel S. A., Cox Jr. T. H. Ethnic diversity and creativity in small groups // *Small group research*. 1996. Vol. 27(2). Pp. 248-264.
53. Montuori A., Stephenson H. Creativity, culture contact, and diversity // *World Futures*. 2010. Vol. 66 (3-4). Pp. 266-285.
54. Moroz V. V., Sakharova N. S. Razvitiye kreativnosti studentov v protsesse kreativno-tsennostnogo vzaimodeystviya "prepodavatel'-student" [Development of student creativity in the process of creative-value interaction "teacher-student"]// *Vestnik Orenburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. 2018. №. 6. S. 61-69.
55. Mpofu E., Myambo K., Mogaji A.A., Mashego T-A., Khaleefa O. H. African perspectives on creativity. // *In The international handbook of creativity / Ed. by J. C. Kaufman, R. J. Sternberg*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Pp. 456–489.
56. Myagkova N. A. Rol' tvorcheskoy sredy v razvitii sotsial'noy kreativnosti studenta [The role of the creative environment in the development of student social creativity] // *Vestnik Orenburgskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. 2011. №. 17. S. 283-286.
57. Nijstad B. A., De Dreu C. K., Rietzschel E. F., Baas, M. The dual pathway to creativity model: creative ideation as a function of flexibility and persistence // *Eur. Rev. Soc. Psychol*. 2010. Vol. 21. Pp. 34–77.
58. Nijstad B., Paulus P. Group creativity: Common themes and future directions // *In Group creativity: Innovation through collaboration / Ed. by P. Paulus, B. Nijstad*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003. Pp. 326–339.

59. Niu W., Sternberg R. J. The philosophical roots of western and eastern conceptions of creativity // *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*. 2006. Vol. 26(1–2). Pp. 18–38.
60. Olson L. C., Kroeger K. R. Global competency and intercultural sensitivity // *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 2001. Vol. 5(2). Pp. 116–37.
61. Paulus P.B., van der Zee K.I., Kenworthy J. Cultural Diversity and Team Creativity // In *The Palgrave Handbook of Creativity and Culture Research* / Ed. by V.P. Glăveanu. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. Pp. 57-76.
62. Petrovskiy V.A. Lichnost' kak sub'yekt aktivnosti. Psikhologiya neadaptivnoy aktivnosti. [Person as a subject of activity. Psychology of non-adaptive activity] M.: TOO Gorbunok, 1992.
63. Pietilä I. Intercultural adaptation as a shared learning process in the life-course // *Cross-cultural Lifelong Learning*. 2010. [Electronic resource] URL: [https://tampub.uta.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/100774/intercultural\\_adaptation\\_as\\_a\\_shared\\_learning.pdf?sequence=1](https://tampub.uta.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/100774/intercultural_adaptation_as_a_shared_learning.pdf?sequence=1)
64. Rank J., Pace V. L., Frese M. Three avenues for future research on creativity, innovation, and initiative // *Applied Psychology: An Interantional Review*. 2004. Vol. 53(4). Pp. 518–528.
65. Rhodes M. An analysis of creativity // *The Phi Delta Kappan*. 1961. Vol. 42 (7). Pp. 305-310.
66. Rich G.J. Big C., Little C., Big M., Little M. // *American Psychologist*. 2009. Vol. 64 (2). Pp. 155–156.
67. Rinne T., Steel G. D., Fairweather J. The role of Hofstede's individualism in national-level creativity // *Creativity Research Journal*. 2013. Vol. 25(1). Pp. 129–136.
68. Rubinshteyn S.L. Osnovy obshcheypsikhologii. [Fundamentals of General Psychology] SPb.: Piter, 2003.
69. Runco M.A. Creativity // *Annual Review Psychology*. 2004. Vol. 55. Pp. 657–687.
70. Russell M. J., DeVries J. W., DeYoung C. G. How internationalizing students through cross-cultural experiences may affect creativity // Poster session at the 2011

