

Creativity at the workplace: Comparative study of tourism organizations in Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden

Gita Šakytė-Statnickė¹ , Anna Katarzyna Mazurek-Kusiak² 
Laurencija Budrytė-Ausiejienė³ 

Abstract

PURPOSE: This study examines differences in creativity at the workplace across tourism organizations in Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden. The aim of this study is to identify (1) whether creativity at the workplace differs between Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden, and (2) whether Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden differ systematically in reported creativity-supporting practices. According to the Global Innovation Index 2024 (WIPO, 2024), these countries exhibit diverse innovation ecosystems and creativity cultures, making them suitable locations for comparative research. **METHODOLOGY:** The study uses a cross-sectional, quantitative, cross-country comparative research design based on the CAWI (Computer-Assisted Web Interview) survey method. Data were collected in 2024 from tourism organizations in Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden. The final sample includes 436 tourism enterprises. Creativity at the workplace was measured using Musek's (2020) Creativity at Workplace Organization Scale. The surveys were conducted online in the respondents' native languages, with their consent. Statistical analysis was performed using Statistica 13.1 PL software, applying nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis tests to compare countries and Multinomial Logistic Regression to examine relationships between countries and organizational practices. **FINDINGS:** The results show that creativity at the workplace varies greatly between Sweden and the other two countries, Lithuania and Poland. In Sweden, creativity at the workplace is significantly higher. The study identified different creativity-supporting practices: Sweden emphasizes innovation-based problem-solving, Lithuania focuses on reflective and customer-oriented practices, while Poland relies more on motivational and task-oriented methods. The results indicate that creativity at the workplace differs across the analyzed national samples and is associated with creativity-supporting practices. **IMPLICATIONS:** The study contributes to the literature on organizational creativity by providing cross-national empirical evidence on perceived creativity-supporting practices, which can be interpreted through the Componential Theory of Creativity, the Interactionist Model of Organizational Creativity, and Social Exchange Theory. In practice, this research highlights the need for country-specific strategies to promote creativity at the workplace in tourism: Sweden's example demonstrates how integrated, leadership-driven innovation strategies can transform into perceived and actual creativity within organizations. Meanwhile, Lithuania and Poland may benefit from strengthening the national and institutional levels and from a more systematic implementation of creativity at the workplace. **ORIGINALITY AND VALUE:** This paper presents one of the first empirical, comparative studies covering three countries, examining creativity at the workplace in tourism organizations in one macro-region (the Baltic Sea region). The study provides empirical evidence of cross-national differences in creativity at the workplace and the associated creativity-supporting practices. **Keywords:** creativity, creativity-supporting practices, tourism organizations, creativity at workplace organization scale, organizational creativity, Baltic Sea region, innovation culture, quantitative survey research, CAWI methodology, creativity measurement.

1 Gita Šakytė-Statnickė, Ph.D., Assoc. Professor, Klaipėdos valstybinė kolegija | Higher Education Institution, Faculty of Business, Jaunystės str. 1, LT-91274 Klaipėda, Lithuania, e-mail: g.statnicke@kvk.lt (ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5320-810X>).

2 Anna Katarzyna Mazurek-Kusiak, Ph.D., Assoc. Professor, University of Life Sciences in Lublin, Department of Tourism and Recreation, Akademicka str. 15, 20-950 Lublin, Poland, e-mail: anna.mazurek@up.edu.pl (ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3786-8861>).

3 Laurencija Budrytė-Ausiejienė, Lecturer, Klaipėdos valstybinė kolegija | Higher Education Institution, Faculty of Business, Jaunystės str. 1, LT-91274 Klaipėda, Lithuania, e-mail: Lausiejiene@kvk.lt (ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5378-3019>).

INTRODUCTION

The concept of creativity at the workplace in tourism, which emphasises new products, services, and experiences, is becoming increasingly popular across Europe, as today's dynamic, globalised environment makes it a crucial asset for organisations, especially in the tourism sector. The sector is highly influenced by rapid changes in consumer preferences, technological advances, and intensified competition, and tourism businesses need to continuously innovate and adapt (Bascavusoglu-Moreau et al., 2013; Montañés-Del-Río & Medina-Garrido, 2020). Creativity is essential for tourism organizations to remain competitive and adaptable to new customer demands. It leads to innovation, service improvement, and high performance, which are crucial for achieving organizational success (Hasan, 2022). Creativity at the workplace is well known as a driver of innovation (Hoang et al., 2019; Patil, 2024) and the generation of new and useful ideas, which is the first stage of the innovation process. The integration of creativity at the workplace into tourism strategies is essential for sustainable growth and innovation, particularly in meeting the evolving expectations of modern tourists (Teodorescu et al., 2015; Benhaida et al., 2024; Damiasih, 2025).

Despite the growing scholarly attention to creativity at the workplace, the existing literature continues to focus on large organizations in Western countries, without accounting for sector-specificities and cultural differences (Zhou & Hoever, 2014; Bavik & Kuo, 2022; De Bernard et al., 2022). The tourism sector is often excluded from mainstream research on the dynamics of creativity and innovation (Pikkemaat, et al., 2019; Yachin & Ioannides, 2020; Sharma et al., 2024). Moreover, few empirical studies examine how national differences determine creative practices in the sector, despite the growing evidence of the influence of cultural and institutional contexts on innovation capabilities (Sarooghi et al., 2015; Ouyang et al., 2021; Yodchai et al., 2022). Furthermore, previous studies have mostly focused on single-country settings, and therefore the understanding of how national context relates to specific organizational practices of tourism organizations to shape creativity at the workplace is limited (Chen & Yu, 2024; Miron-Spektor and Paletz, 2024). Cross-border differences in the tourism industry exist (Huang & Crotts, 2019; Park et al., 2022; Williams & Makkonen, 2024), but empirical evidence linking these differences to specific organizational practices supporting creativity in tourism organizations is lacking.

The study compares three countries, i.e. Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden. According to the Global Innovation Index 2024 (WIPO, 2024), these countries are characterized by different innovation ecosystems and creativity cultures, making them suitable locations for comparative research. Lithuania and Poland represent emerging innovation systems, while Sweden is a global innovation leader. Although all three countries share close regional ties and a certain cultural and economic proximity, they differ in organizational structures, cultural values, tourism development models, and other areas (Roman et al., 2020; Xie et al., 2021; WIPO, 2024). This choice keeps the regional context constant while ensuring sufficient diversity in creativity at the workplace, enabling us to more reliably assess how the specifics of the country's environment relate to organizational practices that promote and support creativity.

The aim of this study is to determine whether creativity at the workplace differs across Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden and whether these cross-country differences are associated with distinct organizational practices. In this paper, we examine tourism organizations' perceptions of their creativity at workplace and examine the relationship between country and creativity-supporting practices as captured by the Creativity at Workplace Organization Scale (Musek, 2020). Based on the above, we formulate two research questions (RQs) that directly correspond to our hypotheses and empirical strategy:

RQ1: Are there significant differences in the creativity at the workplace among Lithuanian, Polish and Swedish tourism organizations?

RQ2: Are there systematic cross-country differences in reported creativity-supporting practices among tourism organizations in Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden?

The research was partly carried out in the framework of the project „NordTournet-4: Developing the Creativity of Tourism Workers Through the Use of Artificial Intelligence Powered Tools to Create New or Improve Existing Tourism Services” (No. NPAD-2022/10078), while in Poland the data were collected separately using the same survey instrument.

The next section reviews the theory on creativity at the workplace in the tourism industry, national and cross-country differences in creativity at the workplace and organizational practices and national differences in creativity at the workplace, then develops H1 and H2. Then, the methodology (research design, measures, sample and sampling procedure, data collection procedure, research ethics and method of analysis) is reviewed, the results are presented (methods: non-parametric tests; multinomial logistic regression), and discusses the theoretical and practical implications, as well as limitations and future research directions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Creativity at the workplace in the tourism industry

Creativity is increasingly mentioned across various fields, including business. Although creativity is crucial to any organization's innovation and survival in today's competitive business environment (Lua et al., 2024), scholars researching and writing about organizational change pay little attention to creativity at the workplace (Woodman, 2024). Creativity is usually considered in the scientific literature as a process of generating new and valuable ideas to solve problems, improve user experience, and create and implement innovations (Rampa & Agogué, 2021; Treffinger et al., 2023; Wingström et al., 2024; Gilson, 2024). Creativity at the workplace arises from the interaction of individual, organizational and cultural factors. According to componential theory of creativity (Amabile, 2011; Gong et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2025), in addition to internal factors (domain-relevant skills, creativity-relevant processes, and intrinsic task motivation), the social environment in which the individual works is important for an employee's creativity. According to the interactionist model of organizational creativity (Woodman, 2024), it can be considered as an extension of commonly accepted definitions of individual creativity into the organizational context and the creative behavior of organizational participants is a complex interaction that is influenced not only by past events but also by the characteristics of the work environment. The integrated model of dynamic problem solving within organizational constraints (Cromwell et al., 2018) views creativity as a continuous cycle of identifying new problems, generating ideas, and solving them, all subject to organizational constraints. The theoretical approaches mentioned above allow us to understand creativity as a multi-layered phenomenon shaped by individual abilities, motivation, social environment, organizational structures, and other factors. The integration of these theories helps to reveal how creativity manifests itself not only at the individual level, but also at the organizational level, especially when it becomes a strategic resource in specific sectors. One such sector is tourism, where creativity is increasingly seen as a key factor in shaping innovative, attractive offerings.

