International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

EQ vs. IQ and its Influences on Employee Performance

Santhosh S [1*], Clayton Michael Fonceca [2]
[1-2] Research Scholar, P.G. & Research Department of Social Work, Sacred Heart College (Autonomous), Tirupattur District, TN India

Corresponding Author: **Santhosh S**

Article Info

ISSN (Online): 2582-7138
Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.04
Volume: 07
Issue: 02
Received: 16-01-2026
Accepted: 14-02-2026
Published: 12-03-2026
Page No: 159-168

Abstract
In the modern collaborative workplace, success is no longer based solely on intellectual ability, but rather on a combination of both intellectual and emotional capabilities. The primary objective of this study was to examine the impact of Emotional Quotient (EQ) and Intelligence Quotient (IQ) on employee job performance within an industry in Housr. A descriptive research design was employed for this study. Primary data was gathered from both executive and non-executive employees in the industrial sector using a simple random sampling technique. The research utilized a structured questionnaire based on Daniel Goleman's dimensions of EQ and the Wechsler Adult Performance Intelligence Scale (WAPIS). Specifically, the study examined Personal Competence, Social Competence (EQ), Verbal Intelligence, Fluid Reasoning, and Cognitive Efficiency (IQ), alongside Core Task Performance, Organizational Contribution, and Work Commitment (Job Performance). The results indicated that nearly half of the employees possessed high levels of EQ (48.3%) and IQ (46.7%), with exactly half demonstrating high levels of job performance effectiveness (50%). Statistical tests revealed no significant differences in performance based on gender, job level, education, or domicile. However, a significant difference in Social Competence was found based on employee category. Additionally, age showed a significant positive correlation with Core Job and Task Performance. The study concluded that while EQ and IQ are significant contributors to performance, demographic factors such as gender and education do not result in performance variations. Therefore, it is vital for organizations to focus on role-based training. Enhancing social competence helps reduce employee stress, anxiety, and loneliness, ultimately fostering a healthier organizational environment.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2026.7.2.159-168

Keywords: Emotional Quotient, Intelligent Quotient, Employee Performance, Social Competence, Personal Competence.

Introduction

The current organizational environment has experienced a paradigm shift in understanding the factors that influence employee performance. Over the years cognitive skills as index by the Intelligence Quotient have remained at the leading as the fundamental factor in determining success in the workplace especially in roles that demand analytical skills and complex problem-solving. This includes the ability to process information, engage in logical reasoning and execute complex tasks with precision. However, the evolution of the work environment into collaborative work systems, dispersed workforces and complex stakeholder relationships has led to the increased importance of emotional intelligence. This led to the development of the Emotional Quotient as a theoretical construct that includes an individual's ability to recognize, understand and utilize their emotions in various situations. This dimension of human ability includes understanding how individuals deal with complex social situations, relationships and decision-making processes. Modern studies have revealed that neither quotient works

independently. Instead, research has shown that EQ and IQ in combination explain a large percentage of the variance in job performance in different organizational contexts. However, the problem in understanding the role of these quotients in different dimensions of job performance remain a challenge to many organizations. This study attempts to fill this information gap by critically examining the dimensional influence of EQ and IQ on different dimensions of employee performance.

