

Workplace Stress and Work Life Balance as Predictors of Well-Being among Full-Time BPO Employees

Jeffrey C. Sibayan¹ , Jean V. Ramos² , Amalia G. Dela Cruz³ , Riza D. Dela Cruz⁴ ,
Josh Abel L. Datuin⁵ , Geomariel Mae Mangonon⁶ , Erlinda P. Radin⁷ , Mathe Zyriell D. Vallo⁸ 

Author Information:

¹⁻⁸Graduate School, University of Luzon,
Dagupan City, Pangasinan, Philippines

Correspondence:

sibayanjeffrey26@gmail.com

Article History:

Date Received: October 3, 2026

Date Revised: October 7, 2026

Date Accepted: October 14, 2026

Date Published: October 16, 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0540>

Document ID: 2026IJROMS0540

Recommended Citation:

Sibayan, J. C., Ramos, J. V., Dela Cruz, A. G.,
Dela Cruz, R. D., Datuin, J. A. L., Mangonon, G.
M., Radin, E. P. & Vallo, M. Z. D. (2026).
Workplace Stress and Work Life Balance as
Predictors of Well-Being among Full-Time BPO
Employees. *International Journal of Research
on Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(9), 451-458.
<https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0540>

Abstract. This study examined workplace stress and work-life balance in relation to employee well-being among employees in the business process outsourcing (BPO) industry. A quantitative cross-sectional predictive-correlational design was used to evaluate the individual and combined predictive effects of these variables within a demanding operational setting characterized by non-standard shifts and high-performance metrics. The survey received 39 total submissions, and the available profile and scale summaries reflected 32 usable responses after screening and completion checking. Frequencies and percentages were utilized to describe the respondents' demographic and work profiles. The available summaries showed that respondents came from varied age groups, job positions, work arrangements, and shifts, with night shift work forming the largest work shift category. Item-level response summaries indicated the presence of workplace stress alongside varied perceptions of work-life balance and employee well-being. Furthermore, the regression model revealed that work-life balance serves as a strong, statistically significant predictor of employee well-being ($\beta = .950, p < .001$), whereas workplace stress was not a unique predictor ($\beta = .046, p = .474$). These findings highlight the critical importance of work-life balance in promoting employee well-being among BPO employees. Although workplace stress was not found to be a significant unique predictor in the model, organizations may still consider implementing supportive scheduling, targeted stress management programs, and holistic wellness initiatives to help employees maintain optimal work-life balance and overall well-being.

Keywords: Business Process Outsourcing; Employee Well Being; Predictive Correlational Research; Work-Life Balance; Workplace Stress.

Introduction

The business process outsourcing industry is an important employment sector in the Philippines. BPO work commonly involves client-based operations, performance targets, customer interaction, technology mediated work, and schedules that may include night, rotating, early morning, or weekend shifts. These conditions can create work demands that influence employees' stress, balance between work and personal life, and overall, well-being.

Workplace health research on the Philippine BPO sector has emphasized physical and psychological risks, including stress, sleep related concerns, and limited workplace wellness support in some organizational settings (Candelario et al., 2024). Recent BPO human capital literature also identifies retention, work life balance, HR technology adoption, and organizational socialization as continuing workforce concerns in Philippine BPO companies (Cuadra, 2025). Work life balance is also relevant because role pressures from work and personal life may become incompatible, creating strain based or time-based conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Greenhaus et al., 2003).

Existing literature largely describes occupational risks and workforce management concerns, yet insufficient evidence is available regarding the relative contribution of workplace stress and work life balance to employee well-being within the unique context of Philippine BPO operations characterized by night shifts, rotating schedules, and technology-mediated work environments. Moreover, much of the available research emphasizes health outcomes or organizational practices rather than testing predictive relationships among these variables using statistical modeling. This gap limits the ability of organizations to identify which factors most strongly influence employee well-being and where intervention efforts should be prioritized. Therefore, the study addresses this gap by investigating the individual and combined predictive effects of workplace stress and work life balance on employee well-being among full-time BPO employees in the Philippines.