In the context of tourism, creativity is increasingly recognized as an important component in creating unique and engaging tourist experiences that contribute to the economic and cultural vitality of travel destinations (Richards, 2020; Sharma et al., 2025). Creativity at the workplace is a key driver of competitiveness in the tourism industry, the integration of creativity into tourism strategies is linked to sustainable growth and innovation. Creative tourism has become an important trend (Benhaida et al., 2024). This approach is seen as a way to satisfy the complex needs of modern tourists and enhance the value of tourism products (Teodorescu et al., 2015).

Creativity at the workplace enhances tourism organizations' ability to innovate, adapt, and meet the evolving demands of tourists, thereby contributing to their growth and competitiveness. This relationship is evident in the way creativity influences service quality, customer satisfaction, and the overall value proposition of tourism products. Creativity at the workplace is essential for the evolution of tourism systems, allowing for the co-production of experiences between tourists and providers. This dynamic is crucial for maintaining a balance between innovation and continuity in tourism offerings (Richards, 2017). Creativity at the workplace in tourism organizations leads to innovation, improved service quality, and enhanced competitiveness. This is vital in a market where traditional methods are insufficient to meet the specialized demands of modern tourists (Hasan, 2022). Creativity at the workplace is an essential part of innovation, implying a growing need to determine methods for generating more and better ideas, which can then be commercialized and turn into innovations (Von Stamm, 2008; Meyer, Gerlitz & Klein, 2022).

Creativity at the workplace is identified as a crucial source of competitive advantage in the tourism industry, enabling organizations to differentiate their offerings and cater to the complex needs of modern tourists. This is particularly important in the context of creative tourism, which emphasizes unique experiences and innovative products (Teodorescu et al., 2015). The integration of creativity into the value chain of tourism organizations can significantly enhance the added value of tourism products, leading to increased consumer satisfaction and loyalty (Teodorescu et al., 2015). Creativity at the workplace is linked to the success of tourism organizations by fostering innovation, improving service quality, and enhancing operational efficiency. These factors are essential for maintaining competitiveness and achieving financial returns (Hasan, 2022). Creativity at the workplace in tourism can lead to the formation of competitive clusters (Odinokova, 2019; Scalabrini & Alves, 2022). The presence of creative tourism entrepreneurs significantly enhances the competitiveness and innovation of tourist destinations, thereby supporting regional development (Dias et al., 2025).

Creativity as a multifaceted phenomenon is well recognized in organizational contexts, but its expression may vary across national settings. Therefore, the next section examines how national and cross-country differences shape creativity at the workplace in tourism organizations across Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden.

National and cross-country differences in creativity at the workplace

Integrating classical and contemporary theories of creativity (Amabile, 2011; Cromwell et al., 2018; Woodman, 2024; Zheng et al., 2025) and recent cultural research (Maimone & Sinclair, 2022; Miron-Spektor & Paletz, 2024), creativity at the workplace is not only the result of individual employee abilities and motivation, but also depends heavily on the cultural, organizational and national context. Maimone and Sinclair (2022) emphasized that national and cross-country differences are important for the development of creative processes at the workplace and noted that although the cultural dimension of creativity at the workplace has been established, studies describing creative processes in organizations often neglect national and cross-country aspects. According to Tang (2019), the main factors determining creativity are originality and usefulness, which are assessed in the specific context and may vary across cultures. Cross-country research in organizational creativity at the workplace suggests that perceptions vary significantly between national contexts due to differences in work values, institutional support, and management practices (House et al., 2004; Barth & Stadtmann, 2026). The fact that creativity is perceived, valued and promoted differently across countries is particularly relevant when analysing creativity at the workplace in the tourism sector in Europe, where cultural differences between countries such as Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden lead to varying levels of creativity.

The creativity of tourism organizations in Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden exhibits differences, influenced by various cultural, economic, and organizational factors. These differences are shaped by the unique characteristics of each country's tourism industry, the role of creativity in its economic strategy, and the specific challenges and opportunities it faces. According to the Global Innovation Index 2024 (WIPO, 2024), Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden occupy different positions in the global innovation and creativity rankings. Sweden (2nd in the overall GII ranking, with a score of 64.5) remains one of the world's innovation leaders. Sweden leads in Infrastructure (1st), Business sophistication (1st), Knowledge and technology outputs (2nd) and Human capital and research (3rd). Sweden ranks highest among the three countries examined in this paper in creative outputs, occupying the 6th position globally with a score of 57.8. According to the Global Innovation Index 2024 (WIPO, 2024), Lithuania ranked 35th overall (score 40.1) and Poland ranked 40th overall (score 37.0). These disparities reflect different levels of integration between national innovation ecosystems and the creative industries across the three countries.

The creative industries in Lithuania, as part of the Baltic Sea Region, are recognized for their potential to contribute to local and regional prosperity. The presence of cultural and creative industries (CCIs) is a significant factor in the competitiveness and economic development of the region. The integration of creativity at the workplace into tourism is seen as a driver of sustainable urban development and innovation (Klein et al., 2021). The development of tourism clusters in Lithuania is supported by European Union programs that provide financial incentives and encourage competition and cooperation among tourism organizations (Rukuižienė, 2017). In Lithuania, the ongoing development of tourism clusters and creative networks highlights the importance of creativity in shaping the future of the tourism industry.

Creativity at the workplace is a crucial factor for the socio-economic development of Polish regions. It influences regional disparities and can lead to enhanced economic performance when effectively harnessed (Kola-Bezka, 2011). Organizations that adopt a strategic approach to innovation, characterized by continuous creativity, are more likely to succeed in international markets. Despite the potential benefits, innovation processes in Polish tourist destinations are underdeveloped, with barriers including weak cooperation structures among organizations and other stakeholders (Panfiluk, 2023). However, market forces, including consumer demand, can drive innovation and creativity in the workplace in the tourism sector (Panfiluk, 2023). Polish tourism organizations are characterized by average and low innovativeness, with a focus on sustaining rather than disruptive innovations. The tourism sector in Poland tends to implement incremental, adaptive innovations that improve organizational functioning but do not significantly alter market dynamics (Panfiluk, 2021). Additionally, regional studies in Poland highlight the importance of external factors, such as customer expectations, in driving innovation in tourism organizations (Zontek, 2015).

Creativity at the workplace plays a pivotal role in the development of tourism organizations, particularly in Sweden, where it is leveraged to enhance the tourism experience and foster economic growth. In Sweden, the integration of creativity into tourism development strategies offers significant opportunities for economic growth (Gustafsson & Ijla, 2017; Eimermann et al., 2019). Sweden, as part of the Baltic Sea Region, benefits from a strong creative industry sector that contributes to its competitiveness and innovation. In Sweden, the creative atmosphere and entrepreneurial culture are particularly valued by tourism entrepreneurs, contributing to the country's competitive advantage in the tourism sector (Dias et al., 2025). The country's focus on sustainable development and the integration of creativity at the workplace into

tourism strategies is evident in its approach to fostering a creative atmosphere and quality of life, which are attractive to creative tourism entrepreneurs (Klein et al., 2021; Dias et al., 2025).

In summary, classical and contemporary theories of creativity show that creativity at the workplace depends not only on individual abilities but also on the external context, including national and cross-country differences. Research reveals that creativity at the workplace is perceived differently across countries, especially in the tourism sector, where national and cross-country differences shape creativity and innovativeness. Given differences in creativity across Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden, the hypothesis is formulated:

H1. Significant differences exist in the creativity at the workplace of tourism organizations among Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden.

Creativity-supporting practices and national differences in creativity at the workplace

Creativity within organizations is a multifaceted phenomenon influenced by various organizational practices and structures. National differences in creativity at the workplace can stem from how organizations foster and reward creativity, which involves creating an environment that encourages innovation and supports employees in generating new ideas. This environment is shaped by management culture, organizational structure, and individual creativity, all of which interact to promote or inhibit creative processes.

A creative organizational culture is essential for fostering creativity. To better understand how this environment functions, it is essential to consider the role of organizational culture. A creative organizational culture is a key driver of innovation, and Social Exchange Theory (SET) offers a valuable framework for explaining this dynamic. According to SET, creativity is closely related to employees' perceptions of organizational support and other factors (Inam et al., 2021; Tripp, 2023). When employees feel valued and are given meaningful opportunities, they are more likely to engage in creative activities (Kassa & Tsigu, 2022; Aldabbas et al., 2023). In tourism organizations, especially those operating in culturally diverse environments, SET helps illuminate how employee-management relationships and customer expectations influence creativity and innovation (Meira & Hancer, 2021; Doğantekin, 2022; Revilla et al., 2023). In this study, Social Exchange Theory is not empirically tested through direct measurement of exchange-relational constructs, but rather used as a conceptual framework to contextualize how supportive organizational practices may relate to perceived creativity at the workplace.