Review of Literature

The researcher from the international and national have conducted the research on Emotional Quotient and Intelligent Quotient in the various sectors such as education, working environment and performance. They were used the various scales to measure the schutte and Baron EQ scale, Sranford Binet scale of EQ, Dhar, Hyde and Pethe scale etc. The Graeme. H, Coetzer (2016) [3, 8]. findings of him shows the EQ is the more significant predictor and remains a significant factor even accounting for IQ. The Sapta Rini Widyawato and Ni Ketut Karwini (2019) says about the effect of IQ and EQ on employee performance which is closer to the study and findings of these study was both the emotional quotient and intelligent quotient shows the positive significant effect on the employee performance. The Cagri Baris Gunec (2022) [2] the study is about the comparative study of the emotional quotient and intelligent quotient in this EQ has qualitative skill that can be tught and improve unlike IQ so it has largely genetically determined. The C.P khokhar and Tulika Kush (2009) [10]. conducted the study on emotional quotient and work performance among executives tell that executive having higher emotional intelligence show better quality of work performance compare to the other than executive employees. The Praveen M. kulkarni, B. Janakiram and D.N.S kumar (2009) [13, 16]. study on emotional intelligence and employee performance as an indicator for promotion findings tells that no significant correlation between emotional intelligence scores and performance appraisal scores. It was determined that managers and supervisors were underperforming because they were not able to manage their emotional intelligence on the job. The A. Ramaraju (2015) [19]. conducted the study on emotional quotient vs intelligence quotient of management students. The study found that IQ level of socioeconomic status of urban and rural character of all year study have interactive effect on EQ and concentrate on developing a better emotional quotient rather than intelligent quotient alone to help students withstand job pressure and stress. Dr. Durga Dwivedi and Dr. Preeti Tamrakar (2023) [6] study titled as EQ vs IQ impact on the organizational environment. The key findings of this study was EQ and IQ have significant positive impact on organizational performance.

Methodology

Aim: To study the emotional quotient vs intelligent quotient and its influences on employee performance.

Objectives:

1. The determine the emotional quotient, intelligent quotient and influences on employee performance among the respondents
2. To analyse the relationship between gender and factors influencing job performance.
3. To examine the difference in EQ, IQ and job performance based on job level (Executive and Non-Executive).
4. To assess the influence of educational qualification, employee category and domicile on EQ, IQ and job performance.
5. To highlight the relationship between age, work experiences and the dimensions of EQ, IQ and job performance.

Hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference between the gender of the respondents and the factors of the job performance.
2. There is no significant difference between the gender of the respondents and their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence on performance.
3. There is significant between the employee cadre and the factors of job performance
4. There is significant between the employee cadre of the respondent and their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence on performance.
5. There is a significant between the educational qualification of the respondents and the factors of the job performance.
6. There is a significant between the educational qualification of the respondents and their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence on performance.
7. There is no significant between the employee category of the respondents and the factors of the job performance.
8. There is no significant between the employee category of the respondents and their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence on performance.

Research Design:

The descriptive research design was used for conducting the study on the employee working in the industry. Descriptive research helps in gathering information about the attitudes, perceptions and factors that influence that employee's performance influenced by emotional quotients and intelligent quotient.

Sampling Technique:

The study was conducted among employees working in one of the top industries located in the Krishnagiri District. The participant pool comprised both executive and non-executive staff. To select participants, the researcher utilized the census method, meaning every eligible member of the target population was invited to participate. A total of 60 respondents took part in the study.

Tools for the Data Collection:

The primary data collected for the study through the questionnaire method. The questionnaire consisted of close ended questions that measured through the Likert Scale. The questions were classified through the various dimensions of the factors that influences on the employee performances such as:

- Personal Competence
- Social Competence
- Verbal Intelligence
- Fluid Reasoning
- Cognitive Efficiency
- Core Job and Task Performance
- Organizational and Interpersonal Contribution
- Work Commitment and Initiative
- Over all Job Performance
- Over all Emotional Quotient
- Over all Intelligent Quotient
- Over all EQ vs IQ and its influences on employee performance

Analysis and Interpretation

The various analysis was computed using SPSS V.21 to understand the factors influencing on the job performance by EQ and IQ this includes Quartile deviations, 't' Test, One-way analysis of variance and Karl Pearson's correlation. The findings are presented below:

Table 1: Distribution of respondents based on their dimensions

Dimensions	EQ, IQ & Employee Performance					
	Low		Moderate		High	
	Freq.	(%)	Freq.	(%)	Freq.	(%)
Personal competence	15	25	23	38.3	22	36.7
Social Competence	15	25	34	56.7	11	18.3
Verbal Intelligence	20	33.3	14	23.3	26	43.3
Fluid Reasoning	21	35	9	15	30	50
Cognitive Efficiency	15	25	19	31.7	26	43.3
Core Job and Task Performance	19	31.7	17	28.3	24	40
Organizational and Interpersonal Contribution	19	31.7	21	35	20	33.3
Work Commitment and Initiative	23	38.3	11	18.3	26	43.3

