

Eastern Illinois University
The Keep

Faculty Research and Creative Activity

Recreational Administration

April 2011

The role of family-friendly benefits on job self-efficacy and organizational commitment of public park and recreation professionals

Michael A. Mulvaney

Eastern Illinois University, mamulvaney@eiu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://thekeep.eiu.edu/recadmin_fac

 Part of the [Recreation Business Commons](#), and the [Tourism and Travel Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mulvaney, Michael A., "The role of family-friendly benefits on job self-efficacy and organizational commitment of public park and recreation professionals" (2011). *Faculty Research and Creative Activity*. 4.
http://thekeep.eiu.edu/recadmin_fac/4

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Recreational Administration at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Research and Creative Activity by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

A Study of the Role of Family-Friendly Employee Benefits Programs, Job Attitudes, and Self-Efficacy among Public Park and Recreation Employees

Michael Mulvaney

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: The number of dual-career couples, workers with eldercare responsibility, single-parent families, and working parents with young children has become increasingly common in the American workplace (Breugh & Frye, 2008) and has led to increased work-family conflicts for the park and recreation professional. In response to these workforce changes, family-friendly employee benefits programs (FFEBP) are becoming more readily available and offered by public park and recreation agencies. Guided by these challenges, this study sought to explore the link between FFEBP and job attitudes (organizational commitment) and employee motivation (self-efficacy) among public park and recreation employees. Specifically, the effects of two FFEBP (dependent care supports and flexible work arrangements) were assessed on organizational commitment and job self-efficacy outcomes. Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1991) was selected as the theoretical framework for this study due to its relevance to a variety of human resource management functions that occur within an organization and its application within employee motivation and commitment contexts (Gibson, 2004). Four hundred and fifty-six public park and recreation professionals completed an online survey that was used to measure the variables of interest. Analyses identified significant differences in employees' job self-efficacy and organizational commitment levels between agencies with family-friendly employee benefits programs and agencies without these programs. Specifically, the findings from this study suggest agencies with dependent care supports or flexible work arrangements benefit programs have employees who are more committed to the agency and generally have higher levels of motivation (i.e., job self-efficacy) than employees working in agencies without these programs. For administrators, these results suggest the potential of FFEBP in creating a strategic advantage for agencies by recruiting and retaining higher performers within an agency and by establishing a more productive workforce. However, despite the potential value of these benefits, careful planning and internal assessment is needed prior to implementation of a FFEBP. Complete results of the study are analyzed and discussed.

KEYWORDS: Employee motivation, family-friendly employee benefits, social cognitive theory

AUTHORS: Michael Mulvaney is with the Department of Recreation Administration, Eastern Illinois University, 600 Lincoln Avenue, Charleston, IL 61920, Phone: (217) 581-6589, Email: mamulvaney@eiu.edu

Change in family structures in recent years has caused a demographic shift in the workforce (Veiga, et al., 2004). The number of dual-career couples, workers with eldercare responsibility, single-parent families, and working mothers/fathers with young children has become increasingly common in the American workplace (Breugh & Frye, 2008). This change in the family structure has led to increased work-family conflicts (Allen, 2001) among employees while raising concerns by employers regarding the job productivity and performance of their employees (Johnson, 1995). Furthermore, previous research has indicated work-family conflicts have contributed to lower job satisfaction, increases in employee turnover, reductions in productivity, and increases in employees' stress levels (Veiga, et al., 2004).

In addition to these workforce trends, recent HR data suggests agencies will be faced with employee retention issues during the recovery phase of the current economic recession. Specifically, a CareerBuilder survey of professionals found that nearly one-third (32%) of employers are concerned about losing their high performing workers in the next few years, while one-third (33%) of workers said it is likely they will start looking for a new job when the economy picks up (Grasz, 2010). In response to these demographic changes and forecasted employee retention issues, family-friendly employee benefits programs (FFEBP) are becoming more readily available and offered by public park and recreation agencies. From on-site childcare to compressed workweeks, agencies are offering more flexible working conditions in an effort to create more family-friendly working environments.

The purpose of this study was to explore the link between FFEBP and job attitudes (organizational commitment) and employee motivation (self-efficacy) among public park and recreation employees. Specifically, the effects of two FFEbps (dependent care supports and flexible work arrangements) were assessed on organizational commitment and job self-efficacy outcomes. Dependent care supports and flexible work arrangements FFEBP were selected due to their prevalence as employee benefits within public park and recreation agencies (see Mulvaney, 2010). In particular, previous descriptive research has found that nearly 80% of public park and recreation agencies provide some form of flexible work arrangements or dependent care supports FFEbps to their employees (Mulvaney, 2010). In contrast, less than 45% of public park and recreation agencies provided leaves or time off FFEbps or work-family stress management FFEbps to their employees (Mulvaney, 2010). Recognizing the large disparity in FFEBP availability within public park and recreation agencies, this study is intended to serve as a starting point for future research in this area by examining the most prevalent FFEbps.

Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1991) was selected as the theoretical framework for this study. Social Cognitive Theory emphasizes the reciprocal interaction of the person, behavior, and environment; and accounts for motivational

aspects of performance (Bandura, 1991). Social Cognitive Theory has been applied to a variety of human resource management functions (i.e., training and development, performance appraisals, employee selection, etc.) that occur within an organization, reflecting real-life situations and problems, and has been shown to be highly applicable in employee motivation and commitment contexts (Gibson, 2004). Although Social Cognitive Theory has been applied to motivation and commitment issues in all age groups, it is shown to be especially relevant for personnel related research, as it emphasizes the interaction of the person, behavior, and environment; and accounts for motivational aspects of job performance (Bandura, 1991). Thus, Social Cognitive Theory appears to have merit when examining FFEBP in the field of public parks and recreation.

Family-Friendly Employee Benefits

FFEBP are those benefits that go beyond the policies required by the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). In general, the FMLA impacts agencies with 50 or more employees, and provides up to 12 weeks (unpaid) leave for the birth or placement for adoption or foster care of a child; care of a seriously ill child, spouse or parent; or an employee's serious illness preventing the employee from performing the functions of his or her job (Bohlander & Snell, 2004). Guided by the FMLA's policies, researchers have conceptualized FFEBP into four distinct categories: dependent care supports (i.e., on-site childcare, after school/holiday programs, eldercare information or referral, childcare discounts/vouchers, etc.); flexible work arrangements (i.e., job sharing, flextime, compressed workweek, telecommuting, etc.); leaves and time off (i.e., family and medical leave, personal leave of absence, sabbatical, leave bank/leave sharing, etc.), and; work-family stress management (i.e., employee assistance programs, health promotion, work-family resource center, support groups, courses on life balancing, etc.) (Johnson, 1995). A brief review of the two FFEBP categories of interest to this study, dependent care supports and flexible work arrangements, is provided in the following paragraphs.