Based on this theoretical framework, practical organizational strategies play a crucial role in nurturing creativity. A management culture that actively supports and encourages employees to pursue new ideas aligned with organizational goals is essential (Dennett, 2022). Organizations that integrate human resource strategies with innovation tend to foster an environment that encourages creativity. This includes practices such as providing constructive feedback, linking performance assessments to professional development, and offering incentives for collective achievements (Parolin & Albuquerque, 2010). Moreover, a supportive work environment that facilitates knowledge sharing and offers a robust support system is vital for individual creativity (Hermida et al., 2019). Recognizing and rewarding creative achievements is a critical practice for sustaining innovation (Lee et al., 2019). Encouraging employees to reflect on their tasks and performance can further stimulate creative thinking and lead to innovative outcomes (Leigh et al., 2013). Cultural structures that promote creativity, such as multicultural interactions and values that embrace both individualistic and collectivist approaches, enhance the overall creative potential within organizations (Hermida et al., 2019).

Cultural differences may influence how creativity at the workplace is perceived and valued within organizations, affecting the implementation of creative practices. Therefore, organizations must carefully balance structure and flexibility to create an environment that nurtures creativity while considering cultural and social factors that may impact creative processes. The national differences in creativity at the workplace among Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden can be associated with specific organizational practices that foster and reward creativity. These practices include fostering a creative atmosphere, making tasks more interesting, encouraging imagination, and rewarding creative achievements. The exploration of national differences in creativity at the workplace among Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden reveals a complex interplay of cultural, cognitive, and motivational factors that shape creative processes and outcomes. Each country exhibits unique characteristics influenced by its cultural dimensions, historical context, and educational system, which, in turn, affect its creative capacities.

Lithuanian creativity at the workplace is significantly influenced by national identity. Studies show that Lithuanians score higher on creativity when primed with national identity, suggesting a strong link between cultural pride and creative

expression (Tidikis et al., 2019). In the context of the Baltic countries, including Lithuania, the importance of the creative industries and the role of education in fostering creativity, especially in the fields of technology and design, is emphasised (Valantinaitė, 2015; Laurušaitė, 2016).

While specific studies on Poland's creativity at the workplace are less detailed in the provided contexts, Poland's cultural dimensions are conducive to innovation and creativity (Czerniak & Smygur, 2017). These cultural traits suggest a potential for high creative output, supported by a focus on individual autonomy and long-term orientation. Family organizations in Poland that support employee development and team integration are more likely to introduce product innovations, underscoring the importance of a supportive, trusting workplace climate (Steinerowska-Streb & Głód, 2020).

Sweden is often characterized by a high degree of individualism and low power distance, which are favorable for creativity at the workplace and innovation. The Swedish educational and professional environments encourage autonomy and self-directedness, which are critical for engaging in creative work (Chiu et al., 2018). This cultural backdrop supports a robust creative economy, as evidenced by Sweden's high rankings in global innovation indices (Jourdan & Smith, 2021). Organizations that foster a creative atmosphere tend to have a supportive cultures that encourage innovation and creativity at the workplace. This involves creating an environment where employees feel safe to express novel ideas without fear of criticism (Hermida et al., 2019; Kranich, 2022).

In summary, creativity at the workplace is shaped not only by individual abilities, but also by organizational practices and cultural contexts. Organizational support, management culture, and structures that encourage innovation are essential for fostering creativity. Social Exchange Theory (SET) helps explain how support affects employees' creative engagement, especially in culturally diverse sectors such as tourism. National differences significantly impact how creativity is perceived and practiced. These differences manifest in how organizations across countries structure their environments, support creative efforts, and reward innovation. Given differences in creativity across Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden, the hypothesis is formulated:

H2. Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden differ systematically in the reported use of creativity-supporting practices.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study draws on the Componential Theory of Creativity (Amabile, 2011; Zheng et al., 2025), the Interactionist Model of Organizational Creativity (Woodman, 2024), and Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Revilla et al., 2023; Tripp, 2023) as theoretical lenses to interpret cross-national differences in perceived creativity-supporting organizational practices. These theoretical assumptions guided the design of this study, which aimed to determine whether creativity at the workplace differs across Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden and whether these cross-country differences are related to distinct organizational practices. The tourism sector was chosen as the empirical context because it strongly depends on human creativity to co-create unique, experience-based products (Richards, 2020; Sharma et al., 2025) and because it reflects a complex interaction of individual, organizational, and cultural determinants of creativity (Dias et al., 2025).

The comparative cross-national design was chosen to capture national and cross-country differences in how creativity at the workplace is fostered, rewarded, and valued, as suggested by recent cross-country research (Maimone & Sinclair, 2022; Miron-Spektor & Paletz, 2024). Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden represent diverse cultural and economic environments within the Baltic Sea Region - ranging from emerging (Lithuania, Poland) to highly developed (Sweden) innovation systems (WIPO, 2024). This diversity allows testing of the hypotheses derived from theoretical assumptions that contextual factors significantly shape organizational creativity practices.

A cross-sectional quantitative study using the CAWI survey was conducted among tourism entrepreneurs in three countries: Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden. The study was conducted in 2024.

Measures

Creativity at the workplace in tourism organizations was assessed using the Creativity at Workplace Organization Scale developed by Musek (2020). This scale assesses the level of creativity at the workplace - that is, the extent to which employees perceive their organization as fostering and rewarding creativity. A higher score indicates a higher level of

creativity at the workplace (Musek, 2020). A sample item from this scale is: "Fosters finding new ways of doing things". There are 20 items, measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1=not at all characteristic, 5=highly characteristic). A double-translation (forward-backward) method was used: first, the text was translated into the target language (Lithuanian, Polish, or Swedish), followed by an independent back-translation into the original language (English). The translations were done by bilingual experts to ensure semantic equivalence. Content validity was further ensured through expert review of the translated versions. The survey instrument was pre-tested with a small group of tourism organizations (n=10) to ensure clarity and contextual relevance of items.

Internal consistency reliability of the Creativity at Workplace Organization Scale was assessed in the present study to ensure its reliability within the current sample. The scale demonstrated excellent internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.962.

Sample and sampling procedure

The sampling frame consisted of tourism-related entities listed in national business registers (based on the NACE classification of the tourism sector). In all three countries (Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden), electronic invitations to participate in the research were sent by e-mail to tourism-related entities included in the relevant national business registers. Data collection across all countries was carried out within the framework of the Nordplus research project, which served only as a funding mechanism (in Lithuania and Sweden) and did not influence the sampling design or the respondent survey procedures, which were the same in all countries. In Poland, the survey invitation was sent to 9,255 entities included in the national tourism business register (System Rejestrów Publicznych w Turystyce, turystyka.gov.pl), resulting in a response rate of 2.215%. In Lithuania, the survey invitation was sent to 1,509 entities included in the national Register of Tourism Service Providers (State Consumer Rights Protection Authority, Tourism Market Supervision Division, vvtat.lrv.lt), resulting in a response rate of 4.904%. In Sweden, the survey invitation was sent to 7,023 entities from the Companies Registration Office (bolagsverket.se) and the Statistics Sweden register (foretagsregistret.scb.se), resulting in a response rate of 2.236%.

436 complete questionnaires were collected (Lithuania: N=74; Poland: N=205; Sweden: N=157) (Table 1). As a result, external validity is limited, and the results should be interpreted as applicable only to the available sample. Nevertheless, the sample size is sufficient for intergroup tests of the three populations and for estimating polynomial models. The largest amount of data was collected in Poland, as it is the largest country, while Lithuania is the smallest country with relatively fewer tourism companies operating there; therefore, the smallest sample was collected (Eurostat, 2024). The characteristics of the surveyed companies are presented in Table 1. Respondents completed the survey in their native language. The survey was conducted only by owners and co-owners of tourism businesses, ensuring that each organization was represented by one respondent.

Table 1. Characteristics of the research sample (data in %)

Specifications		Lithuania N=74	Poland N=205	Sweden N=157
The volume of employment	<50 employees	82.43	87.32	85.35
	51-249 employees	16.22	12.68	14.01
	250 employees and more	1.35	0.00	0.64
The year in which the organization began its activities	<2000	20.26	16.1	1.27
	2000-2009	27.03	41.95	24.2
	2010-2019	45.95	35.61	68.79
	2020 and more	6.76	6.34	5.74

It should be noted that the dominance of micro and small tourism organizations (<50 employees) is consistent with the profile of the sector in the surveyed countries, where the majority of tourism organizations are small, family businesses (Eurostat, 2024). A small proportion of medium and large enterprises was also included in the sample, reflecting the actual structure of the tourism sector.

Data collection procedure

The online survey was conducted over 3 to 5 months in 2024, depending on the country. This extended time frame ensured sufficient participation across tourism organizations in Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden, reflecting differences in response dynamics between countries. The survey was hosted on a secure platform and distributed via personalized electronic invitations. Two reminder emails were sent to increase the response rate, following best practices for online survey research (Sammut et al., 2021). Respondents completed the questionnaire in their native language (Lithuanian, Polish, or Swedish).

