

Workload, Emotional Intelligence, And Intellectual Intelligence On Employee Performance At Maranatha Christian University

Puspita Puji Rahayu¹, Sonny Santosa², Ferdinandus Sampe³, Heliza Rahmania Hatta⁴

¹*Program Studi Psikologi, Universitas Nasional Karangturi¹*

²*Program Studi Manajemen, Universitas Buddhi Dharma²*

³*Program Studi Manajemen, Universitas Atma Jaya Makassar³*

⁴*Program Studi Informatika, Universitas Mulawarman⁴*

Abstarck

Maranatha Christian University is a university that is currently growing with a large number of employees. So it is necessary to evaluate the four factors. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the relationship between workload, intellectual intelligence, and emotional intelligence on employee performance. The results of the research will be used as a basis for determining the Institute's decisions in the placement of employees and balancing the workload in related departments. The results of the research will be used as material for study in decision making and mapping of human resources according to the performance of each employee. The research was carried out using a quantitative approach with a data collection tool using a questionnaire on 81 respondents carried out randomly (random sampling).

Keyword: Workload, Performance, Emotional intelligence, Intellectual Intelligence, Correlation.

Copyright (c) 2023 Puspita Puji Rahayu

✉ Corresponding author :

Email Address : puspita.rahayu@unkartur.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Human Resources (HR) is the main asset in the organization, so that human resources must be managed and utilized in a balanced and humane manner. Human resources have a major role in the organization because they are actors in organizational activities for the success of the organization itself (Prabawa & Supartha, 2018). Maranatha Christian University is an institution that is realizing its vision and mission, so it requires mapping of human resources in order to achieve maximum performance and according to existing standard operating procedures. Performance is the result of achieving an activity in accordance with the targets and responsibilities of each individual in realizing the vision and mission of the organization (Aryaningsih et al., 2018). So that various efforts are made in order to improve the performance and achievements of employees for the survival of the organization itself. The workload, emotional intelligence and intellectual intelligence depend on the workload of each individual (Gumanti & Utami, 2019). The main factor affecting employee performance is workload (Yapono & Khomsatun, 2018). Workload is an activity that must be completed, this is influenced by emotional intelligence (Aryaningsih et al., 2018).

This research is very important to evaluate employee performance based on four factors. Employee performance is an important variable in the progress of the organization in order to achieve its vision and mission. These four factors will be used as material for making decisions in mapping human resources according to the performance of each

employee. This research is important for the long-term sustainability of the company. Identification of the problem in this study is whether there is influence between workload, intellectual intelligence, emotional intelligence on employee performance at Maranatha Christian University. The formulation of the problem in this study is whether there is a positive relationship between workload, intellectual intelligence, emotional intelligence on employee performance at Maranatha Christian University.

THEORETICAL BASIS

2.1. Workload

According to Hart & Staveland (1988) in Tarwaka (2011) states that workload is something that arises from the interaction between the demands of work environment tasks which are used as a workplace, skills and perceptions of workers. Workload is sometimes defined operationally on factors such as task demands or the effort put into doing the job. Workload has a positive relationship with performance (Management et al., 2018). According to Sitepu (2013), based on the research results, there is a sign of a high workload variable on the goal achievement index. This condition can be seen from the responses of respondents to the achievement of goals because employees are still not able to achieve production targets (Sitepu et al., 1123). Meanwhile, emotional intelligence affects employee performance (Azis et al., 2018). Meanwhile, workload is a group or several activities that need to be carried out by an organizational unit or position holder within a certain period of time (Runtuwene, 2016). According to (Sugiharjo et al., nd) states that workload is a set or number of activities that must be carried out by an organization or by an organization holder within a certain period of time.