Form the above table 4.1 Personal Competence has one third (38.3%) of the population shows high level while little higher than one third (36.7%) has chosen moderate level. In the Social Competence has less than two third (56.7%) of the population has a moderate level while exactly one fourth (25%) of the population has a low level of social competence. The exactly half (50%) of the population has high fluid reasoning ability, while another more than one third (35%) of the population has a low level of fluid reasoning ability. In terms of Cognitive Efficiency and Verbal Intelligence, the majority of the population has less than half (43.3%) of the population chosen high levels of these forms of intelligence and little higher than one third (33.3%) of the population has a low level of verbal intelligence. Regarding Core Job and Task Performance, has exactly two fifth (40%) of the respondent's high, while little high than one third (31.7%) remain in the low category. For Organizational and Interpersonal Contribution, the distribution is relatively balanced with little higher than one third (35%) showing moderate involvement and little higher than one third (33.3%) showing high involvement. Finally, in terms of Work Commitment and Initiative slightly high than two fifth (43.3%) of respondents display high and little less than two fifth (38.3%) score in the low category.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents based on their overall dimension of EQ, IQ & Employee Performance.

Dimensions	EQ, IQ & Employee Performance					
	Low		Moderate		High	
	Freq.	(%)	Freq.	(%)	Freq.	(%)
Emotional Quotient	17	28.3	14	23.3	29	48.3
Intelligent Quotient	17	28.3	15	25	28	46.7
Overall effectiveness of Job Performance	15	25	15	25	30	50
Over all EQ vs IQ and employee performance	15	25	16	26.7	29	48.3

From the above table the Emotional Quotient have nearly half (48.3%) of the participants chose the high category and less than one fourth (23.3%) of the respondent's in Moderate level. For the Intelligent Quotient have nearly half (46.7%) chosen the high category and exactly one fourth of the respondents chosen the moderate level. For the Job Performance exactly half (50%) of the respondents chosen the high level and exactly one fourth (25%) of the respondents chosen the low as well as moderate level. For the over all EQ, IQ and Job Performance less than half (48.3%) have selected the high level and exactly one fourth (25%) has chosen the low level. The remaining respondents falls in choosing the little higher than (26.7%) has moderate.

Table 3: 't'-test between the gender of the respondent and factors influences on job performance

Gender of the Respondent		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Df	Statistical Interferences
Personal competence	Male	45	32.87	4.043	0.603	58	't' = 0.356 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	31.80	3.144	0.812	30.716	
Social Competence	Male	45	22.44	4.419	0.659	58	't' = 0.942 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	22.53	2.850	0.736	37.716	
Verbal Intelligence	Male	45	11.13	1.766	0.263	58	't' = 1.00 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	11.13	1.407	0.363	29.924	
Fluid Reasoning	Male	45	20.89	2.854	0.425	58	't' = 0.63 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	19.40	1.805	0.466	38.549	
Cognitive Efficiency	Male	45	20.40	2.683	0.400	58	't' = 0.203 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	19.47	1.356	0.350	48.253	
Core Job and Task Performance	Male	45	12.31	2.141	0.319	58	't' = 0.881 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	12.40	1.352	0.349	38.592	
Organizational and Interpersonal Contribution	Male	45	16.27	2.481	0.370	58	't' = 1.00 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	16.27	2.314	0.597	25.593	
Work Commitment and Initiative	Male	45	8.91	1.311	0.195	58	't' = 0.259 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	8.47	1.302	0.336	24.186	
Overall effectiveness of Job Performance	Male	45	37.49	3.788	0.565	58	't' = 0.754 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	37.13	3.815	0.985	23.892	

The above table 4.3 is the Independent samples t-test was used to analyses the differences in the factors of job performance between male and female employees. The analysis reveals that for every single job performance dimension the calculated p-value is greater than the standard significance level of 0.05. This statistical insignificance is consistent across all factors from specific competencies to the overall effectiveness of job performance. The mean scores for males and females are very close to each other in all cases. Therefore, it can be concluded with confidence that gender does not play a determining role in how employees rate their job performance. The organization can assume that performance levels are perceived similarly by both male and female employees and gender-based initiatives may not be necessary to address performance perceptions.