The same online survey platform, invitation structure, and contact procedure were used in all three countries; invitation emails were standardized in content and format (translated into the respective national languages), and personalized only with the organization's contact details.

Research ethics

Participation was voluntary, and before the survey began, respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, anonymity, and data processing (Artal & Rubinfeld, 2017; Jamal & Higham, 2021). Data were analyzed in aggregate form solely for research purposes, in accordance with research integrity principles.

Before the study commenced, research teams from all three countries assessed potential ethical challenges arising from cross-national contexts and discussed them collaboratively. The final decision to conduct the study was approved by the Academic Council of Klaipėdos valstybinė kolegija, Higher Education Institution (KVK). The study was carried out in accordance with the KVK Code of Academic Ethics (approved by Protocol Resolution No. SV1-07 of the Academic Council of KVK on 30 September 2021) and was registered and confirmed by the KVK Applied Research and Project Activities Center (research registration No. TMV-205).

Method of analysis

Statistical analyses were conducted using Statistica 13.1 PL software. The Kruskal-Wallis test for ranked data was used to compare creativity at the workplace across countries (to test H1). The relationship between country and organizational practices was estimated using multinomial logistic regression (MNL), with Poland as the reference category (to test H2). The study focused only on country comparisons, not on tourism organizations size or year of establishment, as no significant statistical differences were found when examining tourism organizations size or year of establishment.

Additional robustness checks were conducted. Organization size and age were included as control variables in an extended multinomial logistic regression model; the pattern of significant predictors remained stable. Multicollinearity was assessed using variance inflation factors (VIFs), which were below 4, indicating no serious multicollinearity. Internal consistency was high across countries (Lithuania: $\alpha=0.957$; Poland: $\alpha=0.938$; Sweden: $\alpha=0.962$), suggesting stable cross-national reliability of the scale. Formal measurement invariance testing (e.g., multi-group CFA) was not conducted; therefore, cross-country comparisons should be interpreted with appropriate caution.

RESULTS

In the first stage of the research, entrepreneurs from 3 countries (Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden) were asked whether they consider their tourism organizations to be creative (Table 2).

Table 2. Creativity of tourism organizations in the opinion of entrepreneurs

Country	Very creative	Partly creative	Neither creative nor uncreative	Uncreative	Completely uncreative
Sweden	80.25	12.74	6.37	0.64	0.00
Poland	39.51	54.64	4.39	0.00	1.46
Lithuania	43.24	50.00	5.41	0.00	1.35

Note: Chi-square test=76.964, $p<0.001$; V-Cramer=0.297, data in %

Statistical analysis using the chi-square test showed a significant difference in creativity at the workplace among tourism organizations across countries (Chi-square test = 76.964; $p < 0.001$). The V-Cramer coefficient value of 0.297 indicates a moderate strength of the relationship between the variables (Table 2). It means that although there is a relationship between the country and the creativity at the workplace, it is not very strong, but it is significant enough to indicate some differences between the groups studied. The highest level of creativity at the workplace is reported by entrepreneurs from Sweden, with 80.25% rating their tourism businesses as „very creative,” which significantly exceeds the results of entrepreneurs from Lithuania (43.24%) and Poland (39.51%). In Lithuania and Poland, the predominant response is „partly creative” - Lithuania (50.00%) and Poland (54.64%) - indicating moderate creativity in tourism organizations. In Sweden, this category has a much lower share (12.74%). A low percentage of those who consider their tourism organizations to be „neither creative nor uncreative” - Lithuania (5.41%), Poland (4.39%), and Sweden (6.37%). Only 0.64% of entrepreneurs in Sweden rated their tourism organizations as „not particularly creative”. There were no such responses in Poland and Lithuania. The percentage of „completely uncreative” tourism organizations is also minimal - Lithuania (1.35%), Poland (1.46%), and no such responses in Sweden.

Nonparametric tests were used for the analyses because the data were derived from Likert-type scales and did not meet normality assumptions. The sample contained unequal group sizes and possible heterogeneity of variance and skewness, which violates key assumptions of classical parametric tests. The Kruskal-Wallis test operates on ranks, making it more robust to deviations from normality and outliers, and it remains accurate across diverse distribution shapes. Following a significant global result, post hoc comparisons of ranks with significance-level adjustment were used to reliably identify pairs of groups that differed (Stanisz, 2007; Mazurek-Kusiak et al., 2024).

The study compared creativity at the workplace across three countries using the Creativity Scale at Workplace Organization (Musek, 2020), which yields a sum score ranging from 20 to 100. Differences between groups were assessed using the Kruskal-Wallis test, which is suitable for ranked data and potentially non-normal distributions. The global test result indicated very significant differences between the studied countries: $H(2; N=436)=153.419$; $p<0.001$, $\epsilon^2=0,350$, confirming that the distributions of creativity scores are not identical across the compared populations and that the between-group effect has significant practical importance. Mean rank indices reveal a clear order: Sweden achieved the highest mean rank ($MR=317.97$; $N=157$), while Lithuania ($MR=168.55$; $N=74$) and Poland ($MR=160.35$; $N=205$) recorded much lower and similar values. Post hoc analyses on ranks with significance level correction showed that Sweden differs significantly from Lithuania and Poland ($p<0.001$ in both comparisons), whereas the difference between Lithuania and Poland did not reach statistical significance ($p=1.000$), thereby consolidating the conclusion that Sweden > Lithuania \approx Poland (Table 3).

Table 3. Kruskal-Wallis test for creativity at the workplace of tourism organizations

Country	Sweden MR=317.97	Lithuania MR=168.55	Poland MR=160.35	N	Sum of ranks
Sweden		<0.001	<0.001	157	49920.50
Lithuania	<0.001		1.000	74	12473.00
Poland	<0.001	1.000		205	32872.50

Note: $p<0.001$; $H(2; N=436)=153.4190$; MR-mean rank.

In light of these results, the most convincing picture emerges for Sweden, where the level of reported creativity in tourism organizations is significantly higher than in the other two countries, which may reflect differences in perceived work environments and creativity-supporting practices within the participating organizations. No differences between Lithuania and Poland suggest that in the current sample and with this operationalization of creativity, both populations are characterized by similar level of the tested construct, where the conclusions are of a ranked nature and concern the position of distributions, not means in the metric sense. Therefore, the results partially confirm Hypothesis H1. Significant differences in creativity at the workplace among tourism organizations in Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden indicate that Sweden differs significantly from the other two countries, whereas no significant difference was observed between Lithuania and Poland.

Entrepreneurs were then asked about aspects of this creativity at the workplace in tourism organizations. Twenty factors were evaluated. Multinomial logistic regression was used to examine cross-country differences. In addition, the correct specification (link choice and linearity on the logit scale on the predictor side), independence of observations,

sufficient information for each parameter (no serious separation), and no high collinearity between predictors were verified. The likelihood ratio test confirmed the global significance of the model: LR $\chi^2(40) = 336.2734$, $p < 0.001$, which indicates that the included predictors significantly improve the fit relative to the null model and that the model as a whole is statistically valid. The goodness-of-fit measure is complemented by the pseudo- R^2 Nagelkerke = 0.6173, which indicates that the model specification captures a significant portion of the variance in the dependent variable (Table 4).

Table 4. Multinomial logistic regression results - significant predictors

Comparison (vs Baseline)	Predictor	β	OR	95% CI (low)	95% CI (high)	P
Lithuania vs. Poland	Cares for customers in efficient and creative ways	0.5938	1.8109	1.1700	2.8029	0.0077
Lithuania vs. Poland	Fosters finding new ways of doing things	-1.0554	0.3481	0.1919	0.6313	0.0005
Lithuania vs. Poland	Stimulates employees to think and reflect over tasks and performance	0.8308	2.2952	1.2459	4.2281	0.0077
Lithuania vs. Poland	Cares for employees who are more complex and thoughtful than others	1.1260	3.0834	1.8160	5.2355	<0.0001
Lithuania vs. Poland	Avoids work that is too routine and tedious	0.4678	1.5965	1.0222	2.4936	0.0397
Lithuania vs. Poland	Cares to make the tasks and jobs more interesting and attractive	-1.4128	0.2435	0.1339	0.4427	<0.0001
Lithuania vs. Poland	Rewards creative achievements	-0.5155	0.5972	0.3756	0.9495	0.0293
Sweden vs. Poland	Performs many new approaches in production and marketing	1.0927	2.9823	1.6493	5.3927	0.0003
Sweden vs. Poland	Is known for creative improvements	0.7546	2.1267	1.2833	3.5245	0.0034
Sweden vs. Poland	Fosters finding new ways of doing things	-1.3209	0.2669	0.1420	0.5017	<0.0001
Sweden vs. Poland	Cares for employees who are more complex and thoughtful than others	1.1385	3.1222	1.7817	5.4713	0.0001
Sweden vs. Poland	Cares to make the tasks and jobs more interesting and attractive	-0.6877	0.5027	0.2808	0.9001	0.0207
Sweden vs. Poland	Provides positive thinking about creativity in management and executives	-0.8642	0.4214	0.2259	0.7860	0.0066
Sweden vs. Poland	Finds good solutions for new problems	1.1127	3.0424	1.6575	5.5847	0.0003
Sweden vs. Poland	Rewards creative achievements	-0.5468	0.5788	0.3499	0.9573	0.0332

Note: $p < 0.05$

Category: Sweden, Poland, Lithuania; Baseline: Poland; $N = 436$;

Pseudo- R^2 (Nagelkerke):0.6173; LR χ^2 :336.2734; $df(LR)$:40; $p < 0.001$;

Pseudo- R^2 (Cox-Snell)=0.5376; CI - confidence intervals; OR - odds ratio.