2.2. Intellectual intelligence

In terms of intelligence, emotional intelligence, and mental intelligence on employee performance, intellectual intelligence, emotional intelligence, and mental intelligence were found to have a positive effect on employee performance, both partially and simultaneously (Accounting & 2013, nd). Intelligent intelligence is collectively known as intelligence. Intelligence is an individual's cognitive ability to adapt effectively to a complex and constantly changing environment (Intelligence et al., 2016). The effect of intellectual intelligence on employee performance and intelligence positive and significant influence on employee performance (Mamangkey, n.d.). The word emotion comes from the Latin *emovere* which means away. The meaning of this word implies that the tendency to act is absolute in emotion (Hidayati et al., nd).

2.3. Emotional intelligence

Emotional intelligence is self-control, enthusiasm and perseverance, as well as the ability to motivate oneself (Goleman, 2000). Intelligence or intelligence is the ability to understand the world, think rationally, and use resources effectively in the face of challenges. In other words, intelligence is an individual's ability to understand, innovate, and generate solutions in different situations (Anam et al., Nd). Meanwhile, Theo Wescler (1958) explained that intelligence is the general ability of individuals to act, think rationally and interact effectively with the

environment.

2.4. Performance

Performance is the result of the quality and quantity of work performed by employees in carrying out tasks according to the responsibilities given (Business et al., 2018).

METHOD

The research data uses primary data, namely data obtained and collected from the research location, in this case the permanent employees of Maranatha Christian University. The data collection tool uses a questionnaire relating to workload, emotional intelligence and intellectual intelligence on employee performance. As for secondary data, there are 162 employees with 106 employees holding concurrent positions and 56 employees not concurrently. The reference for taking the sample is (random sampling) because the total population is more than 100 people (Norman et al., 2016). The way to determine the sample size in this study is to use the Slovin formula as follows below.

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

Where N is the number of population, n is the sample size, a is the set precession (5% accuracy limit). The N in this study amounted to 106 with e = 5%. So based on formulation (1), the number of samples in this study is (Wahyuni & Wibowo, 2018):

$$n = \frac{106}{1 + 106 \cdot (0.05)^2} = \frac{106}{1 + 0.265} = \frac{106}{1.265} = 83.79 \approx 81$$

So according to the results of the calculation above, the minimum number used as a sample in this study is 81 permanent employees of Maranatha Christian University. The measurement scale used is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 .Likert scale

No	Statement	Score	Code
1	Strongly agree	5	SS
2	Agree	4	S
3	Disagree	3	KS
3	Don't agree	2	TS
4	Strongly Disagree	1	STS

Table 1. is a benchmark in a question or statement expressed in a Likert scale.

The testing technique used is:

- 1) Validity Test, used to determine the validity of each instrument. By using Pearson Product Moment correlation with the following formula:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{(\sum x_i y_i) - (\sum x_i)(\sum y_i)}{\sqrt{((n \sum x_i^2 - (\sum x_i)^2)(n \sum y_i^2 - (\sum y_i)^2))}} \quad (2)$$

Where, r_{xy} is the product torsion factor, r is the factor that determines the validity of the items sought, x is the score obtained from the topic for each item. Y is the number of instrument scores, n the number of respondents is the total number of observations of variable X and variable Y . x^2 the number of cells per point X . y^2 is the number of cells per point Y . The basis for decision making is If r count $>$ r table, then the instrument or correlated matter.

- 1) The reliability test uses Cronbach's Alpha coefficient reference > 0.6 .
- 2) Normality test to meet the normality assumption and vice versa.
- 3) Linearity test to determine the linear relationship between variables. In this study using a significance level of eg 5%.
- 4) The multicollinearity test is used to determine whether there is a high or perfect correlation between the independent variables (Ghozali & Ratmono, 2017).
- 5) Multiple linear regression analysis was used to see the regression equation (Gould et al., 2008). With reference to formula 3 below.

$$Y = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + e \quad (3)$$

Where Y is employee performance (KK), a Constant, X_1 is Workload, X_2 Emotional Intelligence X_3 Intellectual Intelligence and error standard. The hypothesis used is:

