

EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES: ARE THEY COMPETENT AND PERFORMED ?

Aulia Devita, Dina Sartika

Universitas Padjadjaran

auliadevitaa@gmail.com

dina.sartika@unpad.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The diversity of the workforce is considered as an asset for the company if it is implemented and managed properly. However, the implementation of diversity management currently is still difficult and become a challenge for the company especially those with physical disabilities. It is hard for them to be able to work, especially in the formal sector. The purpose of this study was to determine the influence of competency on the performance of employees with disabilities in Thisable Enterprise. The method used in this study is descriptive and verification. Data was conducted through a survey of respondents consisting of employees with disabilities in Thisable Enterprise. Furthermore, the hypothesis test was carried out statistical techniques of multiple linear regression analysis with SPSS 24.0 software. The results show that employees with disabilities in Thisable Enterprise have good competencies, consisting of intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence. The results of self-assessment, assessment of customers, and evaluations from supervisors also showed that employee with disability was able to provide good performance. Finally, the results of the regression analysis show that competency (consisting of intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence) have positive and significant influence on performance.

Keywords: Competence, Performance, Employees with Disabilites

KARYAWAN DENGAN DISABILITAS: APAKAH MEREKA KOMPETEN DAN DAPAT MENGERJAKAN ?

ABSTRAK

Keragaman tenaga kerja dianggap sebagai aset bagi perusahaan jika diterapkan dan dikelola dengan benar. Namun, penerapan manajemen keanekaragaman saat ini masih sulit dan menjadi tantangan bagi perusahaan terutama mereka yang cacat fisik. Sulit bagi mereka untuk dapat bekerja, terutama di sektor formal. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui pengaruh kompetensi terhadap kinerja karyawan penyandang cacat di Thisable Enterprise. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah deskriptif dan verifikasi. Data dilakukan melalui survei terhadap responden yang terdiri dari karyawan penyandang cacat di Thisable Enterprise. Selanjutnya, uji hipotesis dilakukan teknik statistik analisis regresi linier berganda dengan perangkat lunak SPSS 24.0. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa karyawan penyandang cacat di Perusahaan Berpercaya ini memiliki kompetensi yang baik, yang terdiri dari kompetensi intelektual, kompetensi emosional, dan kompetensi sosial. Hasil penilaian diri, penilaian pelanggan, dan evaluasi dari pengawas juga menunjukkan bahwa karyawan penyandang cacat mampu memberikan kinerja yang baik. Akhirnya, hasil analisis regresi menunjukkan bahwa kompetensi (terdiri dari kompetensi intelektual, kompetensi emosional, dan kompetensi sosial) memiliki pengaruh positif dan signifikan terhadap kinerja.

Kata-kata Kunci: Kompetensi, Kinerja, Karyawan Penyandang Cacat

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, diversity becomes a popular issue across business sectors. Diversity of the workforce covers a variety of backgrounds in terms of culture, gender, religion, race, skills, even physical conditions. Diversity or heterogeneity of the workforce is considered to be an asset for the company if it is properly implemented and managed. The interest of the companies and researchers in the diversity phenomenon is based on how the heterogeneity of employees could affect the businesses and organization operationalization, and how a diverse organization needs to be managed.

Research on diversity management has actually been carried out since the late 1980s, when heterogeneity and differences, especially age, race, gender and nationality, were considered among workers within an organization. Dass and Parker (1999) state that workforce diversity has been seen as an opportunity, threat, problem, difference, or even not a problem. This leads to a number of different diversity management styles and will ultimately lead to different costs and benefits (according to the conditions of each company). The phenomenon of diversity in an organization certainly has benefits and challenges.

Based on that previous research, businesses can get benefit from diversity. Ely and Thomas (2001) state that the diversity of workforce can increase organizational effectiveness, improve morale, make new market areas more accessible and increase

productivity. In fact, if diversity only increases profitability, at least diversity can improve learning, creativity, flexibility, organizational and individual growth, and the company's ability to adjust quickly and successfully to market changes. However, to be able to achieve the benefits of diversity, companies must be able to modify attitudes and behaviors in their organizational leadership.