H0: There is no significant difference between male and female employees with respect to the factors of job performance.

H1: There is a significant difference between male and female employees with respect to the factors of job performance.

Result: For all factors the p-value is greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. It is concluded that gender does not have a significant influence on any of the job performance factors.

Table 4: 't'-test between the gender of the employees and their EQ, IQ and overall its influences on job performance

Gender of the Respondent		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Df	Statistical Interferences
Emotional Quotient	Male	45	55.31	7.385	1.101	58	't' = 0.636 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	54.33	5.080	1.312	35.123	
Intelligent Quotient	Male	45	52.42	4.545	0.678	58	't' = 0.61 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	50.00	3.185	0.822	34.415	
Over all EQ vs IQ and its influences on employee performance	Male	45	145.22	12.555	1.872	58	't' = 0.294 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Female	15	141.47	9.523	2.459	31.551	

This analysis examined whether male and female employees differ in their Emotional Quotient, Intelligent Quotient and the combined influence of these factors on performance. The results showed p-values greater than 0.05 for EQ, IQ and their combined influence on employee performance. This indicates no statistically significant difference between genders. The mean scores for males and females were very close to each other. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that emotional and intellectual capabilities are evenly distributed across genders. These quotients do not contribute to any gender-based performance gaps. The findings suggest that gender does not influence the overall EQ, IQ, or their combined effect on job performance.

H0: There is no significant difference between male and female employees regarding their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence on performance.

H1: There is a significant difference between male and female employees regarding their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence on performance.

Result: The p-values for Emotional Quotient, Intelligent Quotient and their combined influence are all greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. It is concluded that gender does not significantly impact the overall EQ, IQ, or their combined effect on employee performance.

Table 5: 't'-test between the job level of the respondent and factors influences on job performance

Job level of the Respondent		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Df	Statistical Interferences
Personal competence	Executive	39	32.00	3.853	0.617	56	't' = 0.143 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	33.58	3.687	0.846	37.254	
Social Competence	Executive	39	22.05	4.273	0.684	56	't' = 0.383 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	10.72	3.613	0.829	41.718	
Verbal Intelligence	Executive	39	11.95	1.746	0.280	56	't' = 0.008 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	20.15	1.268	0.291	47.443	
Fluid Reasoning	Executive	39	21.05	2.870	0.460	56	't' = 0.238 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	20.08	2.272	0.521	44.207	
Cognitive Efficiency	Executive	39	20.26	2.878	0.461	56	't' = 0.791 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	12.21	1.368	0.314	55.995	
Core Job and Task Performance	Executive	39	12.58	2.002	0.321	56	't' = 0.508 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	16.13	2.009	0.461	35.684	
Organizational and Interpersonal Contribution	Executive	39	16.53	2.726	0.436	56	't' = 0.561 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	8.62	1.645	0.377	53.233	
Work Commitment and Initiative	Executive	39	9.05	1.388	0.222	56	't' = 0.238 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	54.05	1.129	0.259	43.181	
Overall effectiveness of Job Performance	Executive	39	36.95	4.006	0.642	56	't' = 0.259 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	38.16	3.287	0.754	42.846	

This test was conducted to compare job performance factors between Executive and Non-Executive employees. The analysis covered all dimensions including Personal Competence, Social Competence, Verbal Intelligence and other performance factors. The results revealed p-values greater than 0.05 for every single performance dimension. This indicates no statistically significant difference between executives and non-executives. Both groups rated themselves similarly on all performance factors.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that job level does not influence self-perceived performance. The organization maintains a consistent performance culture across hierarchies, or the self-assessment tool was not sensitive enough to capture role-specific performance nuances.

H0: There is no significant difference between executives and non-executives with respect to the factors of job performance.