This study focused on workplace stress and work life balance as predictors of employee well-being among BPO employees. It sought to describe the profile of respondents, determine their responses on workplace stress, work life balance, and employee well-being, and test whether workplace stress and work life balance significantly predict employee well-being.

Research Questions

This study aimed to examine workplace stress and work life balance as predictors of employee well-being among employees in the business process outsourcing (BPO) industry.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following research questions;

1. What is the demographic and employment profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1 Age,
 - 1.2 Gender,
 - 1.3 Civil Status,
 - 1.4 Length of BPO work experience,
 - 1.5 Employment position,
 - 1.6 BPO service sector,
 - 1.7 Work arrangement (on-site, work-from-home, hybrid), and
 - 1.8 Work shift
2. What are the descriptive levels and verbal interpretations of the respondents' perceptions regarding:
 - 2.1 Workplace Stress,
 - 2.2 work life Balance, and,
 - 2.3 Employee Well-Being
3. Is there a statistically significant linear relationship between:
 - 3.1 Workplace Stress and Employee Well-Being
 - 3.2 work life Balance and Employee Well-Being; and
 - 3.3 Workplace Stress and work life Balance
4. Do Workplace Stress and work life Balance, singly or in combination, significantly predict Employee Well-Being among BPO employees?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study examined the predictive relationship between workplace stress, work life balance, and employee well-being among Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) employees in the Philippines. It focused on evaluating self-reported levels of workplace stress and work life balance to determine their unique and combined influence on overall employee well-being. The study covered full-time BPO personnel with at least six months of service in their current BPO organization across various service sectors, operational shifts, and work arrangements. Findings are limited to the 30 eligible respondents recruited through non-probability purposive sampling with convenience elements. Eligibility was based on self-reported current BPO employment and at least six months of service in the current BPO organization; full-time employment status was not separately verified. The study did not examine other organizational dynamics, compensation factors, or longitudinal health outcomes.

Literature Review

Workplace Stress and the Job Demands-Resources Framework

Workplace stress refers to the psychological, emotional, and physical strain experienced when professional job demands exceed an individual's available coping resources and personal capabilities. In the Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) industry, employees encounter heightened occupational stress driven by strict client-based service metrics, intensive technology-mediated tasks, repetitive workflow demands, and unsocial operational shifts. To conceptualize and examine this dynamic, the present study is anchored on the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Galanakis & Tsitouri, 2022). The JD-R framework posits that working environments and job characteristics can be classified into two primary categories: job demands, which require sustained physical and psychological effort and incur physiological or psychological costs, and job resources, which assist in achieving work goals, reducing stress, and stimulating personal growth.

International empirical literature extensively validates the foundational premises of the JD-R model across various service-oriented and high-stress professional sectors. For instance, landmark international investigations by Hakanen et al. (2006) and Bakker et al. (2007) established that sustained exposure to high job demands, such as excessive workload and emotional labor, triggers a health-impairment process leading to emotional exhaustion, psychological distress, and diminished well-being. In a specific empirical study on

call center personnel, Magaya (2021) demonstrated that emotional exhaustion and severe occupational stress serve as direct predictors of reduced psychological health. Furthermore, broader global labor and organizational analyses confirm that unmanaged psychosocial hazards directly compromise worker stability and operational performance (International Labour Organization [ILO], 2022; World Health Organization [WHO], 2022). Within the Philippine BPO setting, recent empirical literature reinforces these global findings, indicating that continuous operational pressure and non-standard rotational schedules severely heighten physical fatigue and occupational distress among customer service and back-office agents (Candelario et al., 2024; Cuadra, 2025).

Work life Balance and Work-Family Conflict Theory

Work life balance denotes an individual's ability to effectively manage dual demands between professional responsibilities and personal, social, or family life without severe interference. To explain the friction between these domains, the study incorporates Work-Family Conflict Theory (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), which posits that incompatible role pressures across work and non-work domains give rise to time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based conflicts that compromise individual functioning. In fast-paced BPO environments operating 24 hours a day, work life balance is frequently challenged by irregular shift work, night work, and tight schedule constraints (Cuadra, 2025).