Dependent Care Supports

Dependent care support benefits are becoming increasingly popular in the United States workplace (DeNisi & Griffin, 2001). Although dependent care support benefits plans vary among agencies, they typically involve one or more of the following components (DeNisi & Griffin, 2001): on-site childcare, after school or holiday programs for children, eldercare information/referrals, and/or childcare discounts. On-site childcare programs typically involve the provision of on-site or nearby childcare services. Oftentimes, employers support the childcare program(s) by covering start-up costs, operating expenses, and/or subsidies for tuition (DeNisi & Griffin, 2001). The second dependent care support benefit is after school or holiday programs. These programs are designed to provide employees' children the opportunity to participate in educational or recreation-based activities within a structured and supervised environment after school (i.e., 3 p.m. – 6 p.m.) and/or during school holidays. Eldercare information/referral benefits espouse a combination of services and programs focused on assisting employees in the care of elder family members (DeNisi & Griffin, 2001). Depending on the agency, eldercare services might include free or reduced cost registration within the agency's senior (education and/or recreation) programs. Many agencies also provide educational programs and resources (i.e., information related to independent living, information and contacts for elder housing options, financial and medical considerations, nursing homes, home health care agencies, etc.) for employees who are currently, or who will be, caregivers for elder family members (DeNisi & Griffin, 2001). The fourth dependent care support category is childcare discounts. A common

benefit offered by agencies lacking on-site childcare, childcare discounts or vouchers are provided to employees as a way to reduce the costs associated with childcare.

Research has found that agencies providing dependent care supports have witnessed reductions in turnover and increases in staff availability in the workplace. For example, Demby's (2004) research indicated one private company experienced a decrease in voluntary turnover among salaried employees from 10% to 7% within the first year of adopting a dependent care supports FFEBP. In another study, a 38-person CPA firm estimated that by providing on-site childcare, the firm netted +\$25,000 (annual income) through increased staff engagement and availability in the workplace for meetings, projects, consultation, etc. (Baltes, et al., 1999).

Flexible Work Arrangements

Flexible work arrangements alter the normal workweek of five, eight-hour days in which all employees begin and end their workday at the same time. Agencies providing flexible work arrangements depart from this traditional workday or workweek by providing employees opportunities for compressed workweeks, flextime, job sharing, and telecommuting. With the compressed workweek, the workweek is compressed into fewer than five days by increasing the number of hours an employee is required to work per day (e.g., four-day, 40-hour workweek) (Bohlander & Snell, 2004). Flextime programs enable employees to exercise a decision regarding the time of day they will arrive at and leave from the workplace (DeNisi & Griffin, 2001). With flextime, employees are given considerable latitude in scheduling their work. However, there is typically a "core period" during the morning and afternoon when all employees are required to be on the job (Bohlander & Snell, 2004). For example, an agency adopting a flextime schedule may require all employees work during the "core period" from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. with flexible time periods at 6 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. to 7 p.m. Job sharing allows two or more employees to share the duties of one full-time job. A commonly adopted approach to job sharing involves two employees working three days a week, creating an overlap day for extended face-to-face conferencing (Cascio, 2006). While the pay of the two employees is typically reduced (i.e., three-fifths of a regular salary), the job sharers usually take on additional responsibilities beyond what the original job would require (Higgins, Duxbury, & Johnson, 2000). Telecommuting involves the use of personal computers, networks, and other communications to do work in the home that is traditionally done in the workplace (Hartley, 2002). A variation of the telecommuting benefit is the virtual office, where employees are in the field helping customers or are stationed at other remote locations working as if they were in the home office (Bohlander & Snell, 2004). Several benefits associated with flexible working arrangements have been found in the management literature, including increased employee efficiency, decreased stress, increased job autonomy, and higher job satisfaction (Wang & Walumbwa, 2007). In other research, significant relationships have been identified between the availability of these programs and increased employee flexibility, improved ability to attract workers who might not otherwise be available, reduced burden on dual working parents, and reduced absenteeism (Hartley, 2002).

Theoretical Framework

Social Cognitive Theory's reciprocal determinism takes into account the behavior, the individual, and the environment in which the individual operates (Gibson, 2004). The reciprocal interaction of the work environment, behavior, and the person—with each influencing and being influenced by the other—provides a comprehensive explanation of the factors that influence adult behavior (Gibson, 2004). According to Bandura (1986),

human functioning is comprised of a series of reciprocal interactions between behavioral, environmental, and personal variables (Schunk, 1999). The series of interactions have been represented as a triangle with each factor (behavior, environment, and personal) bi-directionally influencing the others. Individuals are neither driven by inner forces nor buffeted by environmental stimuli (Wexley & Latham, 2002). As Davis and Luthans (1980) explained, “social learning posits that the person and environment do not function as independent units but instead determine each other in a reciprocal manner” (Ginter & White, 1982, p. 298). Martins (2004) suggests that individuals are both producers and products of social systems. Social structures are established by human activity. Conversely, social structures also constrain and provide resources for personal development and everyday functioning; however, neither structural constraints nor enabling resources foreordain what individuals become and do in given situations (Bandura, 1997). The self exercises self-influence and operates generatively and proactively, not just reactively, to shape the character of their social systems (Bandura, 1997). Thus, the individual is socially constituted, but is also an active agent in his/her environment.

In response to the ongoing presence of social influences in the learning process, Schunk (1999) reviewed the literature on reciprocal determinism and proposed a model that sought to identify predominant influences (i.e., variables) within the three areas of Bandura’s (1986) triadic reciprocity. Schunk’s (1999) model adopted Bandura’s (1986) reciprocal determinism variables (individual, environment, and behavior) and identified specific variables within each area. Schunk (1999) suggested that the environmental factors (i.e., presence of FFEBP) affect many individual variables, such as the individual’s attributions (i.e., organizational commitment). Achievement outcomes such as motivational behaviors (i.e., job self-efficacy) are also affected by social and individual influences (Schunk, 1999).

In terms of reciprocal determinism and FFEBPs, organizational commitment appears to have merit as an individual attribute worthy of investigation. Organizational commitment is a work-place attitude that describes the psychological attachment between an individual employee and their employing organization. Meyer and Allen (1997) described a committed employee as “one who will stay with the organization through thick and thin, attends work regularly, puts in a full day (and maybe more), protects company assets, and who shares company goals” (p. 3). Organizational commitment research has found high levels of organizational commitment to be associated with low turnover, limited tardiness, low absenteeism, and in some situations, enhanced job performance (Bartlett & McKinney, 2004; Jaros, 1997; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979). When considering the relationship between organizational commitment and FFEBPs, reciprocal determinism would suggest that if employees perceive that they are being cared for through the provision of FFEBP, the more apt employees are to feel obligated to “pay back” or reciprocate by displaying more commitment to the agency.

Job self-efficacy also appears to have merit as an achievement/behavior outcome. In Social Cognitive Theory, self-efficacy concerns individuals’ beliefs in their capability to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to exercise control over events in their lives (Martocchio & Webster, 1992; Wood & Bandura, 1989). Research on self-efficacy has identified three main themes about the construct (Bandura & Wood, 1989, Wood & Bandura, 1989). First, self-efficacy is a comprehensive summary or judgment of perceived capability for performing a specific job (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). In an organizational context, information derived from the individual, the job, and others in the work environment may contribute to the comprehensive assessment of capability. Second, self-efficacy is a dynamic construct (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). The efficacy of judgment changes over time as new information and experience are acquired (sometimes during actual task performance) (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Third, Bandura (1991) argued

that self-efficacy is more than an inert estimate of future action; it involves a generative capability by which resources and subskills are orchestrated into successful performance (Gist, Stevens, & Bavetta, 1991). This is supported by evidence that (a) people who have high self-efficacy for a specific task typically outperform those who have low self-efficacy, (b) self-efficacy often predicts future performance better than does past performance, and (c) self-efficacy accounts for a significant portion of variance in performance after controlling for ability (Bandura, 1986; Gist et al., 1991).