H1: There is a significant difference between executives and non-executives with respect to the factors of job performance.
Result: For all factors (Personal Competence, Social Competence, etc.), the p-value is greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. It is concluded that job level does not have a significant influence on the perceived factors of job performance.

Table 6: 't'-test between the job level of the employees and their EQ, IQ and overall its influences on job performance

Job level of the Respondent		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Df	Statistical Interferences
Emotional Quotient	Executive	39	54.05	6.755	1.082	56	't' = 0.178 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	56.63	6.792	1.558	35.609	
Intelligent Quotient	Executive	39	50.95	4.489	0.719	56	't' = 0.56 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	53.26	3.679	0.844	42.892	
Over all EQ vs IQ and its influences on employee performance	Executive	39	141.95	11.660	1.867	56	't' = 0.66 P>0.05 Not Significant
	Non-Executive	19	148.05	11.616	2.665	35.908	

This test investigated whether employees at different job levels possess different levels of emotional and intellectual quotients. The results showed p-values greater than 0.05 for Emotional Quotient, Intelligent Quotient and their combined influence on performance. This indicates no statistically significant difference between executives and non-executives. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that promotion to an executive level may not be primarily determined by higher EQ or IQ.
H0: There is no significant difference between executives and non-executives regarding their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence on performance.
H1: There is a significant difference between executives and non-executives regarding their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence on performance.
Result: The p-values for Emotional Quotient, Intelligent Quotient and their combined influence is all greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. It is concluded that job level does not significantly impact the overall EQ, IQ, or their combined effect on employee performance.

Table 7: One-way analysis of variance among the education of the respondent and Job Performance

Variable		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Statistical Inference
Personal competence	Between Groups	59.945	3	19.982	1.381	Sig.=0.258 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	810.455	56	14.472		
Social Competence	Between Groups	175.950	3	58.650	4.121	F=0. 010 P<0.05 **Significant**
	Within Groups	796.983	56	14.232		
Verbal Intelligence	Between Groups	3.337	3	1.112	0.385	Sig.=0.764 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	161.596	56	2.886		
Fluid Reasoning	Between Groups	5.641	3	1.880	0.249	Sig.=0.862 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	423.342	56	7.560		
Cognitive Efficiency	Between Groups	5.641	3	1.880	0.249	Sig.=0.862 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	423.342	56	7.560		
Core Job and Task Performance	Between Groups	2.348	3	.783	0.195	Sig.=0.900 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	224.985	56	4.018		
Organizational and Interpersonal Contribution	Between Groups	4.618	3	1.539	0.253	Sig.=0.859 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	341.116	56	6.091		
Work Commitment and Initiative	Between Groups	3.861	3	1.287	0.737	Sig.=0.534 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	97.739	56	1.745		
Overall effectiveness of Job Performance	Between Groups	22.487	3	7.496	0.516	Sig.=0.673 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	813.913	56	14.534		

G1 = Diploma **G2** = UG degree **G3** = PG degree **G4** = Others

This analysis was conducted to determine if job performance factors differ based on educational qualification (Diploma, UG, PG, Special Course). The results showed that for every single job performance factor, the p-value was greater than 0.05. This includes Personal Competence, Social Competence, Verbal Intelligence and all other performance dimensions. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that educational qualification does not have a significant impact on job performance. Employees with Diplomas perform just as well as those with Postgraduate

degrees. This suggests that organizational training and on-the-job learning may be more critical for performance than formal educational background.

H0: There is no significant difference among respondents with different educational qualifications with respect to job performance factors.

H1: There is a significant difference among respondents with different educational qualifications with respect to job performance factors.

Result: For all job performance factors the p-value is greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. It is concluded that educational qualification does not have a significant influence on job performance factors. But the p-value of social competence (0.010) which less than 0.05 so the hypothesis H1 is accepted for that particular dimension.