Empirical research comparing international and domestic work environments demonstrates that flexible scheduling, organizational support systems, and adequate rest periods function as critical job resources that positively influence employee well-being and alleviate operational strain (Greenhaus et al., 2003; ILO, 2023). In an extensive comparative evaluation of service sector employees, Baral and Bhargava (2009) found that organizational work life initiatives significantly buffer the adverse effects of occupational stress and enhance overall life satisfaction. Similarly, international investigations by Liswandi and Muhammad (2023) established that employees experiencing higher work life balance report improved mental health, enhanced psychological resilience, and greater job satisfaction, all of which directly contribute to overall organizational productivity. Strong work life integration enables employees to maintain psychological recovery, minimize inter-role conflict, and sustain personal well-being amidst demanding working conditions.

Comparative Empirical Insights on Stress, work life Balance, and Well-Being

Comparing empirical findings across previous research reveals a consistent pattern regarding the interplay between workplace stress, work life balance, and employee well-being. Studies examining the direct and interactive effects of these variables consistently highlight that work life balance acts as a primary mediating or predictive mechanism linking stress levels to well-being outcomes. For instance, comparative organizational studies by Anuradha and Pandey (2015) and Mehta and Kothari (2016) demonstrated that prolonged work involvement without adequate recovery time severely restricts personal development and leads to heightened emotional distress. When work life balance is compromised by high job demands, the psychological toll manifests as reduced engagement, anxiety, and diminished well-being.

Conversely, when organizations implement supportive structures that foster work life balance, the negative predictive impact of workplace stress is substantially mitigated. International empirical literature by Parida (2016) and Santhanalaxmi and Chandramohan (2019) emphasized that proactive organizational interventions, such as flexible work arrangements, wellness programs, and mental health support, are crucial in restoring equilibrium and safeguarding employee wellness. These comparative findings substantiate the rationale for examining both workplace stress and work life balance as simultaneous predictors of well-being, verifying that while stress depletes psychological reserves, work life balance replenishes human capital and sustains holistic health.

Contextualizing Findings within the Philippine BPO Sector

Employee well-being encompasses the overall physical, mental, and emotional health status of workers within an organizational environment. In high-stress service sectors like the Philippine BPO industry, well-being serves as a foundational determinant of job satisfaction, work engagement, and workforce retention (Cuadra, 2025). The Philippine BPO landscape presents a unique operational context characterized by night shifts, graveyard schedules, intense metric tracking, and cultural expectations of family support, making work life harmony particularly fragile. Empirical studies focusing on local knowledge economy workers indicate that occupational well-being is heavily contingent upon the quality of available workplace resources and the preservation of work life boundaries (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Greenhaus et al., 2003). Guidelines from international labor organizations further emphasize that protecting psychological safety, mitigating workplace stressors, and promoting healthy work life boundaries are essential prerequisites for sustaining worker productivity and overall quality of life in emerging outsourcing markets (WHO & ILO, 2022).

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted a quantitative, cross-sectional, predictive-correlational research design. A quantitative approach was deemed most appropriate as it systematically evaluates numerical data to establish statistical patterns and draw objective conclusions regarding employee experiences. The cross-sectional framework facilitated the simultaneous collection of data across study variables at a single point in time. Specifically, the predictive-correlational design allowed the researcher to measure the linear relationships among workplace stress, work life balance, and employee well-being, while evaluating the individual and combined predictive power of stress and work life balance on well-being.

Research Locale

The research was situated within the Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) sector in the Philippines. Data collection was conducted virtually across various operational business units, customer support accounts, IT-enabled service divisions, and back-office service teams. This virtual administrative environment enabled participation across diverse organizational structures and geographic work locations throughout the country.

Research Participants

The study targeted full-time BPO employees. The analyzed sample comprised 30 respondents who self-reported current employment in a BPO company and at least six months of service in their current BPO organization. All 30 provided complete demographic, employment, and scale responses. However, the survey did not separately verify full-time employment status, which limits confirmation that all respondents met the intended employment-status criterion.