Diversity can be an asset within a company because it can help success and provide opportunities for companies to grow and develop. This is because diversity can bring new perspectives, ideas and innovations to the organization with variation of skills and capabilities of each employee. Furthermore, currently companies that want to expand globally should be able to apply diversity because it shows that companies uphold the existence of multiculturalism at work.

However, in its current application diversity is still difficult to accept and become a challenge for the company. According to Ruben and Stewart (2006) there are five main areas which are challenges related to diversity, namely: stereotypes, cultural differences, discrimination, secret rules and standards for success that are unknown to minorities and diverse people, and there is no communication related to cultural differences. Unfortunately, these five challenges related to diversity still lead to people with disabilities in Indonesia. The problem of physical ability is still an obstacle for

many people with disabilities to be able to work specifically in the formal sector.

At present, the labor market does not only consist of non-disabled job seekers, but also people with disabilities. Just like other humans, people with disabilities also want to get decent jobs and get the skills they can give to society. Disability is a condition or function that is discussed relatively significantly towards the standards of individuals or groups in general. According to Act No. 8 of 2016 concerning Persons with Disabilities, "Every person who experiences physical, intellectual, mental, and / or sensory limitations for a long time in interacting with the environment can experience obstacles and difficulties to participate fully and effectively with other citizens based on equal rights" are persons with disabilities. Unlike disability, the term *diffable* comes from a combination of two words, namely different abilities or differently able. The term indicates that *diffables* are not defects or deficiencies, but rather refer to people with different abilities. From its understanding, the connotation of the term *diffable* is far more positive than the word disability.

Act No. 8 of 2016 also states that, "Every company must employ at least 2% of *diffables* from the number of employees for government companies, and 1% for private companies". But in practice, currently people with disabilities are still difficult to be given access and opportunities to be able to work. Most companies still doubt the

abilities and skills of persons with disabilities because of their limitations.

According to data released by Satuan Tenaga Kerja Nasional in 2017, the total workforce of people with disabilities in Indonesia amounts to 11 million. Of these, the percentage of persons with disabilities who are still unemployed is quite low, which is only 3.69% or around 400 thousand of the total workforce of persons with disabilities. In contrast, the percentage of persons with disabilities who work is 96.31% or around 10 million people.

Based on these figures, the percentage of disabilities that work is indeed very large. However, most of these disabilities still work in the informal sector. This is due to the new regulations (Act No. 8 of 2016) which require the formal sector to involve people with disabilities, so that this sector is still not familiar with disability issues. In addition, the lack of work participation of people with disabilities in the formal sector is also due to the low level of government oversight of the level of compliance of companies in providing employment opportunities for people with disabilities. The government is indeed in a position to encourage employers to provide employment opportunities for people with disabilities. They will reward employers who are willing to provide employment opportunities for people with disabilities.

However, related to the implementation of the regulation, the government does not yet have clear sanctions (both sanctions issued by the

court or administrative sanctions issued by the Ministry of Manpower/ Kementerian Tenaga Kerja) in connection with companies that do not provide employment opportunities for people with disabilities. Even though, people with disabilities also have the right to get the opportunity to work and make their contributions in accordance with their respective competencies in both the formal and informal sectors.

Low employment rates for people with disabilities can be attributed to several factors. Corporate concerns and misunderstandings in hiring employees with disabilities is one of the main obstacles (Millington, Rosenthal, & Alan Lott, 1998). Most companies still doubt the competence of persons with disabilities because of the limitations they have (Johnson, Greenwood, & Schriener, 1998). According to Winanti (2011) competence has a close relationship with performance, therefore competency is very influential on the final results / good or bad performance given. Regardless of the type and level of work, employee work skills refer to the general competencies and non-technical competencies needed to do all the work. These skills are not specific to one job, but are considered as attributes of employees who make them company assets (Buck & Barrick, 1987). The attribute in question shows that general competencies and non-skill competencies are part of each employee who cannot be separated regardless of the type and level in the company.

Competence is the ability of each individual which consists of knowledge, skills,

attitudes, values, and personal characteristics that enable these individuals to succeed in completing their work (Noe, 2010). Competence is a combination of knowledge, skills, and personality that can improve individual performance so as to support the success of the organization.