Comparing Lithuania to Poland revealed several clearly positive effects. The strongest positive effect was observed for “Cares for employees who are more complex and thoughtful than others”, with an estimated odds ratio of 3.0834 (95% CI: 1.8160-5.2355; $p < 0.0001$), which represents an approximately three-fold increase in the likelihood of being classified as Lithuania compared to Poland. The predictor “Stimulates employees to think and reflect over tasks and performance” also increased the likelihood of being classified as Lithuania (OR=2.2952; 95% CI: 1.2459-4.2281; $p = 0.0077$). Similarly, the predictor “Cares for customers in efficient and creative ways” was associated with an increased likelihood of being classified as Lithuania compared to Poland (OR=1.8109; 95% CI: 1.1700-2.8029; $p = 0.0077$). “Avoids work that is too routine and tedious” was also positively associated with Lithuania (OR=1.5965; 95% CI: 1.0222-2.4936; $p = 0.0397$). At the same time, significant negative effects were identified: “Cares to make the tasks and jobs more interesting and attractive” was associated with a decreased likelihood of being assigned to Lithuania compared to Poland (OR=0.2435; 95% CI: 0.1339-0.4427; $p < 0.0001$). A negative association was also noted for “Fosters finding new ways of doing things” (OR=0.3481; 95% CI: 0.1919-0.6313; $p = 0.0005$) and “Rewards creative achievements” (OR=0.5972; 95% CI: 0.3756-0.9495; $p = 0.0293$) (Table 4).

A complementary, yet clearly pro-innovation profile emerges in Sweden compared to Poland. As in the case of Lithuania, a high score in the category “Cares for employees who are more complex and thoughtful than others” increased the likelihood of being classified in the Sweden group (OR=3.1222; 95% CI: 1.7817-5.4713; $p = 0.0001$), and the ability to “Find good solutions for new problems” was associated with a comparable, more than threefold increase

in likelihood (OR=3.0424; 95% CI: 1.6675-5.5847; $p=0.0003$) of being a Swedish organization. Organizations declaring that they “Performs many new approaches in production and marketing” also had a nearly threefold increase in the odds of being classified as Swedish organization (OR=2.9823; 95% CI: 1.6493-5.3927; $p=0.0003$). “Is known for creative improvements” also increased this probability two-fold (OR=2.1267; 95% CI: 1.2833-3.5245; $p=0.0034$). On the other hand, several practices showed significant negative associations: “Fosters finding new ways of doing things” was negatively correlated with being Swedish organization (OR=0.2669; 95% CI: 0.1420-0.5017; $p<0.0001$), just as “Provides positive thinking about creativity in management and executives” (OR=0.4214; 95% CI: 0.2259-0.7860; $p=0.0066$), “Cares to make the tasks and jobs more interesting and attractive” (OR=0.5027; 95% CI: 0.2808-0.9001; $p=0.0207$) and “Rewards creative achievements” (OR=0.5788; 95% CI: 0.3499-0.9573; $p=0.0332$) (Table 4).

The results of this study support hypothesis H2. Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden differ systematically in the reported use of creativity-supporting practices. In both Lithuania and Sweden, the pattern of positive effects focuses on practices that enhance reflectivity and work complexity, as well as problem-solving skills, while more declarative and motivational elements, such as making tasks more attractive, emphasizing positive thinking, or rewarding achievements, are associated with lower odds of belonging to these categories compared to Poland. This configuration may suggest that, in the analyzed national samples, practices grounded in real-world operational and competency-based activities (reflection on tasks, problem-solving, and implementing new approaches) prevail rather than an emphasis on soft, image-related, or purely motivational aspects of a creative culture. At the same time, the discrepancy between the positive effects of “Caring for complex and reflective employees” and the negative effects of “Rewarding creative achievements” may result from the model being overloaded with interdependent dimensions or from the differences in meaning between competence development and formal reward mechanisms - the former type of practices may promote autonomy and quality of solutions, while the latter does not necessarily translate into operational effects after controlling for other variables.

It is important to remember the limitations specific to this type of research. The multinomial logistic regression model assumes independence of irrelevant alternatives; although the results are consistent and theoretically sound, further work is recommended to test parameter stability across variant specifications and to consider nested versions if national alternatives can be hierarchically ordered by institutional or cultural similarity. Self-reported creativity constructs may be subject to measurement error and differences in the meaning of scale items, and covariation among predictors can lead to dispersion of effects across related dimensions. Although the total sample size is adequate for MNL estimation, further research could strengthen inferences by increasing sample sizes within individual categories, employing variable selection or dimension reduction, and assessing robustness to alternative codings and transformations. Despite these caveats, the presented pattern of effects remains consistent: practices focused on reflection, complexity, and problem-solving have an advantage, while purely motivational strategies are relatively less important after controlling for other factors.

DISCUSSION

Statistically significant differences were found between creativity at the workplace of tourism organizations in Sweden and two other countries - Lithuania and Poland. Creativity at the workplace in the Swedish tourism organizations participating in the study significantly differs from that in Lithuania and Poland. Swedish respondents rated their organizations as very creative much more often than respondents in Lithuania and Poland. The observed differences can be further explained by cross-country research on creativity at the workplace, which highlights how national contexts are associated with differences in perceptions and practices of creativity at the workplace (McKearney et al., 2023; West & Richter, 2024). Previous studies have discussed the active integration of creativity at the workplace and innovation in tourism development in Sweden (Gustafsson & Ijla, 2017; Eimermann et al., 2019). According to the Global Innovation Index 2024 (WIPO, 2024), Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden have different positions in the global context of innovation and creativity at the workplace. Sweden remains one of the world's innovation leaders. Such contextual characteristics may offer a broader interpretive background for understanding the higher reported levels of creativity observed in the Swedish sample. The Swedish tourism sector benefits from a vibrant creative industry, a supportive entrepreneurial culture, and a national focus on sustainable development and innovation (Klein et al., 2021; Gustafsson & Amer, 2023; Dias et al., 2025). According to OECD, Sweden has actively promoted synergies between creative industries and tourism by supporting policies that encourage innovation, design thinking, and cultural engagement.

However, since this study does not assess organizational policy or innovation-related outcomes, national policy factors may be considered potential contextual explanations. The results are consistent with previous cross-country research on

creativity at the workplace, which suggests that creativity varies significantly across national contexts due to differences in work values, institutional support, and management practices (House et al., 2004; Barth & Stadtmann, 2026).

Within the analyzed sample, the observed cross-country differences appear consistent and statistically confirmed. These differences can be discussed in the context of broader conditions highlighted in previous literature; however, this study assesses only respondents' perceptions and does not directly evaluate environmental or institutional conditions.

Based on these results, an analysis of specific organizational practices provides further insights into how reported creativity-supporting practices differ across national contexts. The analysis also confirms that tourism organizations in Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden differ systematically in their reported organizational practices related to creativity support, including the extent to which they encourage and reward creativity. These findings are consistent with the theoretical understanding that creativity at the workplace within organizations is a multifaceted phenomenon (Bratnicka, 2015; Lua et al., 2024). A creative organizational culture is essential for fostering innovation, requiring leadership that encourages employees to pursue new ideas aligned with strategic goals (Dennett, 2022; Yas et al., 2022; Gupta et al., 2024).

In addition, significant differences in reported creativity-supporting practices were identified across countries and each country demonstrated different organizational practices. Compared to Poland, Lithuanian tourism organizations are dominated by creativity-supporting practices that emphasize caring for complex and thoughtful employees than others, encouraging employees to think and reflect on their tasks in terms of their results, effective and creative customer care, and avoiding overly routine or boring work. This profile shows that Lithuanian organizations promote creativity by applying reflective and competency-based methods that promote deeper employee engagement and problem-solving. Lithuania's focus on reflective practices and customer-oriented creativity at the workplace aligns with its Baltic context, where creative industries and education play a central role in fostering innovation (Valantinaitė, 2015; Laurušaitė, 2016).