Research Instrument

Data were gathered using a structured, self-administered online questionnaire hosted on Google Forms. The instrument contained four sections: demographic and employment profiles, Workplace Stress (10 items), work life Balance (10 items), and Employee Well-Being (15 items). Scale responses ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Each respondent's scale score was calculated by averaging the items within that scale, with higher scores indicating greater workplace stress, work life balance, or well-being, respectively. Internal consistency was assessed using the 30 eligible responses. Cronbach's alpha was .961 for Workplace Stress, .980 for work life Balance, and .983 for Employee Well-Being. These estimates indicate high internal consistency within this sample but do not establish validity or confirm that the constructs are distinct. The questionnaire items were developed by the researchers for this study. Workplace Stress items addressed perceived job demands and strain; work life Balance items addressed managing work and personal responsibilities; and Employee Well-Being items addressed physical, emotional, and social functioning. Before distribution, another member of the research group reviewed the questionnaire. No pilot test was conducted. The internal consistency estimates reported in this study were calculated using the final sample of 30 eligible respondents.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher followed a structured four-stage administrative protocol. First, ethical clearance and informed consent protocols were established, requiring participants to read an electronic consent form detailing the study's objective, voluntary nature, and privacy guarantees prior to accessing the survey items. Second, the Google Forms survey link was distributed across professional communication channels and employee networks. Third, submitted entries were screened using respondents' self-reported current employment in a BPO company and at least six months of service in their current BPO organization. Nine of the 39 respondents were excluded because they reported that they were not currently employed in a BPO company. The remaining 30 met both screening requirements and provided complete profile and scale responses. Fourth, these 30 eligible responses were retained for descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis, Pearson correlation, and multiple linear regression.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: What is the demographic and employment profile of the respondents in terms of Age, Gender, Civil Status, Length of BPO work experience, Employment position, BPO service sector, Work arrangement, and Work shift?

Table 1. Screening Summary

Screening Item	Frequency	Percentage
1. Excluded: not currently employed in BPO and less than six months in current organization	7	17.9%
2. Excluded: not currently employed in BPO, although reporting at least six months in current organization	2	5.1%
3. Final eligible respondents with complete profiles and scale responses	30	76.9%
Total responses received; all consented	39	100.0%

Table 1 shows that 39 respondents consented to participate in the study. Nine respondents were excluded because they reported that they were not currently employed in a BPO company. Of these, seven also reported that they had not worked in their current BPO organization for at least six months, while two reported meeting the six-month requirement. The remaining 30 respondents met both eligibility requirements and provided complete demographic, employment, and scale responses, yielding a final eligible sample of 30 (76.9%).

Table 2. Demographic Profile of Respondents

Profile variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Age	18 to 24	6	20.0%
2. Age	25 to 30	10	33.3%
3. Age	31 to 40	10	33.3%
4. Age	41 to 50	2	6.7%
5. Age	51 and above	2	6.7%
6. Gender	Male	10	33.3%
7. Gender	Female	19	63.3%
8. Gender	Prefer not to say	1	3.3%
9. Civil status	Single	21	70.0%
10. Civil status	Married	8	26.7%
11. Civil status	Separated	1	3.3%

Table 2 presents the demographic profile of the 30 eligible respondents. The largest age groups were 25–30 and 31–40 years, each comprising 10 respondents (33.3%), followed by 18–24 years with six (20.0%). The 41–50 and 51-and-above groups each included two respondents (6.7%). Most respondents were female ($n = 19$, 63.3%), while 10 were male (33.3%) and one preferred not to disclose gender (3.3%). Most were single ($n = 21$, 70.0%), followed by married ($n = 8$, 26.7%) and separated ($n = 1$, 3.3%). The sample was therefore predominantly female and single, with equal representation in the two largest age groups.