According to Benardin dan Russel (1998) are recording the outputs or results produced by the activities of a work within a certain period of time. Competency can be a reference for employers because it is directly related to the personal abilities and characteristics of employees with disabilities and non-disabled people. The use of competencies can be considered when recruiting new employees because it can be adjusted to the competency standards that are really needed by the company.

Prior research on people with disabilities was conducted by Unger (2002) which states that in reality, employees with disabilities have an average or above average score on performance, safety records, and attendance based on company / employer ratings. In the same year Graffam et al. (2002), also conducted research by surveying entrepreneurs in Australia who had experience employing people with disabilities, and found that employees with disabilities had lower values than the average employee on productivity factors (speed and accuracy), but were better than average employees on trust factors (absenteeism and sick leave) and employee maintenance factors (recruitment, safety, insurance costs). The overall results show that employers generally feel

that employees with disabilities are productive and trustworthy employees with low cost of employee empowerment.

Ju et al.(2012)found that from the 5 constructs of employability skills (which include basic skills, high-level thinking skills, basic work skills, social skills, and personal traits) non-disabled employees did get slightly higher results compared to employees with disabilities, this is which causes company expectations to generally be greater for non-disabled employees than for disabled employees.

People with disabilities have the potential to contribute to the world of work, namely as employees, entrepreneurs / job providers for others. Due to the variety and nature of people with disabilities, they also have diverse work capacities. That is, people with disabilities remain competent, but maybe the skills, abilities, and productive potential they have are different. Sometimes, it is not a lack of skills or competencies that become reasons for persons with disabilities to be productive individuals, but physical barriers and organizations to utilize their skills in the workplace. The willingness of employers to make relatively small adjustments to job design, regulation of work stations or production processes, or to allow workers to use tools and adaptive technology can significantly increase produktivitas (Powers, 2008).

Based on the explanation mentioned earlier, it shows that actually people with disabilities are workers who are sufficiently competent and have skills. But unfortunately, the

concern of employers in hiring them is still an obstacle to work. Actually, if viewed more deeply the diversity of skills possessed by people with disabilities can be an asset for the company. This is where the role of the employers has to be able to properly place / utilize the competencies of persons with disabilities because of the differences they have. Thus, the potential and ability of people with disabilities can be maximized so that productive performance can be achieved.

The purpose of this study was to identify influence of competence (consist of intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence) of performance of employees with disabilities in Thisable Enterprise Company. The present study was designed to answer these following research questions :

*Research Question 1:*How are the intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence of employees with disabilities inThisable Enterprise?

*Research Question 2:*How is the performance of employees with disabilities in Thisable Enterprise?

Research Question 3: How is the influence between intellectual competence on the performance of employees with disabilities in Thisable Enterprise?

Research Question 4: How is the influence between emotional competence on the performance of employees with disabilities in Thisable Enterprise?

Research Question 5: How is the influence between social competence on the performance of employees with disabilities in Thisable Enterprise?

Research Question 6: How is the influence of intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence simultaneously on the performance of employees with disabilities in Thisable Enterprise?

METHOD

Sample (Participant)

The object of this research is Thisable Enterprise company. Thisable Enterprise is a social enterprise that was founded in 2011 and has a mission to empower Indonesia's disability economically. The background of the establishment of this company was due to the lack of access to jobs provided for disabilities in Indonesia. Business activities carried out are by channeling trained human resources consisting of persons with disabilities who have been nurtured according to their respective abilities and skills to partner companies such as Gojek (with Go-Life consisting of Go-Massage, Go-Clean, Go-Auto, and Go-Glam) and outsourced to BUMN and private companies.

Thisable Enterprise has around 1000 databases of people with disabilities from all over Indonesia. However, around 200 people have been absorbed to be employed. Of the 200 employees with disabilities, as many as 85% or 170 employees are employed in Go-Jek (Go Life) and the remaining 15% are spread across six

other companies (PGN, CIMB Niaga, Rabo Bank, General Electric, Bank Mandiri, and Infomedia Nusantara).