- Internationalizing the Curriculum and Campus Conference, Minneapolis, MN. 2011.  
[Electronic source]. URL:  
[https://global.umn.edu/icc/documents/11\\_conference\\_poster23.pdf](https://global.umn.edu/icc/documents/11_conference_poster23.pdf)
71. Saek N., Fan X., Van L. A comparative study of creative thinking of American and Japanese college students // Journal of creative behavior. 2001. Vol. 35(1). Pp. 24–36.
72. Sergeeva L. V. Sotsial'no-psikhologicheskiye problemy adaptatsii inostrannykh studentov v mezhkul'turnoy obrazovatel'noy srede [Socio-psychological problems of the adaptation of foreign students in an intercultural educational environment]// Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta. 2017. №. 5. S. 111-115.
73. Shadrikov V.D. Sposobnosti i intellekt cheloveka. [Abilities and human intelligence.] M.: Izd-vo Sovrem. gumanitar. un-ta, 2004.
74. Shamayeva R. M. Fenomen kreativnosti v kontekste kul'tury [The phenomenon of creativity in the context of culture]// Mezhdunarodnyy zhurnal issledovaniy kul'tury. 2014. №. 4 (17). S. 95-106.
75. Shane S. Why do some societies invent more than others? // Journal of Business Venturing. 1992. Vol. 7. Pp. 29–46. 22.
76. Simonton D. K. Creative cultures, nations, and civilizations: Strategies and results // In Group creativity: Innovation through collaboration / Ed. by P. B. Paulus, B. A. Nijstad. Oxford University Press, 2003. Pp. 304-325.
77. Simonton D. K. Foreign influence and national achievement: The impact of open milieus on Japanese civilization // Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1997. Vol. 72. Pp.86–94.
78. Simonton, D. K. Exceptional personal influence: An integrative paradigm // Creativity Research Journal. 1995. Vol. 8(4).Pp. 371–376.
79. Smith J. J. Therapist Self-Disclosure with Adolescents: A Consensual Qualitative Research Study. 2009. [Electronic resource]. URL:  
[http://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations\\_mu/86](http://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/86)

80. Spitzberg B. H., Changnon G. Conceptualizing intercultural competence. // The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence / Ed. by D.K. Deardorff Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2009. Pp. 2-52.
81. Starovoytenko Ye. B. Myslitel'nyye ustanovki tvorcheskoy lichnosti v kul'turnoy dinamike [The mental attitude of a creative person in cultural dynamics] // Mir psikhologii. Nauchno-metodicheskiy zhurnal. 2009. T. 57. № 1. S. 260-271.
82. Straffon D. A. Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of high school students attending an international school // International journal of intercultural relations. 2003. Vol. 27(4). Pp. 487-501.
83. Tadmor C. T., Galinsky A. D., Maddux W. W. Getting the Most Out of Living Abroad: Biculturalism and Integrative Complexity as Key Drivers of Creative and Professional Success // Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 2012. Vol. 103(3). Pp. 520-542.
84. Tadmor C. T., Tetlock P. E., Peng, K. Biculturalism and integrative complexity: Testing the acculturation complexity model // Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 2009. Vol. 40. Pp. 105–139.
85. Tadmor C.T., Tetlock P.E. Biculturalism: A model of the effects of second-culture exposure on acculturation and integrative complexity // Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 2006. Vol. 37(2). Pp. 173-190
86. Teplov B.M. Problemy individual'nykh razlichiy [Problems of individual differences] M.: Izdatel'stvo APN RSFSR, 1961.
87. Tuncel I., Paker T. Effects of an Intercultural Communication Course in Developing Intercultural Sensitivity // International Journal of Higher Education. 2018. Vol. 7 (6). Pp. 198-211.
88. Valeeva R., Valeeva A. Intercultural education from Russian researches perspective // Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences. 2017. Vol. 237. Pp. 1564-1571.
89. Volet S. E., Ang G. Culturally mixed groups on international campuses: An opportunity for inter-cultural learning // Higher education research & development. 1998. Vol. 17(1). Pp. 5-23.

90. Vygotskiy L. S. Psikhologiya iskusstva. [Psychology of art] Rostov n/D: Feniks, 1998.
91. Westwood R., Low D. R. The multicultural muse: Culture, creativity and innovation // *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*. 2003. Vol. 3(2). Pp. 235–259.
92. Wright S., Lander D. Collaborative group interactions of students from two ethnic backgrounds // *Higher Education Research & Development*. 2003. Vol. 22(3). Pp. 237-251.
93. Yunlu D.G., Clapp-Smith R., Shaffer M. Understanding the Role of Cultural Intelligence in Individual Creativity // *Creativity Research Journal*. 2017. Vol. 3. Pp. 236–243.
94. Zhai L., Scheer S. D. Global perspectives and attitudes toward cultural diversity among summer agriculture students at the Ohio State University // *Journal of Agricultural Education*. 2004. Vol. 45(2). Pp. 39–51.