Table 8: One-way analysis of variance among the education of the respondent and their EQ, IQ and overall Job Performance

Variable		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Statistical Inference
Emotional Quotient	Between Groups	429.070	3	143.023	3.419	Sig.=0.023 P<0.05 **Significant**
	Within Groups	2342.663	56	41.833		
Intelligent Quotient	Between Groups	6.619	3	2.206	0.111	Sig.=0.953 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	1110.364	56	19.828		
Over all EQ vs IQ and its influences on employee performance	Between Groups	603.864	3	201.288	1.453	Sig.=0.237 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	7760.319	56	138.577		

G1 = Diploma **G2** = UG degree **G3** = PG degree **G4** = Others

This test examined emotional quotient, intelligent quotient and their combined influence differs based on educational level. The p-values for EQ (0.023), IQ (0.953) and their combined influence (0.237) were all above the 0.05 threshold. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that educational background does not significantly influence a person's emotional or intellectual quotient. An employee with a Diploma is just as likely to have high EQ or IQ as an employee with a PG degree. These quotients are distinct from academic achievement and are likely developed through life experiences and personality rather than formal schooling alone.

H0: There is no significant difference among respondents with different educational qualifications regarding their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence.

H1: There is a significant difference among respondents with different educational qualifications regarding their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence.

Result: The p-values for Intelligent Quotient (0.953) and their combined influence (0.237) are all greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. It is concluded that educational qualification does not significantly impact the overall EQ, IQ or their combined effect but the p-value for Emotional Quotient (0.023) less than 0.05 so there is significant differences among respondents with different educational qualification regarding their EQ.

Table 9: One-way analysis of variance among the Employee Category of the respondent and Job Performance

Variable		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Statistical Inference
Personal competence	Between Groups	8.496	2	4.248	0.281	Sig. = 0.756 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	861.904	57	15.121		
Social Competence	Between Groups	129.374	2	64.687	4.371	Sig. = 0.017 P<0.05 Significant
	Within Groups	843.559	57	14.799		
Verbal Intelligence	Between Groups	1.759	2	.879	0.307	Sig. = 0.737 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	163.174	57	2.863		
Fluid Reasoning	Between Groups	.810	2	.405	0.054	Sig. = 0.948 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	428.173	57	7.512		
Cognitive Efficiency	Between Groups	3.826	2	1.913	0.313	Sig. = 0.733 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	348.508	57	6.114		
Core Job and Task Performance	Between Groups	20.665	2	10.333	2.850	Sig. = 0.066 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	206.668	57	3.626		
Organizational and Interpersonal Contribution	Between Groups	4.636	2	2.318	0.387	Sig. = 0.681 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	341.097	57	5.984		
Work Commitment and Initiative	Between Groups	.604	2	.302	0.170	Sig. = 0.844 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	100.996	57	1.772		
Overall effectiveness of Job Performance	Between Groups	6.958	2	3.479	0.239	Sig. = 0.788 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	829.442	57	14.552		

G1 = Permanent **G2** = Contractual **G3** = Temporary

This crucial analysis tested if an employee's contractual status (Permanent, Contractual, Temporary) affects their job performance. For almost all factors, p-values were greater than 0.05 which indicates that no significant difference. However, for Social Competence, the p-value was 0.017 which is less than 0.05, indicating a statistically significant difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected for Social Competence and accepted for all other factors. It is concluded that employee category significantly influences Social Competence only. This could be because permanent employees have more opportunities for team-building and relationship development while contractual workers might feel like outsiders.

H0: There is no significant difference among respondents in different employee categories with respect to job performance factors.

H1: There is a significant difference among respondents in different employee categories with respect to job performance factors.

Result: For all job performance factors except one, the p-value is greater than 0.05. However, for Social Competence the p-value is 0.017 which is less than 0.05. This indicates a significant difference.