- 1) $H_a: \beta_1 = 0$, there is no positive and significant effect between the workload variable (X_1) on the performance of permanent employees (Y) at Maranatha Christian University.
- 2) $H_0: \beta_1 \neq 0$, there is a positive and significant influence between the load variable (X_1), on the performance of permanent employees (Y) at Maranatha Christian University.
- 3) $H_a: \beta_2 = 0$, there is no significant effect between the emotional intelligence variable (X_2) on the performance of permanent employees (Y) at Maranatha Christian University.
- 4) $H_a: \beta_2 = 0$, there is no significant effect between the intellectual intelligence variable (X_3) on the performance of permanent employees (Y) at Maranatha Christian University.
- 5) $H_0: \beta_2 \neq 0$, there is a positive and significant influence between the intellectual

intelligence variable (X3), on the performance of permanent employees (Y) at Maranatha Christian University.

- 6) H0: $\beta_2 \neq 0$, there is a positive and significant influence between the intellectual intelligence variable (X3), on the performance of permanent employees (Y) at Maranatha Christian University.

The respondents' responses to the research variables are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Respondent Measuring Tool According to Likert Scale

Feedback value	Information
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree
1.81-2.60	Don't agree
2.61-3.40	Simply Agree
3.41-4.20	Agree
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the validity test conducted on 81 respondents are presented in Table 4. Decision making is based on the value of $r \text{ Count} > r \text{ Table}$ of 0.215, and $< = 0.05$, then the item is valid.

Table 4.Workload Variable Validity Test Results

	Items	R-Count	R-Table	Sig.	Information
Workload	BK1	0.637	0.215	0.000	Valid
	BK2	0.635	0.215	0.000	Valid
	BK3	0.631	0.215	0.000	Valid
	BK4	0.623	0.215	0.000	Valid
	BK5	0.679	0.215	0.000	Valid
	BK6	0.619	0.215	0.000	Valid
	BK7	0.619	0.215	0.000	Valid
	BK8	0.592	0.215	0.000	Valid

Table 4 shows the value of the critical coefficient ($r_{\text{table}} = 0.215$) so that all instruments are valid. Likewise for Tables 5, 6 and 7.

Table 5.Emotional Intelligence Variable Validity Test Results

Variable	Items	R-Count	R-Table	Sig.	Criteria
Emotional Intelligence	NUMBER 1	0.777	0.215	0.000	Valid
	2ND	0.823	0.215	0.000	Valid
	THE 3RD	0.561	0.215	0.000	Valid
	TO 4	0.761	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KE5	0.757	0.215	0.000	Valid

Table 6.Intellectual Intelligence Variable Validity Test Results

Variable	Items	R-Count	R-Table	Sig.	Criteria
Intellectual Intelligence	KI1	0.794	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KI2	0.835	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KI3	0.790	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KI4	0.716	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KI5	0.761	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KI6	0.679	0.215	0.000	Valid

KI7	0.676	0.215	0.000	Valid
KI8	0.793	0.215	0.000	Valid
KI9	0.576	0.215	0.000	Valid
				Valid
KI10	0.602	0.215	0.000	

Table 7.Results of Validity Test of Employee Performance Variables

Variable	Item s	R-Count	R-Table	Sig.	Criteri a
Perform ance Employ ee	KK1	0.753	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KK2	0.780	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KK3	0.655	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KK4	0.789	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KK5	0.822	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KK6	0.813	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KK7	0.716	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KK8	0.727	0.215	0.000	Valid
	KK9	0.745	0.215	0.000	Valid

The results of the reliability test are shown in Table 8.

Table 8.Reliability Test Results

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Alph aStand ard	Criteri a
Workload (X1)	0.775	0.60	Reliable
Emotional Intelligence (X2)	0.789	0.60	Reliable
Intellectual Intelligence (X3)	0.894	0.60	Reliable
Employee Performance (Y)	0.901	0.60	Reliable

The normality test results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9.Data normality test results

	Unstandi zed Residuals
N	81
Normal Parameters, b Means	.0000000

	std. Deviation	2.22205134
Most extreme	absolute	.070
Differences	Positive	.070
	Negative	-.068
Test Statistics		.070
asympt. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200c,d

Meanwhile, the results of the linearity test are shown in able 10 below.