Social Cognitive Theory would suggest that human behavior and one's self-efficacy is regulated by the ongoing exercise of self-influence (Gist et al., 1991). Self-efficacy is regulated by forethought as individuals are able to hold beliefs about what they can and/or cannot do, recognize the possible consequences of their actions, establish personal goals and devise plans to assist in achieving those goals (Bandura, 1986). In discussing this self-regulated function, Bandura (1991) contends that individuals cannot influence their own motivation and actions very well if they do not pay adequate attention to their own performances, the conditions under which they occur, and the immediate and distal effects they produce. Thus, the success in self-regulation depends on self-monitoring (Bandura, 1991). Observing one's pattern of behavior is the first step toward doing something to affect it, but, in itself, such information provides little basis for self-directed reactions (Bandura, 1991). Bandura (1991) contends that one's judgmental function connect the observations to one's self-reaction. These judgment patterns one subscribes to are influenced primarily by their personal standards. These personal standards are developed based on three factors: social referential comparisons, valuation of activities, and perceived performance determinants. Social referential comparison involves the evaluation of one's performance in relation to the attainments of others. Valuation of activities suggests that people place varying levels of importance (or value) on activities based on their significance. Anticipated self-reactions are determined by a person's internalized performance standards (i.e., self-monitoring and judgment of one's behavior). Taken collectively, these judgment patterns influence one's self-efficacy perceptions and future performance (Bandura, 1997).

When considering the relationship between job self-efficacy and FFEBCPs, Social Cognitive Theory would suggest that if employees perceive they are being pulled away from work-related responsibilities due to personal reasons (i.e., taking child to school, caring for elder family members, lengthy commute to work, etc.), they are more likely to view their work-related performance at a lower standard when compared to employees without significant personal responsibilities. Specifically, the employees faced with significant personal responsibilities, who struggle to maintain the workload and schedule of their co-workers are likely to perceive their performance as below standard. This lower self-evaluation of their work-related performance will likely negatively influence their self-efficacy perceptions (Bandura, 1997). Thus, the availability of FFEBCPs as a strategy to reduce employees' work-family conflicts and improve their self-efficacy perceptions appears to have merit.

Research Hypotheses

This study sought to examine the effects of two types of FFEBCP (dependent care supports and flexible work arrangements) on motivational (i.e., job self-efficacy) and commitment (i.e., organizational commitment) outcomes of employees in public park and recreation agencies. Guided by Social Cognitive Theory, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1a: Public park and recreation professionals who perceive the availability of dependent care supports FFEBP within their agency will have higher levels of job-self efficacy compared to public park and recreation professionals who do not perceive the availability of dependent care supports FFEBP within their agency.

Hypothesis 1b: Public park and recreation professionals who perceive the availability of flexible work arrangements FFEBP within their agency will have higher levels of job-self efficacy compared to public park and recreation professionals who do not perceive the availability of work-family stress management FFEBP within their agency.

Hypothesis 2a: Public park and recreation professionals who perceive the availability of dependent care supports FFEBP within their agency will have higher levels of organizational commitment compared to public park and recreation professionals who do not perceive the availability of dependent care supports FFEBP within their agency.

Hypothesis 2b: Public park and recreation professionals who perceive the availability of flexible work arrangements FFEBP within their agency will have higher levels of organizational commitment compared to public park and recreation professionals who do not perceive the availability of work-family stress management FFEBP within their agency.

Rationale for Conducting FFEBP Research in the Parks and Recreation Field

There are unique issues facing the park and recreation profession that support the need for FFEBP research. First, an increasing number of public park and recreation agencies are adopting FFEBPs with little understanding of the effects these programs have on their employees or agency (Mulvaney, 2010). Research investigating the links between these programs and employee commitment to the agency and performance motivation can provide insight on the impact(s) these programs have on several of the agency's human resource functions (i.e., performance management, training and development, compensation strategies, etc.).

The overall mission of public park and recreation agencies also lends itself to advocating FFEBP research. In particular, public park and recreation agencies are predicated on enhancing the quality of life within communities. From enhancing residents' recreational opportunities and experiences to educating the community on the value of leisure, public park and recreation agencies are dedicated to improving the lives of their constituents. Subscribing to this approach, one might argue that the field of public parks and recreation should be a "front runner" in the promotion and enhancement of family friendly work environments for their professionals. In particular, FFEBPs can be used by public park and recreation agencies as a way to educate their employees on the importance of a "work-life" balance. Furthermore, public park and recreation agencies can integrate FFEBPs within their public agendas to communicate and help educate their entire community on the value of this "work-life" balance.

Another issue facing park and recreation agencies is the current economic climate within the public sector. Consider the findings from a 2010 white paper published by the National Recreation and Park Association that described these economic conditions within the field of public parks and recreation:

Changes in economies at the local, national, and global levels have created new challenges for public park and recreation agencies and their constituencies. For the first time since the postwar period, local, state and federal governments have reported shortfalls in all major revenues—sales, income tax, and capital property—at the same time (Miller & Svara, 2009). In addition to these findings, economists and city planners have suggested that city fiscal conditions tend to lag behind national economic conditions due to delays in property tax assessments. Thus, the full effects of the depressed real estate market, low levels of consumer confidence, and the high levels of unemployment in recent years may not have fully impacted local agencies yet. As some national economic forecasts have predicted slow to moderate improvements in the nation's economic conditions, public park and recreation agencies will likely still be realizing the effects of the current downturn through the year 2011. Clearly, public park and recreation agencies are in the midst of an economic downturn that might be several years in length.

In response to these economic conditions, many agencies are using this period as an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their operations. Some agencies are focusing their efforts on returning to the social service models that characterized the parks and playground movements of the past, while other agencies are using the economic downturn as a call to improve their agency's business model. Regardless of the service model adopted by the agency, virtually every public park and recreation agency recognizes the need to think and act strategically and is achieving this through re-organization of staff and resources, reconnecting with their constituencies, and/or revisiting their mission, goals and objectives (Mulvaney, 2010).

As agencies undergo these financial, physical, and human resource audits, research on the role of FFEFBPs within the public park and recreation agency appears to have merit. From identifying the employee usage rates of FFEFBPs to examining the possible effects of these programs (i.e., employee motivation, commitment to the agency, improved job performance, etc.), research on FFEFBPs is needed and can provide agencies with a clearer understanding of the overall utility of FFEFBPs.

Despite these views, little to no empirical research on FFEFBPs has been conducted within public park and recreation agencies. The intent of this research project is to serve as a starting point for FFEFBP research within the setting of public parks and recreation. In meeting this challenge, this study sought to investigate the effects associated with FFEFBP on motivational (i.e., job self-efficacy) and commitment (i.e., organizational commitment) outcomes of employees in public park and recreation agencies.