Table 3. Employment Profile of Respondents

Profile variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Length of BPO service	6 months to less than 1 year	4	13.3%
2. Length of BPO service	1 year to less than 3 years	7	23.3%
3. Length of BPO service	3 years to less than 5 years	7	23.3%
4. Length of BPO service	5 years to less than 10 years	5	16.7%
5. Length of BPO service	10 years and above	7	23.3%
6. Employment position	Customer service representative	9	30.0%
7. Employment position	Technical support representative	4	13.3%
8. Employment position	Sales representative	3	10.0%
9. Employment position	Back-office employee	5	16.7%
10. Employment position	Quality analyst	2	6.7%
11. Employment position	Team leader or supervisor	7	23.3%
12. BPO service sector	Customer service	12	40.0%
13. BPO service sector	Information technology	2	6.7%
14. BPO service sector	Finance and accounting	4	13.3%
15. BPO service sector	Technical support	2	6.7%
16. BPO service sector	Back office or administrative support	4	13.3%
17. BPO service sector	Sales or marketing support	1	3.3%
18. BPO service sector	Other business-related service	2	6.7%
19. BPO service sector	Healthcare	2	6.7%
20. BPO service sector	Data analytics	1	3.3%

Table 3 presents the employment profile of the 30 eligible respondents. The largest BPO service-length groups were 1 to less than 3 years, 3 to less than 5 years, and 10 years and above, each with seven respondents (23.3%). Five respondents had 5 to less than 10 years of service (16.7%), while four had 6 months to less than 1 year (13.3%). Customer service representatives formed the largest position group ($n = 9$, 30.0%), followed by

team leaders or supervisors (n = 7, 23.3%), back-office employees (n = 5, 16.7%), technical support representatives (n = 4, 13.3%), sales representatives (n = 3, 10.0%), and quality analysts (n = 2, 6.7%). Customer service was the largest BPO service sector (n = 12, 40.0%), followed by finance and accounting and back-office or administrative support, each with four respondents (13.3%). The remaining sectors each included one or two respondents.

Table 4. Work Setting Profile of Respondents

Profile variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Work arrangement	On site	13	43.3%
2. Work arrangement	Work from home	9	30.0%
3. Work arrangement	Hybrid	8	26.7%
4. Work shift	Day shift	4	13.3%
5. Work shift	Night shift	15	50.0%
6. Work shift	Rotating shift	7	23.3%
7. Work shift	Early morning shift	2	6.7%
8. Work shift	Weekend shift	1	3.3%
9. Work shift	Other	1	3.3%

Table 4 presents the work arrangements and shift schedules of the 30 eligible respondents. On-site work was the most common arrangement (n = 13, 43.3%), followed by work-from-home (n = 9, 30.0%) and hybrid work (n = 8, 26.7%). Half of the respondents worked night shifts (n = 15, 50.0%), followed by rotating shifts (n = 7, 23.3%), day shifts (n = 4, 13.3%), and early-morning shifts (n = 2, 6.7%). Weekend and other shifts each accounted for one respondent (3.3%).

These findings describe a sample in which night and rotating shifts were common.

Research Question 2: What are the descriptive levels and verbal interpretations of the respondents' perceptions regarding Workplace Stress, work life Balance, and Employee Well-Being?

Table 5. Instrument Reliability and Descriptive Summary (N=30)

Variable	No. of Items	Mean (M)	Std. Deviation (SD)	Verbal Interpretation	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
1. Workplace Stress	10	3.51	0.94	High Stress	.961
2. work life Balance	10	3.65	1.12	High Balance	.980
3. Employee Well-Being	15	3.67	1.05	High Well-Being	.983

Table 5 summarizes the scale scores of the 30 eligible respondents. Workplace Stress had a mean of 3.51 (SD = 0.94), work life Balance had a mean of 3.65 (SD = 1.12), and Employee Well-Being had a mean of 3.67 (SD = 1.05). Cronbach's alpha values were .961, .980, and .983, respectively, indicating high internal consistency in this sample. These reliability estimates do not, by themselves, establish measurement validity or demonstrate that the scales measure distinct constructs.