Table 10. Linearity Test Results

Variable	Deficiatio n Of Linearity	Sig .05	Conclusion
Workload	0.054	0.05	There is a linear relationship between workload and employee performance
Emotiona l Intelligen ce	0.171	0.05	There is connection linear between emotional intelligence with employee performance
Intellectu al Intelligen ce	0.72	0.05	There is connection linear between intellectual intelligence with employee performance

Based on Table 10, the regression model shows a linear relationship between workload, emotional intelligence and intellectual intelligence on employee performance. because the Deviation from Linearity Significant > 0.05 , it can be concluded that all the independent variables have a linear relationship. The multicollinearity test results are shown in Table 11.

Table 11.Multicollinearity Test Results

	Mod el	Unstandardiz ed Coefficient s		Standardize d Coefficient s		t	Sig.	Collineari ty Statistics	
		B	std. Error	Bet as				tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	4,803	2,835			1694	.094		
2	Workload	.186	.077	.194		2,411	.018	.701	1,426

3	Intelligence							
	Emotional	.482	.141	.273	3,421	.001	.713	1,403
4	Intellectua							
	l	.406	.061	.515	6,606	.000	.746	1,340
	Intelligenc							
	e							

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Based on the Tolerance value and the VIF value in Table 11, it shows that there is no multicollinearity. The results of the heteroscedasticity test can be seen in Table 12.

Table 12.Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		B	std. Error	Betas			
1	(Constant)	-.585	1,808			-.324	.747
	BK	.007	.049	.018		.138	.890
	TO	-.011	.090	-.017		-.128	.899
	KI	.056	.039	.181		1,419	.160

a. Dependent Variable: Absolutur_Residual

Based on Table 12. the test results showed no symptoms of heteroscedasticity. The Multiple Linear Analysis Test Results The test results are shown in Table 13.

Table 13.Multiple Linear Analysis Test Results*Coefficientsa*

Model		Unstandardize d Coefficient s		Standardize d Coefficien ts		t	Sig.
		B	std. Error	Betas			
1	(Constant)	4,803	2,835			1694	.094
	BK	.186	.077	.194		2,411	.018
	TO	.482	.141	.273		3,421	.001
	KI	.406	.061	.515		6,606	.000

a. dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Individual Parameter Significance Test (t-test)

The t test aims to determine whether there is a partial influence of workload (X1), emotional intelligence (X2), and intellectual intelligence (X3) on employee performance (Y). Shown in Table 14.

Table 14.T Coefficients Test Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		B	std. Error	Betas			
1	(Constant)	4,803	2,835			1694	.094
	BK	.186	.077	.194	.515	2,411	.018
	KI	.406	.061			6,606	.000
	TO	.482	.141	.273		3,421	.001

Table 14. t-table, namely $2.411 > 1.663$ and the significance is smaller than α , namely $0.018 < 0.05$, then H1 is accepted. On the variable emotional intelligence (KE) the t-count test results are greater than t-table $3.421 > 1.633$ with the results of a significance value smaller than α which is $0.001 < 0.05$ so it can be concluded that H2 is accepted and on the intellectual intelligence variable (KI) the t-test results greater than the t-table of $6.606 > 1.633$, the significant value is smaller than α , namely $0.000 < 0.05$, meaning that it can be concluded that H3 is accepted.