Method

Sample

Participants for the study were obtained from the complete membership of the Illinois Park & Recreation Association's (IPRA) database of professionals. The list contained 1,822 professionals from +340 park districts, forest preserve districts, conservation districts, special recreation associations, and municipal park and recreation departments within the state of Illinois. Each of the 1,822 professionals was included in the study and an online survey was utilized to measure all of the study's variables. A description of the instruments used to measure the variables of interest and the data-collection procedures are provided in the following paragraphs.

Family Friendly Employee Benefits Programs

Guided by Johnson's (1995) conceptual model of FFEBP, eight FFEBP were measured. An overview of each benefit category and the measurement instruments are provided in the following paragraphs.

Dependent care supports. Johnson's (1995) research has identified four FFEBPs within the dependent care supports domain. These FFEBPs include: on-site (or near site) childcare, school-age programs, eldercare information or referral, and childcare discounts, vouchers (Johnson, 1995). In completing the instrument, respondents were provided a list of the four dependent care support benefits (on-site or near site) childcare, school-age programs, eldercare information or referral, and childcare discounts, vouchers) and asked to identify which of the following employee benefits their agency provided to its employees.

Flexible work arrangements. Research has identified four FFEBPs within the flexible work arrangements category (Johnson, 1995; Wang & Walumbwa, 2007). The four FFEBPs include: compressed workweeks, flextime, job sharing, and telecommuting (Johnson, 1995). Similar to the dependent care supports instrument, respondents were provided a list of the four flexible work arrangements benefits and asked to identify which of the following employee benefits their agency provides to its employees.

Job Self-Efficacy Beliefs

As suggested by Riggs et al. (1994), job self-efficacy was assessed as an indicator of future job performance. Participants' job self-efficacy was measured using a 10-item scale that was adopted from Riggs et al. (1994). Items are scored on a five-point scale ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. A sample item includes, "I have confidence in my ability to do my job." The 10-item scale has shown acceptable internal consistency reliability in previous research on public sector employees ($\alpha=.85$).

Organizational Commitment

The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to measure commitment to the organization in which respondents were currently employed. Previous park and recreation research has supported the improved reliability of the nine-item OCQ ($\alpha=.90$) compared to the original 15-item OCQ ($\alpha=.88$) (Bartlett & McKinney, 2004). Based upon this previous research, the nine-item OCQ was utilized for the current study. The nine items on the OCQ were measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree) providing a composite indicator of employee organizational commitment (Bartlett & McKinney, 2004).

Demographic Variables

Information on six demographic variables was collected: gender, marital/couple household status, household income, household employment status (single vs. dual income household), do you have children, and years employed with current agency. Each of these variables was measured using a single item. To test the hypotheses of interest, response categories for the household employment status was dichotomized. Specifically, the original response categories for household employment status (single, one income; married/couple, one income, and; married couple/dual incomes) were consolidated into two categories—single income or dual income.

Data Collection and Procedures

Each of the 1,822 professionals was sent an email invitation to participate in the study. The email invitation described the study and provided a link to the online survey

(a separate link was also provided for those individuals who wanted to be removed from the mailing list and the study). The online survey was created utilizing a well known online survey development tool, Survey Methods. The online survey measured all of the study's variables, including each of the FFEBP, job self-efficacy beliefs, organizational commitment, and demographic characteristics.

Subscribing to the Dillman (2000) technique, a series of reminders was sent to the participants. In particular, a reminder e-mail with a link to the survey was sent one week after the initial e-mail was submitted. Next, a personalized reminder e-mail was sent to participants who had not completed the survey fourteen days after the initial invitation e-mail. A final e-mail was sent to non-respondents five days before the deadline. These procedures yielded a 25% response rate (n=456). To address the potential for nonresponse bias, brief phone interviews were conducted with 25 of the nonrespondents. The phone interviews found little difference between the respondents and nonrespondents, providing further support for the generalizability of the study's findings. Descriptive statistics for the sample professionals are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for the Total Sample

A. Sample Frequencies			
Variable	n	%	
Gender			
Male	152	36.6%	
Female	263	57.7%	
Household Status			
Single, no children	74	17.9%	
Married/couple, no children	72	17.4%	
Single, with children	35	8.5%	
Married/couple, with children	233	56.3%	
Household Income			
Up to \$34,999	20	4.9%	
\$35,000 to \$74,999	101	24.9%	
\$75,000 to \$99,999	108	26.7%	
\$100,000 to \$149,999	115	28.4%	
\$150,000 to \$199,999	49	12.1%	
\$200,000 or more	12	3.0%	
Household Employment Status			
Single, one income	101	24.5%	
Married/couple, one income	25	6.1%	
Married/couple, dual incomes	281	68.0%	
Other	6	1.5%	
Do You Have Children?			
Yes	268	64.7%	
No	146	35.3%	
Agency Description			
Conservation District	2	0.5%	
Forrest Preserve District	7	1.7%	
Municipality	42	10.1%	
Not-for-Profit	3	0.7%	
Park District	316	76.1%	
Special Recreation Association	37	8.9%	
University	1	0.2%	
Other	7	1.7%	
B. Sample Mean and Standard Deviation			
Variable	M	SD	
How many years have you worked for this agency?	10.9	8.65	

Data Analysis

Preliminary analyses focused on screening the data for (a) missing values, (b) multivariate outliers, (c) linearity, normality, and homoscedasticity, and (d) multicollinearity issues among the study's independent variables. Boxplots were computed and screened to identify possible outliers within the dataset. As multiple regression can be very sensitive to extreme cases (see Stevens, 2001), Mahalanobis distance statistics were also calculated in an effort to provide a more precise identification of outliers in the sample. Linearity, normality, and homoscedasticity issues were assessed through the examination of the residuals scatterplots as well as measures of skewness, kurtosis, and Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics. Internal consistency measures were obtained for job self-efficacy beliefs and organizational commitment. In addressing multicollinearity concerns, tolerance statistics and intercorrelations were performed among the study's variables. The results of these analyses were used to guide subsequent statistical analyses in determining the support (or lack of) for the study's hypotheses.

In the examination of the study's hypotheses, hierarchical regression analyses were computed. Hierarchical regression analyses was used in an effort to obtain a more precise estimate of the amount of variance accounted for by the two types of FFEBP on job self-efficacy and organizational commitment after partialling out the individual characteristics of the participants. The individual characteristic variables (sex, marital/couple status, household income, years worked with current agency, do you have children, and single vs. dual income) were specified as the first block of predictor variables in the regression analysis and the availability of FFEBP within the agency comprised the second block. Categorical variables were dummy-coded in all of the regression analyses.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Prior to testing the hypotheses, the data were examined for accuracy of data entry, missing values, and outliers. Bivariate scatterplots, Mahalanobis distance, and missing value analyses identified 30 cases that were either outliers or were uncompleted surveys and thus were removed from subsequent analyses.