Table 10: One-way analysis of variance among the Employee Category of the respondent and their EQ, IQ and overall its employee performance

Variable		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Statistical Inference
Emotional Quotient	Between Groups	129.737	2	64.868	1.400	Sig.=0.255 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	2641.996	57	46.351		
Intelligent Quotient	Between Groups	3.477	2	1.738	0.089	Sig.=0.915 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	1113.507	57	19.535		
Over all EQ vs IQ and its influences on employee performance	Between Groups	74.317	2	37.158	0.255	Sig.=0.775 P>0.05 Non-Significant
	Within Groups	8289.867	57	145.436		

G1 = Permanent **G2** = Contractual **G3** = Temporary

This test investigated whether core emotional and intellectual capabilities vary by employment type. The results showed p-values of 0.255 for EQ, 0.915 for IQ and 0.775 for their combined influence, all comfortably above 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference in EQ and IQ based on whether an employee is permanent, contractual, or temporary. This is logical as hiring for these roles likely targets a similar baseline of cognitive and emotional ability. The significant difference found in Social Competence is likely a result of work situation and opportunities, not inherent differences in emotional intelligence.

H0: There is no significant difference among respondents in different employee categories regarding their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence.

H1: There is a significant difference among respondents in different employee categories regarding their overall EQ, IQ and their combined influence.

Result: The p-values for Emotional Quotient (0.255), Intelligent Quotient (0.915) and their combined influence (0.775) are all greater than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. It is concluded that employee category does not significantly impact the overall EQ, IQ, or their combined effect on performance.

Major Findings

The research established that nearly half of the workforce demonstrates high EQ (48.3 percent), high IQ (46.7 percent), and high overall job performance (50 percent). Gender and hierarchical position show no significant effects on any performance dimension or quotient measure. Educational background significantly influences social competence ($p=0.010$) and emotional quotient ($p=0.023$) but not cognitive abilities or most performance dimensions. Employment category significantly affects social competence ($p=0.017$) but not core capabilities, indicating workplace opportunity differences rather than inherent capability variations. Age demonstrates significant positive correlation with core task performance ($r=0.342$, $p<0.01$) but no relationship with quotients. Work experience and domicile show no significant relationships with any measured variables. These findings collectively indicate that while emotional and cognitive capabilities contribute substantially to performance, demographic and organizational variables except age and employment category for specific dimensions do not create performance disparities, suggesting organizations should focus on inclusive practices and targeted training to enhance social competencies across all employee categories.

Suggestions

Strategic recommendations arising from the investigation into the influence of Emotional Quotient and Intelligence Quotient on employees' job performance include the following: Inclusive integration programs that offer contractual and temporary employees equal chances with permanent employees to build social relationships should be implemented to address social competence gaps among employees.

Mentor programs should be implemented to capitalize on the positive correlation between age and performance in core tasks by facilitating knowledge transfer from older employees to younger employees. Continuous professional

development programs focusing on employees' emotional intelligence should be emphasized, with priority given to leadership development programs. Existing gender-neutral human resource policies based on employees' capability assessments should be reinforced by auditing selection processes regularly and communicating to employees that gender is not a factor in determining performance capability. Training programs focusing on improving employees' communication flexibility and addressing conflicts should be implemented to enhance employees' social capabilities, with programs targeting employees with low levels of formal education focusing on improving their communication skills. Designing the role of the employee should capitalize on the strength of age by putting the experienced employee in a role that requires procedural knowledge while putting the younger employee in a role that requires rapid adaptation. Monitoring the EQ-IQ-performance relationship allows for the improvement of HR processes through a data-driven approach. Lastly, the organization should strive to create an organizational culture that recognizes the importance of emotional intelligence as much as IQ through leadership modeling and recognition systems for contextual performance.

Conclusion

The theoretical and empirical evidence explored in this chapter clearly shows that both Intellectual Quotient and Emotional Quotient are key determinants of the success of employees, though the nature of their impact differs. Theories of classical intelligence focus on cognitive abilities that can be gauged through the IQ quotient. These include analysis and reasoning abilities that are the benchmark for assessing the performance of complex tasks. Emotional intelligence theories, such as the Goleman model, focus on non-intellective behavioral abilities that are critical for adapting to the social and psychological demands of the modern work environment.