DISCUSSION

Based on the results of multiple linear regression tests in table 2.14. then the regression line equation is as follows:

$$Y = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + e$$

$$Y = 4.803 + 0.186 X_1 + 0.482 X_2 + 0.406 X_3 + e$$

A constant of 4.803 states that if the independent variables are considered constant, then the average performance score of Maranatha Christian University employees is 4.803, so

- 1) Increasing or decreasing the workload variable will affect employee performance by 0.186 units.
- 2) Increase or decrease in emotional intelligence variables affect employee performance by 0.482 units.
- 3) Increasing or decreasing the intellectual intelligence variable will affect employee performance by 0.406 units.

Based on the description above then:

- 1) Workload (X_1) has no effect on the performance of permanent employees (Y) at Maranatha Christian University. The test results show that this variable has a significant effect on the permanent employee performance variable (Y). This is shown by the results of the tcount < ttable test, namely $2.411 > 1.663$. The significance value < α is $0.018 < 0.05$. So it can be concluded that workload has a positive and significant effect on the performance of permanent employees (Y).
- 2) Meanwhile, the results of the hypothesis test for the emotional intelligence variable (X_2) show a significant effect on the permanent employee performance variable (Y). This is shown by the results of the tcount test, which is $3.421 > 1.663$ and the results of the significance value are smaller than α , namely $0.001 < 0.05$. So that the H2 hypothesis is accepted.
- 3) The results of individual hypothesis testing for the intellectual intelligence variable show that this variable has a significant effect on the permanent employee performance variable. This is shown by the results of the tcount > ttable test, namely $6.606 > 1.663$ and the significance value > α , namely $0.000 > 0.05$. So that the H3 hypothesis is accepted.
- 4) The effect of Emotional Intelligence on employee performance is based on the

results of the $t_{count} > t_{table}$ test, namely $2.411 > 1.663$, then H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted.

- 5) The Effect of Intellectual Intelligence on Employee Performance, based on the result that t_{count} is greater than t_{table} , namely 1.663 , then H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions from this study include that H_1 is accepted because the significance value of X is 0.018 . Furthermore, emotional intelligence has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. H_3 is accepted because the significance value of X is 0.000 because the sig value < 0.05 . Then intellectual intelligence has a positive and significant effect on performance. It is indicated by the t_{count} value, which is $6.606 > 1.663$ so that H_0 is accepted. Furthermore, all variables are simultaneous and have a positive effect on performance. Indicated by a t_{count} value greater than the table, namely $3.421 > 1.663$, then H_0 is accepted. In the future, the results of this study can be used as material for consideration in determining the performance burden of employees at Maranatha Christian University. So that the vision and mission of the university can be in line with the field

References :

- Agustina, R., Yusuf, M., Sutiyan, O. S. J., Ardianto, R., & Norvadewi, N. (2022). EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE MEDIATED QUALITY OF WORK LIFE RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION ON THE JOB AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT. *Jurnal Darma Agung*, 30(2), 589–605.
- Aryaningsih, Y. Y., Fathoni, A., & Harini, C. (2018). PENGARUH RETURN ON ASSET (ROA), RETURN ON EQUITY (ROE) DAN EARNING PER SHARE (EPS) TERHADAP RETURN SAHAM PADA PERUSAHAAN KONSUMER BAHAN BAKAR (FOOD AND BEVERAGES) YANG TERDAFTAR DI BURSA EFEK INDONESIA (BEI) PERIODE 2013-2016. *Journal of Management*, 4(4).
- Asir, M., Yusuf, M., & Ardianto, R. (2022). *Performance In The Company : A Review Literature Dampak Kompensasi , Motivasi Dan Kepuasan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Di Perusahaan : Review Literature*. 3(October), 3476–3482.
- Azis, M. A., Maslichah, M., & Afifudin, A. (2018). PENGARUH KECERDASAN INTELEKTUAL, KECERDASAN EMOSIONAL DAN KECERDASAN SPIRITUAL TERHADAP PEMAHAMAN AKUNTANSI (Studi Empiris Mahasiswa Jurusan Akuntansi Perguruan Tinggi Berbasis Islam di Malang). *E_Jurnal Ilmiah Riset Akuntansi*, 7(11).
- Ghozali, I., & Ratmono, D. (2017). *Analisis multivariat dan ekonometrika: teori, konsep, dan aplikasi dengan review 10*.
- Gould, P. G., Koehler, A. B., Ord, J. K., Snyder, R. D., Hyndman, R. J., & Vahid-Araghi, F. (2008). Forecasting time series with multiple seasonal patterns. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 191(1), 207–222.
- Gumanti, M., & Utami, B. H. S. (2019). Faktor Penentu Keberhasilan Implementasi Enterprise Resource Planning Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Era 4.0. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Manajemen*, 10(02), 51–58.
- Hanis, R., & Yusuf, M. (2022). Applying A Swot Analysis Approach To A Sharia Marketing