Research Question 3: Is there a statistically significant linear relationship between Workplace Stress and Employee Well-Being, work life Balance and Employee Well-Being, and Workplace Stress and work life Balance?

Table 6. Pearson Correlations between Study Variables (N = 30)

Variable pair	Pearson's r	95% confidence interval	p-value
1. Workplace Stress and Employee Well-Being	-.155	[-.488, .218]	.414
2. work life Balance and Employee Well-Being	.942	[.881, .972]	< .001
3. Workplace Stress and work life Balance	-.202	[-.524, .171]	.285

Table 6 presents the correlations among the study variables for the 30 eligible respondents. work life Balance had a strong positive correlation with Employee Well-Being (r = .942, 95% CI [.881, .972], p < .001). Workplace Stress was not significantly correlated with Employee Well-Being (r = -.155, 95% CI [-.488, .218], p = .414) or work life Balance (r = -.202, 95% CI [-.524, .171], p = .285). The confidence intervals for the stress-related correlations include both negative and positive values; therefore, these results do not establish the absence of relationships.

The particularly strong association between work life Balance and Employee Well-Being requires cautious interpretation. The researcher-developed scales include similar content concerning rest, recovery, and family or social participation, which may contribute to the observed correlation. Collecting both measures through the same self-report questionnaire may also contribute to shared measurement effects. Because the instrument received only an internal review and was not pilot-tested, the distinctness of these constructs has not been established. The correlation indicates an association within this sample and does not demonstrate that work life balance causes improved well-being.

Research Question 4: Do Workplace Stress and work life Balance, singly or in combination, significantly predict Employee Well-Being among BPO employees?

Table 7. Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Employee Well-Being (N = 30)

Predictor	B	Std. Error	Standardized β	t-value	p-value
1. (Constant)	0.263	0.379	-	0.693	.494
2. Workplace Stress	0.041	0.073	.037	0.563	.578
3. work life Balance	0.892	0.061	.950	14.531	<.001

Table 7 presents the multiple linear regression results for the 30 eligible respondents. The overall model was statistically significant, $F(2, 27) = 108.51$, $p < .001$, and accounted for 88.9% of the observed variation in Employee Well-Being ($R^2 = .889$; adjusted $R^2 = .881$). work life Balance was a statistically significant positive predictor ($B = 0.892$, $SE = 0.061$, $\beta = .950$, $t = 14.531$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.766, 1.018]). Holding Workplace Stress constant, a one-point higher work life Balance score was associated with an estimated 0.892-point higher Employee Well-Being score. Workplace Stress was not a statistically significant unique predictor after accounting for work life Balance ($B = 0.041$, $SE = 0.073$, $\beta = .037$, $t = 0.563$, $p = .578$, 95% CI [-0.109, 0.191]).

The high proportion of explained variance requires cautious interpretation given the small, non-probability sample and possible content overlap between the work life Balance and Employee Well-Being scales. The reported R^2 describes a model fit within the analyzed sample; predictive performance in an independent sample has not been established. The nonsignificant Workplace Stress coefficient does not demonstrate that stress is unimportant, as its confidence interval includes both negative and positive associations. The cross-sectional design also prevents causal conclusions.

Regression diagnostics were conducted for the model containing Workplace Stress and work life Balance. The Shapiro–Wilk test did not detect a statistically significant departure from residual normality ($W = .949$, $p = .159$). The studentized Breusch–Pagan test did not detect significant heteroscedasticity, or unequal residual variance ($\chi^2(2) = 1.456$, $p = .483$). A Ramsey RESET test using squared and cubed fitted values did not detect significant model misspecification ($F(2, 25) = 1.243$, $p = .306$). Variance inflation factors were 1.042 for both predictors, indicating little collinearity between Workplace Stress and work life Balance. This finding does not resolve the separate concern about measurement overlap between work life Balance and Employee Well-Being.