Skewness and kurtosis statistics were computed to assess normality of the organizational commitment and job self-efficacy variables and are provided in Table 2. Skewness measures identified an acceptable degree (see Mertler & Vannatta, 2010) of symmetry of score distribution about the mean and Kurtosis measures were also found to be within the acceptable ± 1 range for both dependent variables. In subsequent normality tests, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests for both variables were also not significant, providing further support for normality.

Table 2. Skewness and Kurtosis Statistics: Job Self-Efficacy and Organizational Commitment

Variable	<i>n</i>	M	Skewness		Kurtosis	
			Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Job Self-Efficacy	395	40.33	-.48	.12	.23	.24
Organizational Commitment	395	52.72	-.77	.15	.84	.27

To examine linearity and homoscedasticity, linear regression analyses were performed that compared the standardized residuals to the predicted values of organizational commitment and job self-efficacy (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). Residuals regression analyses for organizational commitment and job self-efficacy both generated plots that were rectangular-shaped distributions with a concentration of values along the center of the plot, indicating the assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity were met for organizational commitment and job self-efficacy.

In assessing possible multicollinearity issues, tolerance statistics were obtained for each of the study's fourteen independent variables. Tolerance statistics for the variables were found to be well above the 0.1 cutoff point (see Norusis, 1998), ranging from .62 (income variable) to .98 (sex variable), indicating the absence of multicollinearity among the variables. Patterns of association among the study variables were also investigated to assess possible multicollinearity concerns (see Table 3). Several significant positive correlations were found among the specific FFEBP within each of the dependent care support and flexible work arrangement categories. In particular, the results suggest that agencies providing FFEBP tend to provide more than one specific option within the dependent care support and flexible work arrangement categories.

Despite the significant intercorrelations obtained from the analyses, the results indicated a lack of multicollinearity among the study's variables. In particular, statisticians suggest combating multicollinearity issues in a regression analysis only when variables have intercorrelations of .80 or higher (Stevens, 2001). Based upon these findings, none of the study's variables were deleted or combined prior to subsequent analyses.

The instruments used in the study were also examined for reliability. Internal consistency on the job self-efficacy instrument with the study participants yielded an alpha coefficient of .88 while the organizational commitment instrument yielded an alpha coefficient of .90. Inspection of the individual changes in alpha levels should each item be deleted was also completed for both instruments.

Job Self-Efficacy and FFEBP

Tables 4a and 4b show the results for hypotheses 1a and 1b. Hypothesis 1a predicted that professionals working for agencies that provided dependent care supports FFEBP (on-site childcare, after school/holiday programs, eldercare information or referral, and childcare discounts, vouchers, etc.) would exhibit higher job self-efficacy than professionals working for agencies without dependent care supports FFEBP. The results of the regression analysis indicated that the individual characteristics (gender, marital/couple status, household income, single- vs. dual-income household, children vs. no children, and years employed with current agency) cluster accounted for 7% of the variance in job self-efficacy scores and significantly contributed to the prediction of the professionals' job self-efficacy ($F(6, 308) = 3.97, R^2 = .07, p < .05$). Compared to the other individual characteristic variables, income was the strongest contributor to differences in job self-efficacy scores. Specifically, individuals with higher household income displayed higher levels of job self-efficacy compared to lower income households. The second block comprised of the four dependent care supports FFEBP did significantly contribute to the regression equation (F change = 3.17, R^2 change = .03, $p < .05$). Inspection of the individual dependent care supports FFEBP showed that after school/holiday programs were stronger predictors of job self-efficacy than on-site childcare, eldercare information or referral, or childcare discounts/vouchers. In particular, professionals working for agencies that provided after school/holiday programs for their employees had higher levels of job self-efficacy than professionals working for agencies without these programs. Thus, hypothesis 1a was supported.

Table 3. Intercorrelations of Study Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Job Sharing ^a	-															
2. Flextime ^a	.13*	-														
3. Telecommuting ^a	.23*	.31*	-													
4. Compressed workweek ^a	.24*	.17*	.26*	-												
5. On-site childcare ^a	.18*	.05	.09	.13*	-											
6. After school programs ^a	.10*	.13*	.09	.00	.35*	-										
7. Eldercare programs ^a	.06	-.03	.05	.00	.13*	.18*	-									
8. Childcare discounts ^a	.07	.08	.03	.04	.32*	.34*	.08	-								
9. Sex	.01	.02	-.05	-.04	.02	-.01	-.05	.07	-							
10. Marital/Couple status ^b	.05	.07	-.03	.02	.02	.03	.03	.03	.16*	-						
11. Household income	.14*	.03	.08	.05	-.01	-.08	-.02	-.09	.06	.45*	-					
12. Years worked w/agency	.16*	.00	.07	.11*	-.03	-.10	.04	-.05	.09	.21*	.36*	-				
13. Job self-efficacy	.04	-.02	.08	.04	.02	.06	.12*	.03	.01	.09	.23*	.16*	-			
14. Organizational commitment	.07	.11*	.15*	.09	.11*	.12*	.10*	.07	-.02	.14*	.22*	.25*	.26*	-		
15. Do you have children ^c	.04	.06	-.04	.05	.03	.05	.05	.03	.12*	.94*	.32*	.20*	.06	.14*	-	
16. Single vs. dual income ^d	.03	.05	-.01	-.02	.02	-.03	-.04	-.04	.09	.54*	.54*	.06	.05	.03	.31*	-

* $p < .05$ ^a Code: 0 = FFEB not available within employee's agency; 1 = FFEB available within employee's agency^b Code: 0 = single; 1 = married/couple^c Code: 0 = no; 1 = yes^d Code: 0 = single income household; 1 = dual income household

Table 4a. Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis Summary Table for Job Self-Efficacy and Dependent Care Supports FFEBP

Block	Variable	R ²	Δ R ²	F	p	B	SE	T	p
1	Sex					-.14	.47	-.30	.77
1	Marital/couple status					.23	.99	.23	.82
1	Household income					.79	.25	3.19	.00
1	Years worked w/agency					.04	.03	1.48	.14
1	Do you have children					-.10	2.15	-.04	.97
1	Single vs. dual income	.07	.07	3.97	.00	-.82	.91	-.90	.37
2	On-site childcare					-.83	.56	-1.48	.14
2	After school/ holiday programs					.93	.41	2.30	.02
2	Eldercare info/referral					1.24	.64	1.93	.06
2	Childcare discounts, vouchers, etc.	.10	.03	3.17	.01	.38	.47	.80	.42

Table 4b. Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis Summary Table for Job Self-Efficacy and Flexible Work Arrangements FFEBP

Block	Variable	R ²	Δ R ²	F	p	B	SE	T	p
1	Sex					-.14	.47	-.30	.77
1	Marital/couple status					.23	.99	.23	.82
1	Household income					.79	.25	3.19	.00
1	Years worked w/agency					.04	.03	1.48	.14
1	Do you have children					-.10	2.15	-.04	.97
1	Single vs. dual income	.07	.07	3.97	.00	-.82	.91	-.90	.372
2	Job sharing					-.03	.74	-.04	.97
2	Flextime					-.06	.54	-.12	.91
2	Telecommuting					.26	.63	.41	.68
2	Compressed workweek	.07	.00	.23	.92	.52	.71	.75	.46

Hypothesis 1b predicted that professionals working for agencies with flexible work arrangements FFEBP (compressed workweeks, flextime, job sharing, and telecommuting) would have higher job self-efficacy than professionals working for agencies without flexible work arrangements FFEBP. According to the results, hypothesis 1b was not supported (F change = .23, R^2 change = .00, $p > .05$).