Swedish tourism organizations demonstrate greater innovation and outcome-oriented, creativity-supporting practices. Swedish tourism organizations, compared to Polish tourism organizations, are characterized by a strong innovation focus, a concern for complex and thoughtful employees, the ability to find good solutions to new problems, the application of new production and marketing methods, and a reputation for creative improvements. The results support previous studies highlighting Swedish organizations' strong capabilities in creative problem-solving, positive leadership, and innovation, particularly in the tourism sector, where collaborative management, advanced technology, and open innovation play an important role (Aas, 2016; Gustafsson & Amer, 2023). Swedish organizational practices often emphasize solution-oriented thinking and employee empowerment, fostering a psychologically safe environment where creativity can flourish (Marklund, 2024).

Polish tourism organizations, compared to Lithuanian tourism organizations, show a stronger connection with practices that aim to make tasks more interesting and attractive, encourage the search for new ways of doing things, and reward creative achievements. Meanwhile, Polish tourism organizations, compared to Swedish tourism organizations, tend to place greater emphasis on seeking new approaches, encouraging positive attitudes toward creativity in management and leadership, pursuing more interesting tasks and jobs, and rewarding creative achievements. The results highlight that in Poland, the creativity-supporting practices focus on employee care and task attractiveness, reflecting a human-oriented approach. Previous research indicates that Poland offers favorable conditions for the development of business tourism products and demonstrates considerable diversity in its business tourism potential (Lipianin-Zontek & Zontek, 2021). Family organizations that support employee development and team integration are more likely to introduce product innovations, highlighting the importance of a trusting and supportive workplace climate (Steinerowska-Streb & Głód, 2020). Polish tourism sector is characterized by a structure and types of innovations comparable to those found in other countries (Panfiluk, 2021).

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to identify (1) whether creativity at the workplace differs between tourism organizations in Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden, and (2) whether tourism organizations in these countries differ systematically in reported creativity-supporting practices.

First, it has been confirmed that there are significant differences in creativity at the workplace between tourism organizations in Sweden and those in the other two countries, Lithuania and Poland. The results show that Swedish tourism organizations report significantly higher creativity at the workplace than those in Lithuania and Poland, while Lithuania and Poland do not differ significantly in overall creativity scores. The absence or minimal number of indications of a lack

of creativity suggests that, across all the countries studied, entrepreneurs have a relatively positive view of creativity at the workplace in their tourism organizations.

Second, the results confirm that Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden differ in reported creativity-supporting organizational practices. The multinomial logistic regression analysis shows that specific organizational practices are differentially represented across countries, forming distinct national profiles. In Swedish tourism organizations, creativity at the workplace is integrated into everyday problem-solving, marketing, and production processes, with a strong emphasis on innovation. Lithuanian tourism organizations emphasize the importance of reflective and customer-oriented practices. Polish tourism organizations, in turn, reflect more people-oriented organizational practices, seeking to make work more interesting and to motivate creativity by rewarding creative achievements.

The findings contribute to the theoretical understanding of creativity at the workplace as a multidimensional and context-sensitive phenomenon, supporting the idea that the national context plays an important role in shaping the perception, support, and practice of creativity within the analyzed sample. The findings suggest that creativity at the workplace in tourism organizations may be shaped by organizational practices and broader national contexts.

This study, situated at the intersection of tourism innovation and creativity at the workplace, contributes to a better understanding of how creativity at the workplace is implemented across tourism organizations operating in different national contexts. This interdisciplinary perspective highlights the importance of organizational creativity as a strategic resource for tourism innovation and provides a basis for future research seeking to link creativity-supporting organizational practices with broader innovation outcomes.

Theoretical and practical implications

The theoretical implications of the study results emphasize that creativity at the workplace in tourism organizations is a culturally rooted and strategically important phenomenon. The results obtained in the study are consistent with key assumptions of the Componential Theory of Creativity (Amabile, 2011; Gong et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2025), the Interactionist Model of Organizational Creativity (Woodman, 2024), and Social Exchange Theory (Revilla et al., 2023; Tripp, 2023) when these theories are applied as interpretive perspectives at the organizational and national levels. The findings suggest that national context may be associated with differences in perceived creativity-supporting practices within the analyzed sample. Swedish organizations, which reported the highest levels of creativity at the workplace in the analyzed sample, may be consistent with descriptions in cross-cultural literature that characterize Sweden as a low power distance and highly individualistic context (Bennett & Nikolaev, 2021). The Swedish leadership style, which emphasizes solution-oriented thinking and employee empowerment, creates a psychologically safe environment that encourages creative expression (Marklund, 2024). These results confirm the theoretical concept that creativity at the workplace is a multifaceted construct (Bratnicka, 2015; Lua et al., 2024). In contrast, Lithuania and Poland demonstrate a more fragmented and localized approach to creativity at the workplace, which may limit its broader impact on the development of tourism organizations and competitiveness.

This study provides empirical evidence consistent with the view that creativity at the workplace may function as a multi-layered structure linking organizational, and national contexts. The study's practical implications suggest that Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden differ systematically in their reported creativity-supporting practices.

Limitations and future research

This study provides valuable insights into creativity at the workplace in tourism organizations in Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden, but several limitations should be noted. The study was limited to only three countries, which may affect the generalization of the results.

Another limitation is related to the study design. The study uses a CAWI design, which captures relationships at a single point in time. This means that the directionality of the causal relationship cannot be confirmed. A longitudinal design would allow for the verification of causality.

The third limitation relates to the conceptual scope. The analysis focused on organizational practices and the country-level context but did not cover individual-level factors (e.g., creative self-efficacy, creative mindset). Including these aspects in future research would provide a more comprehensive and multi-layered understanding of how creativity at the workplace arises from the interaction of individual and organizational factors.

Given the low response rates (2-5%) and the voluntary nature of participation, the possibility of non-response bias and sampling heterogeneity cannot be excluded; therefore, cross-country differences should be interpreted with caution.

Future research should also employ mixed-methods, combining quantitative methods with detailed qualitative insights (e.g., interviews, case studies, or ethnographic methods) to capture the dynamics of creativity in the workplace.

Furthermore, as digital transformation continues to transform the tourism sector, future research should examine how the latest technologies, such as artificial intelligence, affect creativity in organizations, i.e., whether they enhance human creative potential or change its nature. This line of research is particularly relevant for policymakers and managers seeking to balance human creativity with the effective application of technology in order to achieve synergy.

Acknowledgment

Part of this research (in Lithuania and Sweden) was carried out in the framework of the project “NordTournet-4: Developing the Creativity of Tourism Workers Through the Use of Artificial Intelligence Powered Tools to Create New or Improve Existing Tourism Services” (No. NPAD-2022/10078).

References

- Aas, T. H. (2016). Open service innovation: The case of tourism firms in Scandinavia. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 12(2), 53-75. <https://doi.org/10.7341/20161223>
- Aldabbas, H., Pinnington, A., & Lahrech, A. (2023). The influence of perceived organizational support on employee creativity: The mediating role of work engagement. *Current Psychology*, 42(8), 6501-6515. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01992-1>
- Amabile, T. M. (2011). *Componential theory of creativity*. Harvard Business School.
- Artal, R., & Rubinfeld, S. (2017). Ethical issues in research. *Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics & Gynaecology*, 43, 107-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2016.12.006>
- Barth, P., & Stadtmann, G. (2026). Creativity in the West and the East: A meta-analysis of cross-cultural differences. *Creativity Research Journal*, 38 (1), 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2024.2369442>
- Bascavusoglu-Moreau, E., Kopera, S., & Wszendybył-Skulska, E. (2013). The role of creativity in development of innovation in tourism. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management & Innovation*, 9(1), 5-15. <https://doi.org/10.7341/2013911>
- Bavik, A., & Kuo, C. F. (2022). A systematic review of creativity in tourism and hospitality. *The Service Industries Journal*, 42(5-6), 321-359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2022.2041605>
- Benhaida, S., Safaa, L., Perkumienė, D., & Labanauskas, G. (2024). Creative tourism: Two decades of conceptual evolution and characterization. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(8), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14080172>
- Bennett, D. L., & Nikolaev, B. (2021). Individualism, pro-market institutions, and national innovation. *Small Business Economics*, 57(4), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11187-020-00396-Y>
- Bolagsverket. (2024). *API: er och öppna data*. Retrieved February 2, 2024, from <https://bolagsverket.se/index.html>
- Bratnicka, K. (2015). Creativity and effectiveness in organizations. A new approach to an old question. *Management*, 19(1), 33-45.
- Chen, X., & Yu, S. (2024). Synergizing culture and tourism talents: Empowering tourism enterprises for success. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 15(3), 12439-12471. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-023-01598-x>
- Chiu, W. C. K., Lun, V. M.-C., & Bond, M. H. (2018). Engaging in creative work: The influences of personal value, autonomy at work, and national socialization for self-directedness in 50 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 49(2), 239-260. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116651336>
- Cromwell, J., Amabile, T. M., & Harvey, J. F. (2018). An integrated model of dynamic problem solving within organizational constraints. In R. Reiter-Palmon, V. L. Kennel, & J. C. Kaufman (Eds.), *Individual creativity in the workplace* (pp. 53-81). Elsevier.
- Czerniak, J., & Smygur, V. (2017). National culture as a determinant of innovativeness. *Handel Wewnętrzny*, 369(4), 50-58.
- Damiasih, D. (2025). Innovative marketing strategies for sustainable tourism development: A literature review. *Golden Ratio of Marketing and Applied Psychology of Business*, 5(1), 246-257. <https://doi.org/10.52970/grmapb.v5i1.875>
- De Bernard, M., Comunian, R., & Gross, J. (2022). Cultural and creative ecosystems: a review of theories and methods, towards a new research agenda. *Cultural Trends*, 31(4), 332-353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2021.2004073>
- Dennett, P. (2022). The creative organization. In R. de Villiers (Ed.), *The handbook of creativity & innovation in business* (pp. 319-335). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2180-3-15>
- Dias, Á., González-Rodríguez, M. R., Pereira, L., & Conta, R. (2025). Attracting and retaining creative tourism entrepreneurs. *Creative Industries Journal*, 18(1), 88-103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17510694.2023.2203290>
- Doğantekin, A. (2022). Social exchange theory and tourism. In D. Gursoy & S. Çelik (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of social psychology of tourism* (pp. 61-67). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003161868>
- Eimermann, M., Mattsson, K. T., & Carson, D. A. (2019). International tourism entrepreneurs in Swedish peripheries: Compliance and collision with public tourism strategies. *Regional Science Policy & Practice*, 11(3), 479-493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rsp3.12148>
- Eurostat. (2024). *Key figures on European business 2024 edition* (ISBN 978-92-68-15530-1). European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2785/561679>
- Gilson, L. L. (2024). A review of the practical outcomes associated with creativity at the individual, group, and organizational levels. In J. Zhou & C. E. Shalley (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational creativity* (pp. 303-322). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003573326>
- Gong, Z., Nanjappan, V., Lee, L. H., Soomro, S. A., & Georgiev, G. V. (2023). Exploration of the relationship between culture and experience of creativity at the individual level: a case study based on two design tasks. *International Journal of Design Creativity and Innovation*, 11(3), 185-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21650349.2022.2157889>
- Gupta, R., Kumar, S., Rani, L., Sharma, T., & Naganandini, S. (2024). Innovation management: Strategies for fostering a culture of creativity in organizations. *Library Progress International*, 44(3), 7398-7408.