Based on these data, because the majority of people with disabilities who have been empowered by Thisable Enterprise are channeled to Go Jek (Go Life), then the population in this study is employees who are employed at Go Jek, amounting to 170 employees with disabilities. Employees with disabilities who were distributed to six other companies were not included as a population because the numbers were too few, so they were not proportional. From this population, the number of samples obtained based on the results of calculations is as many as 62 people as respondents consisting of employees with disabilities who are channeled to Go Jek (Go Life).

The sampling technique in this study uses probability sampling, which is a sampling technique by providing equal opportunities for each member of the population. The type of probability sampling used is simple random sampling technique. This technique is said to be simple because it is done by randomly selecting individuals who are used as research samples (regardless of the strata in the population). This means that the selection of samples of 62 employees with disabilities is done through random selection of the total population (170 employees with disabilities).

The method used in this study is descriptive and verivicative. Data was carried out through

surveys by distributing questionnaires to the number of respondents.

A researcher-developed survey instrument was used. Survey items were generated based on a review of previous studies and published topical reports. An electronic search was conducted by using the following databases: Mendeley, Emerald, and Google Scholar. Search terms included competence, skill, job performance, diversity, employee with disabilities, and disability. Competencies are then drawn into 3 draft sections consisting of intellectual competency, emotional competency, and social competency taken from the identified literature, while the performance remains in 1 draft section.

The final instrument questionnaire consisted of 4 sections. Section I contained 5 statement items that represent intellectual competence, include skills, knowledge, ability to think analytically, ability to think critically, and the ability to solve problems.

Section II contained 5 statement items that represent emotional competence, include caring for others, self-confidence, adaptability, sensitivity / sensitivity to others, and self-control.

Section III also contained 5 statement items that represent social competence, include

teamworking influencing / give impact, leading, self-development, and directing

Section IV contained 7 statement items that represent performance, include quality, quantity, cost of effectiveness, timeliness, interpersonal impact, and need for supervision. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each item on a 5-point Likert-type scale with the choices from Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, to Strongly Disagree.

Moreover, data collection was also carried out through direct interviews with the leaders of Thisable Enterprise to find out assessments from the Company's perspective, as well as interviews with disability employees (respondents) who were channeled to Go Jek (precisely in the Go Life department) to find out their personal views on disability issues and direct assessment from customers (rating on the Go Life app).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After the data collection process is carried out and the data needed in the study is collected, the next step is to do data analysis. This process uses quantitative and qualitative methods. The following are the results of validity tests and reliability tests that have been carried out:

Table1. Results of Validity and Reliability Test on the Four Constructs

Scales	Description	CFA loading	Realibility (α)
Intellectual competence	Sufficient skills in carrying out tasks and work	0,83	0,85
	Sufficient knowledge in carrying out tasks and work	0,84	
	Ability to think analytically	0,78	
	Ability to think critically	0,71	
	Ability to solve problems related to tasks and work	0,81	
Emotional competence	Attitude of concern for others	0,88	0,87
	Self-confidence	0,85	
	Ability to adapt to the environment	0,73	
	Sensitivity and sympathy for others	0,77	
	Good self control	0,85	
Social competence	Ability to work with other people	0,84	0,90
	Ability to influence and impact others	0,87	
	Ability to lead others	0,80	
	Ability to develop themselves and others	0,86	
	Ability to give direction to others	0,85	
Performance	Ability to work effectively	0,77	0,86
	Ability to work efficiently	0,74	
	Ability to produce maximum output	0,79	
	Ability to allocate costs effectively	0,71	
	Ability to complete assignments and work on time	0,81	
	Ability to have a positive impact on colleagues	0,82	
	Ability to work independently without the need for supervision	0,61	

The validity test was carried out using the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) test in SPSS software. Based on the SPSS output above, it is known that the value of all indicator items in the

four constructs shows value > 0.50 which means that all indicator items used are valid.