Organizational Commitment and FFEBP

To test hypothesis 2a, this study sought to explore the effect of the four dependent care supports FFEBP on organizational commitment beliefs (Table 5a). The results of the regression analysis indicated that the individual characteristics (gender, household/marital status, household income, single vs. dual income household, children vs. no children, and years employed with current agency) block was a significant predictor, accounting for 11% of the variance in professionals' organizational commitment ($F(6, 312) = 6.15$, $R^2 = .11$, $p < .05$). Income and the years worked for the agency contributed to explaining differences in organizational commitment more than did gender, household/marital status, single vs. dual income household, and children vs. no children. Individuals with higher household income displayed higher levels of organizational commitment compared to lower income

households. In addition, employees who had worked more years at the agency had higher levels of organizational commitment than those employees with shorter tenure at the agency. The second block comprised of the four dependent care supports FFEBP did significantly contribute to the regression equation (F change = 2.63, R^2 change = .02, $p < .05$). Similar to hypothesis 1a, after school/holiday programs were stronger predictors of organizational commitment than on-site childcare, eldercare information or referral, or childcare discounts/vouchers. Based upon these findings, hypothesis 2a was supported. Specifically, those professionals working for public park and recreation agencies that provide dependent care supports FFEBP for their employees (and families) displayed higher levels of organizational commitment compared to employees of agencies that do not provide these programs for their employees.

Table 5a. Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis Summary Table for Organizational Commitment and Dependent Care Supports FFEBP

Block	Variable	R ²	ΔR ²	F	p	B	SE	T	p
1	Sex					-1.08	1.17	-.93	.36
1	Marital/couple status					-.55	2.44	-.23	.82
1	Household income					1.86	.61	3.05	.00
1	Years worked w/agency					.19	.07	2.75	.01
1	Do you have children					3.35	5.32	.63	.53
1	Single vs. dual income	.11	.11	6.15	.00	-1.43	2.22	-.64	.52
2	On-site childcare					.52	1.14	.46	.65
2	After school/ holiday programs					2.02	.82	2.45	.02
2	Eldercare info/referral					1.10	1.31	.84	.39
2	Childcare discounts, vouchers, etc.	.13	.02	2.63	.03	.13	.95	.13	.89

Hypothesis 2b predicted that professionals working for agencies with flexible work arrangements FFEBP (compressed workweeks, flextime, job sharing, and telecommuting) would have higher levels of organizational commitment than professionals working for agencies without flexible work arrangements FFEBP (Table 5b). The regression analysis indicated flexible work arrangements FFEBP did significantly contribute to the regression equation by accounting for an additional 3% of the variance in organizational commitment ratings (F change = 3.48, R^2 change = .03, $p < .05$) (Table 5). Individual analysis indicated telecommuting was a stronger predictor of professionals' organizational commitment than the other three flexible work arrangements (compressed workweeks, flextime, and job sharing). These findings provide support for hypothesis 2b, indicating that employees working for agencies with flexible work arrangements FFEBP have higher levels of organizational commitment compared to employees working for agencies without flexible work arrangements.

Discussion

Guided by Social Cognitive Theory, this study sought to explore the effects of FFEBP on public park and recreation professionals' job attitudes and motivation. The tenets of Social Cognitive Theory's reciprocal determinism suggest agencies that are perceived by employees as being caring and compassionate are more likely to have a more committed workforce. One method for instilling a caring and compassionate agency is through the implementation of a FFEBP.

Table 5b. Hierarchical Linear Regression Analysis Summary Table for Organizational Commitment and Flexible Work Arrangements FFEBP

Block	Variable	R ²	Δ R ²	F	p	B	SE	T	p
1	Sex					-1.08	1.17	-.93	.36
1	Marital/couple status					-.55	2.44	-.23	.82
1	Household income					1.86	.61	3.05	.00
1	Years worked								
	w/agency					.19	.07	2.75	.01
1	Do you have children					3.35	5.32	.63	.53
1	Single vs.								
	dual income	.11	.11	6.15	.00	-1.43	2.22	-.64	.52
2	Job sharing					-.33	1.19	-.27	.76
2	Flextime					1.47	.83	1.77	.08
2	Telecommuting					2.54	1.05	2.43	.02
2	Compressed workweek	.14	.03	3.48	.01	.18	1.15	.16	.87

A key element in Social Cognitive Theory's reciprocal determinism is the self-efficacy construct. Self-efficacy concerns individuals' beliefs in their capability to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to exercise control over events in their lives (Martocchio & Webster, 1992; Wood & Bandura, 1989). Furthermore, numerous studies have recognized that self-efficacy is related to job performance (Martocchio & Webster, 1992). Guided by this literature, research on FFEBP and job self-efficacy appeared to have merit.

Hypotheses 1a, which predicted there would be positive effects of dependent care supports FFEBP on an employee's job self-efficacy, was supported. Individual analyses identified after school/holiday childcare programs, as a significant predictor of an employee's job self-efficacy. In contrast to hypothesis 1a, hypothesis 1b was not supported indicating professionals working for agencies with flexible work arrangements FFEBP did not have higher job self-efficacy than professionals working for agencies without flexible work arrangements FFEBP.

A possible explanation for these mixed findings might center on the overall quality of the FFEBPs offered by agencies. In general, a strong component of public park and recreation agencies' operations, mission, and goals center on programming. The specific dependent care supports FFEBP (after school/holiday programs, on-site childcare, eldercare information or referral, and childcare discounts/vouchers) examined in this study tend to resemble popular programming areas the public park and recreation agency provides to its constituents. Thus, it is plausible that public park and recreation agencies are more equipped to provide these dependent care support FFEBPs to their staff and at a much higher standard compared to flexible work arrangement FFEBPs. In particular, many agencies are staffed with professionals who have a great deal of expertise and experience in providing these benefit programs, such as afterschool and holiday programs, to various populations within their communities. Drawing upon these skill sets and experiences, agencies are able to provide these programs, which are already in place and include a competent staff and an established history of success, at a much higher standard compared to the flexible work arrangements FFEBPs.

In contrast, the quality of agencies' flexible work arrangements FFEBPs might be at a lower standard due to the administrators being unfamiliar or inexperienced in the design and/or delivery of these programs. This potential problem has been supported in

the research as administration's inexperience in the design and implementation of flexible work arrangement FFEBCs has been found to be associated with negative outcomes, including loss of employee creativity (Wells, 2001). Administrative-related issues have also been found with poorly designed flexible work arrangement FFEBC. Specifically, research has indicated many agencies and their administrators experience difficulty in developing appropriate performance standards and performance appraisal systems for employees engaged in flexible work arrangements FFEBC (Wells, 2004). Issues such as the development and/or revision of job performance evaluation criteria; consistently measuring organizational citizenship behaviors (i.e., teamwork, internal relations, attitude, etc.) across all employees; and evaluating the job performance are challenges facing managers of employees using flexible work arrangements (Wells, 2004).