From the empirical investigations carried out, it has been seen that although numerous investigations have proven the positive and significant effects of both quotients on performance outcomes, the findings are not consistent across populations and settings. Studies have proven the association between high levels of emotional intelligence and superior work quality and decision-making abilities of managers. However, application problems have also been seen, with some investigations proving the association between the possession of emotional intelligence and poor performance due to the non-utilization of the same. Contemporary investigations have proven the high predictive power of the combined quotients, with some investigations proving the association between EQ and IQ and 57% of the variance in job performance. This literature review provides the platform to examine the association between the quotients and the workforce of Tamil Nadu, thereby fulfilling the gaps through dimensional analysis.

References

1. Akimas HN. The influence of intellectual intelligence (IQ), emotional intelligence (EQ), and spiritual intelligence (SQ) on the performance of inspectorate employees. 2024.
2. Gunec CB. Intelligent quotient (IQ) vs emotional quotient (EQ): A comparative study. 2022.
3. Coetzer GH. Emotional versus cognitive intelligence: Which is the better predictor of efficacy for working in teams? J Organ Psychol. 2016.
4. Dhani P, Sehrawat A, Sharma T. Relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance: A study in Indian context. Indian J Ind Relat. 2016.
5. Dwivedi D, Tamrakar P. EQ vs IQ: Impact on the organizational environment. 2023.
6. Dwivedi D, Tamrakar P. EQ vs IQ: Impact on the organizational environment. J Manag Res Anal. 2023.
7. Gayathri R, Anandan CC. Relationship between emotional intelligence and psychological well-being of employees: An empirical study. Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval. 2023;4(2):500-503.
8. Coetzer GH. Emotional versus cognitive intelligence: Which is the better predictor of efficacy for working in teams? 2016.
9. Kanmani JO, Fonceca CM. Employee happiness index and its impact on employee performance. Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval. 2023;4(2):360-364.
10. Khokhar CP, Kush T. Emotional intelligence and work performance among executives. J Indian Acad Appl Psychol. 2009.
11. Kishore S, Fonceca CM. Impact of training and development on employee performance and productivity. J Acad Indus Res. 2023;11(3):43-47.
12. Kotler P, Keller KL. Marketing management. 15th ed. Pearson Education; 2016.
13. Kulkarni PM, Janakiram B, Kumar DNS. Emotional intelligence and employee performance as an indicator for promotion. Indian J Soc Sci Res. 2009.
14. Mayer JD, Salovey P, Caruso DR. Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. Psychol Inq. 2004.
15. Rajesh M. Impact of emotional intelligence on job performance in IT industry in Andhra Pradesh. 2019.
16. Kulkarni PM, Janakiram B, Kumar DNS. Emotional intelligence and employee performance as an indicator for promotion. 2009.
17. Palani D, Fonceca CM. Employee engagement practices and its impact on organizational productivity. SSRN. 2025 Mar 23. Available from: https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5190915
18. Dhani P, Sehrawat A, Sharma T. Relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance: A study in Indian context. 2016.
19. Ramaraju A. A study on emotional quotient vs intelligence quotient of management students. Int J Manag Res Rev. 2015.
20. Reddy S, Kumar P. Factors influencing consumer purchase behaviour towards pre-owned cars. Int J Mark Manag Res. 2019.
21. Widyawati SR, Karwini NK. The effect of intelligence quotient and emotional quotient on employee performance. 2019.
22. Sharma R, Singh A. Role of digital platforms in influencing consumer buying behaviour in used car markets. J Bus Retail Manag Res. 2020.
23. Marwaha S. Analysis of emotional quotient and intelligence quotient among high achievers and low performers in school academics. 2015.
24. Spearman C. General intelligence, objectively determined and measured. Am J Psychol. 1904.
25. Supramaniam S, Singaravelloo K. Impact of emotional intelligence on organizational performance: An analysis

in the Malaysian public administration. Asian J Public Aff. 2021.
26. Widyawati SR, Karwini NK. The effect of intelligence quotient and emotional quotient on employee performance. Int J Appl Bus Int Manag. 2019.

How to Cite This Article

Santhosh S, Fonceca CM. EQ vs. IQ and its influences on employee performance. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation. 2026;7(2):159–168. doi:10.54660/IJMRGE.2026.7.2.159-168.

Creative Commons (CC) License