- Gustafsson, C., & Amer, M. (2023). Forsvik, Sweden: Towards a people-public-private partnership as a circular governance and sustainable culture tourism strategy. *Sustainability*, 15(5), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054687>
- Gustafsson, C., & Ijla, A. (2017). Museums - A catalyst for sustainable economic development in Sweden. *International Journal of Innovative Development & Policy Studies*, 5(2), 1-14.
- Hasan, N. (2022). Evaluating the impact of applying organizational creativity on tourism companies' success. *International Journal of Tourism Archaeology and Hospitality*, 2(1), 75-84. <https://doi.org/10.21608/ijtah.2022.244448>
- Hermida, Y., Clem, W., & Güss, C. D. (2019). The inseparable three: How organization and culture can foster individual creativity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2019.02133>
- Hoang, G., Wilson-Evered, E., & Lockstone-Binney, L. (2019). Leading innovation among tourism small and medium organizations: examining the mediating role of climate for innovation. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 40(5), 647-666. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-08-2018-0287>
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 cultures*. SAGE Publications.
- Huang, S. S., & Crotts, J. (2019). Relationships between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and tourist satisfaction: A cross-country cross-sample examination. *Tourism Management*, 72, 232-241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.12.001>
- Inam, A., Ho, J. A., Zafar, H., Khan, U., Sheikh, A. A., & Najam, U. (2021). Fostering creativity and work engagement through perceived organizational support: The interactive role of stressors. *Sage Open*, 11(3), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244021110469>
- Jamal, T., & Higham, J. (2021). Justice and ethics: towards a new platform for tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(2-3), 143-157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1835933>
- Jourdan, L. F., & Smith, M. (2021). National culture dimensions as predictors of innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Global Business Insights*, 6(2), 154-171. <https://doi.org/10.5038/2640-6489.6.2.1093>
- Kassa, A. G., & Tsigu, G. T. (2022). Corporate entrepreneurship, employee engagement and innovation: A resource-based view and a social exchange theory perspective. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 30(6), 1694-1711. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-05-2020-2172>
- Klein, M., Gutowski, P., Gerlitz, L., & Gutowska, E. (2021). Creative and culture industry in Baltic sea region condition and future. *Sustainability*, 13(8), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13084239>
- Kola-Bezka, M. (2011). Creativity as a factor for socio-economic development of Polish regions. *Equilibrium: Quarterly Journal of Economics and Economic Policy*, 6(1), 71-84.
- Kranich, S. (2022). A climate for creative endeavours. In R. de Villiers (Ed.), *The handbook of creativity & innovation in business* (pp. 337-361). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2180-3_16
- Laurušaitė, L. (2017). Lumen intellectus and economic benefit: expansion of and obstacles to creative industries in the Baltic countries. *Creativity Studies*, 10(1), 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.3846/23450479.2016.1164255>
- Lee, S., Kern, M. C., & Sawang, S. (2019). Editorial: Fostering Creative Organizations: Antecedents, Processes, and Consequences of Individual and Team Creativity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1-2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2019.02840>
- Leigh, K. E., Huber, A. M., & Tremblay, K. R. (2013). Fostering individual and organizational creativity in design. *Journal on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics*, 11(7), 64-69.
- Lipianin-Zontek, E., & Zontek, Z. (2021). Conditions for creating business tourism offers and the regional potential in Poland. In V. Katsoni & C. van Zyl (Eds.), *Culture and tourism in a smart, globalized, and sustainable world* (pp. 305-314). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72469-6_30
- Lua, E., Liu, D., & Shalley, C. E. (2024). Multilevel outcomes of creativity in organizations: An integrative review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 45(2), 209-233. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2690>
- Maimone, F., & Sinclair, M. (2022). Cross-cultural and intercultural dimensions of creativity in the workplace. *Frontiers in Communication*, 7, 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2022.1062257>
- Marklund, J. (2024). *Leadlike a Swede: navigating new terrain with solution-focused leadership*. Productivity Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003537274>
- Mazurek-Kusiak, A. K., Soroka, A., & Godlewska, A. (2024). Nutritional education in Polish companies: Employee needs and the role of employers in health promotion. *Nutrients*, 16(19), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu16193376>
- McKearney, A., Prouska, R., Tungtapanpoung, M., & Opute, J. (2023). The influence of national culture on employee voice in small and medium enterprises: a cross-cultural perspective. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 45(2), 478-494. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-04-2022-0187>
- Meira, J. V. D. S., & Hancer, M. (2021). Using the social exchange theory to explore the employee-organization relationship in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(2), 670-692. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2020-0538>
- Meyer, C., Gerlitz, L., & Klein, M. (2022). Creativity as a key constituent for smart specialization strategies (S3), what is in it for peripheral regions? Co-creating sustainable and resilient tourism with cultural and creative industries. *Sustainability*, 14(6), 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14063469>
- Ministerstwo Sportu i Turystyki. (2024). *System Rejestrów Publicznych w Turystyce*. Retrieved February 3, 2024, from <https://turystyka.gov.pl/>
- Miron-Spektor, E., & Paletz, S. B. (2024). Culture and creativity in organizations: New directions and discoveries. In M. J. Gelfand & M. Erez (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of cross-cultural organizational behavior* (pp. 240-267). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190085384.013.10>
- Montañés-Del-Río, M. Á., & Medina-Garrido, J. A. (2020). Determinants of the propensity for innovation among entrepreneurs in the tourism industry. *Sustainability*, 12(12), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12125003>
- Musek, J. (2020). *Creativity at workplace organization scale*. [Measurement instrument]. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.23152.48641>
- Odinokova, T. (2019). Tourism cluster as a form of innovation activity. *Economics Ecology Socium*, 3(2), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.31520/2616-7107/2019.3.2-1>
- OECD. (2014). *Tourism and the creative economy* (OECD studies on tourism). OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264207875-en>
- Ouyang, X., Liu, Z., & Gui, C. (2021). Creativity in the hospitality and tourism industry: a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(10), 3685-3704. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2021-0411>
- Panfiluk, E. (2021). Innovativeness of tourism organizations: Example of Poland. *Sustainability*, 13(3), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13031024>
- Panfiluk, E. (2023). In search of innovation barriers to tourist destinations - indications for organizations managing destinations. *Sustainability*, 15(2), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15021091>