These difficulties and challenges associated with the development of performance standards and performance appraisal practices and procedures for employees using flexible work arrangements could impact the FFEBC effect on employees' job self-efficacy. Social cognitive theory's self-regulation framework suggests an individual possesses cognitive representations of a desired goal state that provide the individual with an internal standard for evaluating the effects of their behavior (Martocchio & Webster, 1992). Commonly referred to as self-evaluations, this process can influence an individual's self-efficacy expectations. Drawing from the tenets of self-regulation, research has repeatedly shown that one approach to influencing an individual's self-evaluative processes is through the use of performance feedback (Martocchio & Webster, 1992). Performance feedback provides information about prior performance and serves as a basis for evaluating one's capability to perform successfully on subsequent tasks (Bandura, 1991; Martocchio & Webster, 1992). Thus, feedback has the ability to influence one's self-evaluations, and subsequently one's self-efficacy.

Guided by Bandura's (1991) self-regulatory process, it is possible that the inconsistencies in the development and management of the flexible work arrangements FFEBC might have a moderating effect on the relationship between employee motivation and flexible work arrangements FFEBC. In particular, employees using flexible work arrangements who work for agencies that are struggling with the development of appropriate employee performance criteria and standards for flexible work arrangement employees are more likely to experience limited or even inconsistent feedback (Wells, 2004). As a result of this incomplete feedback, employees' self-evaluations would be compromised, which would negatively impact their self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1991; Martocchio & Webster, 1992).

Hypotheses 2a and 2b, which predicted there would be positive effects of dependent care supports and flexible work arrangements FFEBC on an employee's organizational commitment, were supported. Individual level analyses identified after school/holiday programs and telecommuting as the strongest predictors of professionals' organizational commitment compared to the other dependent care supports and flexible work arrangements FFEBC.

Management Implications

Research on the effects on FFEBC can assist public park and recreation agencies in the development of effective benefits programs, allow agencies to evaluate current HR practices, and provide direction for the future provision of programs and resources to best meet the needs of their staff. Furthermore, as research begins to investigate the links between various job attitudes (i.e., organizational commitment, self-efficacy, etc.) and FFEBC, agency administrators need to consider the value of these particular benefit programs in recruiting and retaining high performers within their agency. For example,

the findings from the current study suggest agencies with dependent care supports and flexible work arrangements benefit programs have employees who are more committed to the agency and agencies with dependent care support FFEBCs have employees with higher levels of motivation (i.e., job self-efficacy) than employees working in agencies without these programs. Thus, these FFEBCs appear to have potential in creating a strategic advantage for agencies by establishing a more productive workforce.

Despite its potential value, careful planning and internal assessment is needed prior to implementation of a FFEBC. To assist agencies with this process, researchers have identified the following strategies (Mulvaney, 2010):

- One size does not fit all.” Agencies must focus on customizing the FFEBC to ensure it is closely aligned with the agency’s priorities. To address this concern, agencies can perform an audit of their culture and work environment to determine the appropriateness of a FFEBC.
- Statistics alone cannot make the case for the FFEBC. Agencies need to collect quantitative (i.e., questionnaires, usage rates, etc.) and qualitative data (i.e., staff interviews, focus groups, etc.). Agencies should answer the following questions: What is the mission of our agency and what does that tell us about what we should be doing? What are the guiding values within our agency? Based upon our values, where does a FFEBC fit in our agency? How satisfied is our agency with the current workplace culture? Where do you want to be? What role could a FFEBC play in changing/reshaping that culture?
- Agencies should avoid placing their FFEBC under an unreasonable burden of proof. If skepticism persists, even after the facts and costs have been identified/promoted, deeper issues may be occurring (i.e., fears, attitudes, values, etc.). For example, one of the more common issues with FFEBCs centers on administration fearing that promoting a workplace with a blurred distinction between work time and personal time will be detrimental to the internal/external service within the agency. Another issue is the concern by administration and staff that employees using FFEBCs will take unfair advantage of these benefits (i.e., completing personal chores/tasks while telecommuting from home).
- Agencies must consider the costs and benefits. When calculating the bottom-line benefits associated with work-family concerns, the agency must consider the costs of the problems left unattended and the benefits associated with any initiatives. Table 6 provides example formulas for calculating the costs and benefits associated with FFEBCs (Mulvaney, 2010).
- Managers’ attitudes and the general work environment has been shown to be even more important than specific policies associated with the FFEBCs (i.e., number of after school programs an employee’s child can register for at a reduced cost) in helping employees balance work with personal responsibilities (Mulvaney, 2010). Thus, it is important that prior to implementing a FFEBC, the agency must ensure managers are trained/educated on work-family issues and the FFEBC.
- Research has repeatedly shown that when staff is involved in the development phase of projects, policies, programs, etc., they develop a stronger sense of ownership and acceptance (Roberts, 2003). As a result, the agency should get staff involved in the development and coordination of the FFEBC. A suggested approach is the development of committees for the various FFEBC and place staff within each of these committees. Through membership on a FFEBC committee, employees become active participants and acquire a voice in the FFEBC development process. They are empowered to rebut changes to the FFEBCs, propose new ideas, and vote on

Table 6. Quantitative and Qualitative FFEBP Cost-Benefit Model

Quick Calculation (Quantitative Data)	
1.)	Number of FFEB users = ?
2.)	Number of employees retained (.005 x number of users) = ?
3.)	Average cost of turnover (.75 x average salary) = ?
4.)	Dollar savings (# of employees retained x turnover cost) = ?
5.)	How does the dollar savings compare to resources invested in the FFEBP?
Quick Calculation (Qualitative Data)	
1.)	Has the FFEBP improved moral? How, or in what way?
2.)	Has the FFEBP impacted quality efforts within the agency?
3.)	Has the FFEBP impacted the agency's public & community relations? How, or in what way?
4.)	Has the FFEBP enhanced the agency's personnel recruitment efforts?

revisions. Simply put, the employee attains ownership over the process and has a personal stake in the success of the FFEBP, which enhances employee acceptance (Roberts, 2003).

- Agencies must develop procedures and policies to manage the FFEBP. For example, an agency might establish a flextime schedule that includes a band of core time where each employee must be present (i.e., 10 a.m. – 2 p.m.). Employees are free to arrive before the core time and/or remain after the core time with certain restrictions (i.e., cannot start before 5 a.m. and cannot stay past 11 p.m.). The agency has no daily hour requirements (i.e., eight-hour day), but employees must work at least 40 hours per week. Employee handbook(s) covering the FFEBP policies should also be developed.
- For the FFEBP to achieve its mission of fostering and promoting a family-friendly workplace, an open sign of support by the agency is needed. Agency administrators must openly communicate their support for the FFEBP. A common practice involves management developing a statement acknowledging the importance of family and personal life among staff and how the FFEBP can assist staff manage these issues.
- For a FFEBP to be successful, it must be subjected to an ongoing evaluation. Specifically, the FFEBP should be monitored and revised in the attempt to enhance the program to further ensure the desired outcomes (i.e., adequate usage rates, staff satisfaction with benefits, perceived family-friendly workplace, etc.) are achieved.