- Perspective At Alunicorn Shops In Bandung. *Proceeding of The International Conference on Economics and Business*, 1(2), 653–670.
- Kurniadi, W., Natalia, L., Lotte, A., Cakranegara, P. A., Sampe, F., & Yusuf, M. (2022). HANAN WEDDING PLANNER ' S MARKETING COMMUNICATION STRATEGY FOR INCREASING SALES IN THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC ERA ON THE TIKTOK APP. 11(03), 1359–1364.
- Mamangkey, L. (n.d.). BT-JEJR, & 2018, undefined.(2018). Pengaruh Kecerdasan Intelektual (IQ), Kecerdasan Emosional (EQ), dan Kecerdasan Sosial (SQ) Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Kantor Wilayah BANK BRI Manado. *Ejournal. Unsrat. Ac. Id*, 6 (4), 3208–3217.
- Muhammad Yusuf, Sutrisno, Putri, P. A. N., Asir, M., & Cakranegara, P. A. (2020). PROSPEK PENGGUNAAN E-COMMERCE TERHADAP PROFITABILITAS DAN KEMUDAHAN PELAYANAN KONSUMEN: LITERATURE REVIEW. *Suparyanto Dan Rosad* (2015, 5(3), 248–253.
- Norman, C., Mello, M., & Choi, B. (2016). Identifying frequent users of an urban emergency medical service using descriptive statistics and regression analyses. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 17(1), 39.
- Prabawa, I. M. A., & Supartha, I. W. G. (2018). Meningkatkan produktivitas karyawan melalui Pemberdayaan, kerja sama tim dan pelatihan Di perusahaan jasa. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Unud*, 7(1), 497–524.
- Rio Haribowo, Moridu, I., Rafid, M., Kamar, K., & Yusuf, M. (2022). COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INDONESIAN HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE 2018-2021 By. *Journal of Innovation Research and Knowledge*, 2(8.5.2017), 2003–2005.
- Runtuwene, P. (2016). Pengaruh Penempatan Kerja, Mutasi Dan Beban Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT. Bank Sulutgo Manado. *Jurnal Berkala Ilmiah Efisiensi*, 16(1).
- Sutrisno, Cakranegara, P. A., Asri, F., Yusuf, M., & Sahala, J. (2022). STRATEGY FOR MSME DEVELOPMENT USING FINANCIAL TECHNOLOGY TO. 30(2), 677–686.
- Wahyuni, S. N., & Wibowo, F. W. (2018). Internet usage pattern in entrepreneurship-based XYZ IT private university. *Advanced Science Letters*, 24(4), 2651–2654.
- Wowling, S. A. S., Yusuf, M., Gampu, S., & Sahala, J. (2022). PRODUCT QUALITY AND PRICING INFLUENCE ON THE BRAND REPUTATION OF LOCO COFFEE FAST FOOD PRODUCTS. *Jurnal Darma Agung*, 30(2), 541–548.
- Yapono, D. A., & Khomsatun, S. (2018). Peranan tata kelola sebagai pemoderasi atas pengaruh manajemen laba terhadap efisiensi investasi. *Jurnal Dinamika Akuntansi Dan Bisnis*, 5(2), 179–194.