Influence diagnostics identified one observation with Cook's distance of .268, exceeding the screening threshold of $4/N = .133$. Three observations also slightly exceeded the leverage screening threshold of .200, with a maximum leverage of .203. These thresholds were used to identify observations for examination rather than automatic removal. A leave-one-out sensitivity analysis was therefore conducted by repeating the regression after omitting each respondent individually. Across these analyses, the work life Balance coefficient ranged from 0.863 to 0.927 and remained statistically significant (all $p < .001$), while Workplace Stress remained nonsignificant ($p = .342$ –.878). All 30 eligible responses were retained in the primary analysis.

These checks provide some reassurance that the main finding was not driven by a single respondent. However, nonsignificant diagnostic tests do not prove that all assumptions hold, particularly with a small sample. Possible dependence among employees recruited through shared workplace networks could not be assessed from the available data. The findings therefore remain subject to the study's sampling and measurement limitations.

Ethical Considerations

This study strictly adhered to established ethical research standards throughout the data collection process. Prior to accessing the survey instrument, all respondents were provided with an electronic Informed Consent Form outlining the study's primary objectives, voluntary nature, and estimated completion time. Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents retained the right to withdraw at any stage without incurring professional penalties or impacting their employment status. To guarantee anonymity and data privacy, no personally identifiable information such as participant names, employee identification numbers,

or corporate affiliations was collected. All gathered data were anonymized, aggregated, and stored in password-protected, encrypted digital storage accessible solely to the primary researcher. Furthermore, the study posed minimal psychological or physical risk, as survey items regarding workplace stress and well-being were neutrally worded to prevent discomfort.

Conclusion

This study examined workplace stress and work life balance in relation to employee well-being among BPO employees. The analyzed sample comprised 30 respondents who met the current BPO employment and six-month service screening requirements and provided complete profile and scale responses. The results indicate that workplace stress and work life balance remain important issues in the BPO work context. In conclusion, the findings indicate that work life balance was a strong and statistically significant predictor of employee well-being among the respondents in this study. For corporate leaders and human resource practitioners in the Philippine BPO sector, the findings suggest that practices such as flexible scheduling, greater shift predictability, and clear personal time boundaries may help support employee well-being and workforce sustainability.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, BPO organizations may consider strengthening workplace policies and practices that support employees' ability to balance work and non-work responsibilities. Particular attention may be given to predictable scheduling, flexible work arrangements where feasible, adequate leave and recovery opportunities, supervisor support, and programs that promote healthy work life boundaries. Although workplace stress did not emerge as a statistically significant unique predictor of employee well-being in the regression model, organizations may still maintain appropriate stress-management and wellness initiatives as part of broader employee-support programs. Future studies may examine workplace stress, work life balance, and employee well-being using larger and more diverse samples of BPO employees. Longitudinal research may also help determine how changes in work arrangements, schedules, and work life balance relate to employee well-being over time.

References

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Candelario, C. M. C., Fullante, M. K. A., Pan, W. K. M., & Gregorio, E. R. (2024). Integrative review of workplace health promotion in the business process outsourcing industry: Focus on the Philippines. *Public Health in Practice*, 7, Article 100476. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhip.2024.100476>
- Cuadra, N. P. (2025). Human capital management in business process outsourcing (BPO) companies: A systematic review. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 45(10), 1230–1237.
- Galanakis, M. D., & Tsitouri, E. (2022). Positive psychology in the working environment. Job demands-resources theory, work engagement and burnout: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 1022102. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1022102>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4277352>
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63(3), 510–531. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(02\)00042-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8)
- International Labour Organization. (2022). Psychosocial risks and stress at work. <https://www.ilo.org/resource/psychosocial-risks-and-stress-work>
- International Labour Organization. (2023). Working time and work-life balance around the world. International Labour Office. <https://www.ilo.org/publications/working-time-and-work-life-balance-around-world>
- Lakens, D. (2022). Sample size justification. *Collabra: Psychology*, 8(1), Article 33267. <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.33267>
- World Health Organization. (2022). WHO guidelines on mental health at work. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240053052>
- World Health Organization, & International Labour Organization. (2022). Mental health at work: Policy brief. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240057944>