- Park, J., Tse, S., Mi, S. D., & Song, H. (2022). A model for cross-border tourism governance in the greater bay area. *Journal of China Tourism Research*, 18(6), 1259-1283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19388160.2022.2036664>
- Parolin, S. R. H., & Albuquerque, L. G. de. (2010). Gestão de pessoas para a criatividade em organizações inovativas. *REAd-Revista Eletrônica de Administração*, 16(3), 514-543.
- Patil, R. (2024). Nurturing innovation and creativity for business success. *JCMM's Kaleidoscope Journal of Management Research*, 1(1), 73-75.
- Pikkemaat, B., Peters, M., & Bichler, B. F. (2019). Innovation research in tourism: Research streams and actions for the future. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 41, 184-196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.10.007>
- Rampa, R., & Agogué, M. (2021). Developing radical innovation capabilities: Exploring the effects of training employees for creativity and innovation. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 30(1), 211-227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12423>
- Revilla, R. G., Moure, O. M., & Marfil, L. L. (2023). Social exchange theory in tourism. In J. Jafari & H. Xiao (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of tourism* (pp. 1-2). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-01669-6_388-2
- Richards, G. (2017). The challenge of creative tourism. *Ethnologies*, 38, 31-45. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1041585AR>
- Richards, G. (2020). Designing creative places: The role of creative tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 85, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102922>
- Roman, M., Roman, M., & Niedziółka, A. (2020). Spatial diversity of tourism in the countries of the European Union. *Sustainability*, 12(7), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12072713>
- Rukuižienė, R. (2017). Lietuvos turizmo klasterių plėtros sprendimai. *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, 39(3), 357-372. <https://doi.org/10.15544/MTS.2017.26>
- Sammut, R., Griscti, O., & Norman, I. J. (2021). Strategies to improve response rates to web surveys: a literature review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 123, 104058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2021.104058>
- Saroghi, H., Libaers, D., & Burkemper, A. (2015). Examining the relationship between creativity and innovation: A meta-analysis of organizational, cultural, and environmental factors. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(5), 714-731. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2014.12.003>
- Scalabrini, E. B., & Alves, J. (2022). Some examples of best practices in creative tourism: How do entrepreneurs fit in the market and possible clusters? In P. C. A. Remoaldo, J. Araújo Alves, & V. Ribeiro (Eds.), *Creative tourism and sustainable territories: Insights from Southern Europe* (pp. 101-129). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Sharma, G. D., Taheri, B., Cichon, D., Parihar, J. S., & Kharbanda, A. (2024). Using innovation and entrepreneurship for creating edge in service firms: A review research of tourism and hospitality industry. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 9(4), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2024.100572>
- Sharma, I., Lim, W. M., & Aggarwal, A. (2025). Creative tourism: reviewing the past and charting the future. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 32(11), 109-149. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-11-2023-0787>
- Stanisz, A. (2007). *Przystępny kurs statystyki z zastosowaniem STATISTICA PL na przykładach z medycyny: T. 3, Analizy wielowymiarowe*. StatSoft Polska.
- Statistiska centralbyrån (SCB). (2024). *Företagsregistret*. Retrieved February 2, 2024, from <https://www.scb.se/vara-tjanster/bestall-data-och-statistik/foretagsregistret/>
- Steinerowska-Streb, I., & Glód, G. (2020). Innovations in Polish family firms. Exploring employee creativity and management practices that stimulate innovative thinking. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 16(2), 231-260. <https://doi.org/10.7341/20201628>
- Tang, M. (2019). Fostering creativity in intercultural and interdisciplinary teams: the VICTORY model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02020>
- Teodorescu, N., Stăncioiu, A.-F., Răvar, A. S., & Botoș, A. (2015). Creativity and innovation - Sources of competitive advantage in the value chain of tourism organizations. *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, 1, 35-48.
- Tidikis, V., Donohue, D. K., Petkevičiūtė-Barysienė, D., & Rakickienė, L. (2019). The relationship between creativity and global / national identity: Comparative study of Lithuanian and American students' sample. *Psichologija*, 58, 72-87. <https://doi.org/10.15388/PSICHOL.2018.4>
- Treffinger, D. J., Isakson, S. G., & Stead-Dorval, K. B. (2023). *Creative problem solving: An introduction* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003419327>
- Tripp, P. W. (2023). Social exchange theory: supporting frameworks for innovation. *Muma Business Review*, 7, 91-105.
- Valantinaitė, I. (2015). Creativity of trainee technology teachers of the Baltic countries as readiness to educate learners meeting the needs of the labor market of the beginning of the 21st century. In *Society. Integration. Education. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference* (Vol. 1, pp. 443-455). <https://doi.org/10.17770/SIE2015VOL1.305>
- Valstybinė vartotojų teisių apsaugos tarnyba. (2024). *Turizmo paslaugų teikėjai*. Retrieved February 1, 2024, from <https://vvtat.lrv.lt/lt/veiklos-sritys-54/vartojimo-paslaugos-78/turizmo-paslaugos-125/turizmo-paslaugu-teikejai-128/>
- Von Stamm, B. (2008). *Managing innovation, design and creativity*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- West, M. A., & Richter, A. W. (2024). Climates and cultures for innovation and creativity at work. In J. Zhou & C. E. Shalley (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational creativity* (pp. 211-236). Psychology Press.
- Williams, A. M., & Makkonen, T. (2024). Cross-border tourism and innovation system failures. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 105, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2024.103735>
- Wingström, R., Hautala, J., & Lundman, R. (2024). Redefining creativity in the era of AI? Perspectives of computer scientists and new media artists. *Creativity Research Journal*, 36(2), 177-193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2022.2107850>
- Woodman, R. W. (2024). Creativity and organizational change: Linking ideas and extending theory. In J. Zhou & C. E. Shalley (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational creativity* (pp. 283-300). Psychology Press.
- World Intellectual Property Organization. (2024). *Global innovation index 2024: Unlocking the promise of social entrepreneurship* (17th ed.). WIPO. <https://doi.org/10.34667/tind.50062>
- Xie, W., Li, H., & Yin, Y. (2021). Research on the spatial structure of the European Union's tourism economy and its effects. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18041389>
- Yachin, J. M., & Ioannides, D. (2020). "Making do" in rural tourism: The resourcing colour of tourism micro-firms. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(7), 1003-1021. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1715993>
- Yas, H., Othman, B., Mohammad, A. J., & Agala, S. R. (2022). Investigating the role of leadership and organisational culture in fostering innovation. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S5), 2316-2334. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS5.9145>
- Yodchai, N., Ly, P. T. M., & Tran, L. T. T. (2022). How the creative mindset affects entrepreneurial success in the tourism sector: The mediating role of innovation capability. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 34(1), 279-298. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2021-0695>

- Zheng, W., Li, X., & Ben, S. (2025). Structural equation modeling of determining factors in musical creativity: An extended model based on Componential Theory of Creativity. *BMC Psychology*, 13(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-03277-9>
- Zhou, J., & Hoever, I. J. (2014). Research on workplace creativity: A review and redirection. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 333-359. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091226>
- Zontek, Z. (2015). Innovation development in regional tourism enterprises [Conference paper]. *3rd International Scientific Conference Tourism in Southern and Eastern Europe*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2637747

Biographical notes

Gita Šakytė-Statnickė, Ph.D. in Management, Social Sciences, is an Associate Professor at Klaipėdos valstybinė kolegija | Higher Education Institution, Lithuania. She is a member of Lithuanian Union of Scientists (LMS), a member of Lithuanian Educational Research Association (LETA), European Association for Educational Research (EERA), Researchers' Excellence Network (RENET), LiMA. Her research interests include human resource management, employees of different generations, work engagement, artificial intelligence, and marketing. She has authored and co-authored over 40 scientific publications published in national and international scientific journals.

Anna K. Mazurek-Kusiak – habilitated doctor of social sciences in the discipline of economics and finance, professor at the Department of Tourism and Recreation at the University of Life Sciences in Lublin, Poland. Research projects manager: “Research and promotion of Polishness and regional traditions in the thematic villages of Eastern Poland” (NdS/536437/2021/2022) funded from Ministry of Science and Education and “An empiric model of tourist behavior on the travel agency market” (2018/02/X/HS4/02427) funded from National Science Center, Poland. She has 20 years of experience as an academic lecturer and researcher. She is also a certified professional guide in Lublin. Author of over 160 scientific publications in the field of economics, tourism, nutrition, management and marketing, as well as several scientific monographs.

Laurencija Budrytė-Ausiejienė – lecturer and head of the Tourism Business and Hospitality Service Management study programs at Klaipėdos valstybinė kolegija | Higher Education Institution, Lithuania. Her academic work focuses on tourism, cultural heritage, creativity development, intergenerational and intercultural communication in tourism enterprises, and the application of artificial intelligence in the tourism sector. Laurencija has participated as a researcher and project leader in several national and international projects, including NordPlus programs aimed at enhancing tourism education, digital competence, and service innovation. She is co-author of multiple scientific publications in the fields of tourism management, communication, and AI in tourism.

Author contributions statement

Gita Šakytė-Statnickė: Conceptualization, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project Administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing. **Anna Katarzyna Mazurek-Kusiak**: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing. **Laurencija Budrytė-Ausiejienė**: Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Project Administration, Resources, Software, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Citation (APA Style)

Šakytė-Statnickė, G., Mazurek-Kusiak, A. K., & Budrytė-Ausiejienė, L. (2026). Creativity at the workplace: Comparative study of tourism organizations in Lithuania, Poland, and Sweden. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 22(1), 78-94. <https://doi.org/10.7341/20262215>