Limitations and Future Research

Despite the statistically significant findings, it is important to mention the issue of statistical versus practical significance. Although significant results were obtained for the two FFEBP categories, the amount of variance accounted for by each category was relatively small, ranging from 2% to 3%. Thus, caution is needed when considering these findings. Future research is needed within the area of FFEBP to more clearly identify the outcomes associated with these employee benefits in public park and recreation agencies.

Research with different and larger samples is needed to further understand the effects on FFEBP and employee attitudes. Park districts, forest preserve districts, conservation districts and special recreation association districts represent the norm in the state of Illinois, but public park and recreation departments managed within municipal or county government are the predominant type of public recreation organization in the United

States. This study examined the effects of FFEBP within the state of Illinois. Additional research investigating the effects of FFEBP within municipal or county park and recreation departments is recommended.

The findings from this study also raise new questions to explore within the FFEBP research such as, the role of employee participation in the FFEBP development process, performance appraisal processes associated with flexible work arrangements FFEBP, supervisory support, and leadership style. As organizational research has found links between employee participation in agency activities (i.e., involvement in designing and delivering staff training, performance appraisal process, employee benefit decisions, etc.), research exploring the effects of employee usage and participation in FFEBP on job attitudes appears warranted.

References

- Allen, T.D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 414-435.
- Baltes, B. B., Briggs, T. E., Huff, J. W., Wright, J. A., & Neuman, G. A. (1999). Flexible and compressed workweek schedules: A meta-analysis of their effects on work-related criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 496-513.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thoughts and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 248-287.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A., & Wood, R. E. (1989). Effect of perceived controllability and performance standards on self-regulation of complex decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 805-814.
- Bartlett, K. R., & McKinney, W. R. (2004). A study of the role of professional development, job attitudes, and turnover among public park and recreation employees. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*.
- Batt, R., & Valcour, P. M. (2003). Human resource practices as predictors of work-family outcomes and employee turnover. *Industrial Relations*, 42, 189-220.
- Bohlander, G., & Snell, S. (2004). *Managing human resources* (13th ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.
- Breaugh, J. A., & Frye, N. K. (2008). Work-family conflict: The importance of family-friendly employment practices and family-supportive supervisors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 22(4), 345-353.
- Cascio, W. F. (2006). *Managing human resources: Productivity, quality of work life, profits*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Davis, T. R. V., & Luthans, F. (1980). A social learning approach to organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 281-290.
- Demby, E. R. (2004). Do your family-friendly programs make cents? Businesses making significant strides in calculating the return on family-friendly programs. *HR Magazine*, 49(1), 74-78.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Griffin, R. W. (2001). *Human resource management*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Earley, P. C. (1986). Supervisors and shop stewards as sources of contextual information in goal setting: A comparison of the United States with England. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 111-117.
- Frayne, C. A., & Latham, G. P. (1987). Application of social learning theory to employee self-management of attendance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*, 387-392.
- Gibson, S. K. (2004). Social learning (cognitive) theory and implications for human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 6*(2), 193-210.
- Ginter, P. M., & White, D. D. (1982). A social learning approach to strategic management: Toward a theoretical foundation. *The Academy of Management Review, 7*, 253-261.
- Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management, 17*, 183-212.
- Gist, M. E., Stevens, C. K., & Bavetta, A. G. (1991). Effects of self-efficacy and post-training intervention on the acquisition and maintenance of complex interpersonal skills. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 837-861.
- Grasz, J. (2010). Nearly one-third of employers are concerned about top talent leaving their organizations, finds new CareerBuilder survey. Retrieved from www.careerbuilder.com.
- Grover, S. L., & Crooker, K. J. (1995). Who appreciates family-responsive human resource policies: The impact of family-friendly policies on organizational attachment of parents and non-parents. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 271-288.
- Halpern, D. F. (2005). How time-flexible work policies can reduce stress, improve health, and save money. *Stress and Health, 21*, 157-168.
- Hartley, D. E. (2002). Observations of a telecommuter. *The Wall Street Journal, 3*, B4.
- Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Johnson, K. L. (2000). Part-time work for women: Does it really help balance work and family? *Human Resource Management, 39*, 17-32.
- Jaros, S. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 319-337.
- Johnson, A. A. (1995). The business case for work-family programs. *Journal of Accountancy, 180*(2), 53-58.
- Latham, G. P., & Frayne, C. A. (1989). Self-management training for increasing job attendance: A follow-up and replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 241-251.
- Martin, J. (2004). Self-regulated learning, social cognitive theory, and agency. *Educational Psychologist, 39*(2), 135-145.
- Martocchio, J. J., & Webster, J. (1992). Effects of feedback and cognitive playfulness on performance in microcomputer software training. *Personnel Psychology, 45*, 553-578.
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2010). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical applications and interpretation* (4th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, G. J., & Svava, J. H. (2009). *Navigating the fiscal crisis: Tested strategies for local leaders*. Washington D.C.: International City/County Management Association.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*, 224-247.
- Mulvaney, M.A. (2010, January). *Understanding family-friendly employee benefits programs*. Paper presented at the 2010 Illinois Park and Recreation Association/ Illinois Association of Park Districts conference, Chicago, IL.

- Mulvaney, M. A. (2010). *Economic Issues Affecting Parks & Recreation: A White Paper Summary of Two Special Sessions at the 2009 NRPA Congress*. Ashburn, Virginia: National Recreation and Park Association.
- Nogradi, G. S., Yardley, J. K., & Kanters, M. A. (1993). The relationship between work-related attention, motivating potentials of jobs, and job effectiveness outcomes. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration*, 11(3), 37-50.
- Norusis, M. J. (1998). *SPSS 8.0: Guide to data analysis*. Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Parr, M. (2005). Recruiting for the park and recreation profession. *Parks & Recreation*, 40(2), 73-76.
- Porter, L. W., Steers R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 603-609.
- Riggs, M. L., Warka, J., Babasa, B., Betancourt, R., & Hooker, S. (1994). Development and validation of self-efficacy and outcome expectancy scales for job-related applications. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 54(3), 793-802.
- Roberts, G. E. (2003). Employee performance appraisal system participation: a technique that works. *Public Personnel Management*, 32(1), 89-99.
- Schunk, D. H. (1999). Social-self interaction and achievement behavior. *Educational Psychologist*, 34, 219-227.
- Stevens, J. (2001). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4th ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Veiga, J. F., Baldrige, D. C., & Eddleston, K. A. (2004). Toward understanding employee reluctance to participate in family-friendly programs. *Human Resource Management Review*, 14, 337-351.
- Wang, P., & Walumbwa, F.O. (2007). Family-friendly programs, organizational commitment, and work withdrawal: The moderating role of transformational leadership. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 397-427.
- Wells, A. (2004). Paid family leave: Striking a balance between the needs of employees and employers. *California Law Review*, 77, 1067-1075.
- Wexley, K. N., & Latham, G. P. (2002). *Developing and training human resources in organizations* (3rd ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 361-384.

Copyright of Journal of Park & Recreation Administration is the property of Sagamore Publishing, LLC and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.