Besides having to be valid, the research instrument must also be reliable. The statistical

technique commonly used in research to test reliability is Cronbach Coefficient Alpha. The reliability test results above show that the four constructs shows value > of the Cronbach Alpha coefficient value of 0.60. So that it can be said, all questionnaire statement instruments from all constructs are reliable. Furthermore, the data

analysis techniques used are descriptive and verificative analysis. The following are the characteristics of respondents based on the results of recapitulation of data obtained from questionnaires:

Table2. Summary of Respondent Characteristics (n = 64)

Key characteristic	<i>n</i>	Percent
Age		
≤ 25 years old	10	16.0
26 – 35 years old	21	33.0
36 – 45 years old	22	34.0
> 45 years old	11	17.0
Gender		
Male	55	86.0
Female	9	14.0
Relationship Status		
Married	37	58.0
Single	27	42.0
Education level		
≤ High school	62	97.0
Diploma	0	0.0
Bachelor	2	3.0
≥ Magister	0	0.0
Working period		
≤ 6 months	11	17.0
6 – 12 months	3	5.0
1 – 2 years	30	47.0
> 2 years	20	31.0
Position as a Go Jek (Go Life) partner		
Go Massage	25	39.0
Go Clean	0	0.0

Go Glam	0	0.0
Go Auto	39	61.0

Tabel 2 summarizes key characteristics of the survey respondents: The majority of respondents were male with an age range of 25 to 45 years old. More than half of the respondents were married (58%), then almost all respondents (97%) had the \leq high school education level. Based on the working period of the respondents, most of the employees with disabilities who are partners of Go Jek (Go Life) have worked for 1-2 years and are partners of Go Auto.

Descriptive Analysis

Intellectual competence

In this research, intellectual competence is one of the independent variables consisting of 5 dimensions/indicators, namely skills, knowledge, ability to think analytically, ability to think critically, and ability to solve problems. The 5 dimensions are contained in the five statements on the questionnaire which produce the data calculation as follows:

Table3. Recapitulation of Intellectual Competency Score

Description	Score	Average
Sufficient skills in carrying out tasks and work	275	4,30

Sufficient knowledge in carrying out tasks and work	274	4,28
Ability to think analytically	244	3,81
Ability to think critically	266	4,16
Ability to solve problems related to tasks and work	242	3,78
Score total	1301	4,07

The results of the recapitulation above show that the average intellectual competency variable of employees with disabilities who are partners of Go Life is 4.07. The dimensions of skills are dimensions with the highest average value of 4.30. These results are reinforced by a statement from the Project Coordinator Thisable Enterprise (Ulvi, 22 years) which states that,

"They (persons with disabilities / partners Thisable) have different skills. For blind people, almost 70% of them have skills. Indeed, there are some partners who when registering at Thisable do not have sufficient skills. However, the amount is not too much when compared to disabled partners who have the skills".

Conversely, the dimension with the lowest average is the ability of employees to solve problems that are equal to 3.78. This dimension achieves the lowest average score because some people with disabilities still have a trust issue

related to solving work problems because of their limitations.

The total score on the intellectual competency variable based on recapitulation is 1301. The score is then calculated in the interval to find out the range of the score categories. Based on the calculations that have been made it is known that intellectual competence is in the "good" category.

Emotional competence

The next independent variable is emotional competence, which also consists of 5 dimensions/indicators, including caring for others, self-confidence, adaptability, sensitivity / sensitivity to others, and self-control. The 5 dimensions are contained in the five statements on the questionnaire which produce the data calculation as follows:

Table4. Recapitulation of Emotional Competency Score

Description	Score	Average
Attitude of concern for others	285	4,45
Self-confidence	285	4,45
Ability to adapt to the environment	278	4,34
Sensitivity and sympathy for others	282	4,41
Good self control	283	4,42
Score total	1413	4,41

Based on the results of recapitulation, the average obtained on the five dimensions reached a

score of 4.41. These results indicate that most respondents agreed to the statement in the questionnaire. In accordance with the average score obtained, it can be said that employees with disabilities have a concern for others as indicated by relationships between partners (helping each other); have confidence that is shown by not giving up on the physical limitations they have; able to adapt to the environment indicated by the willingness to work and contribute to society; sensitivity to others is indicated by the willingness to help colleagues and other people in need; and being able to control themselves well is shown by the ability to control attitudes in serving customers.

This statement is reinforced by the results of interviews conducted to Talent Development Thisable Enterprise (Aliyah, 24 years), which states that,

"Disability employees are quite confident, precisely with the existence of Thisable program. The confidence they have is increasing. As a talent development, I feel that there has been a significant change in them since the first interview until after they worked. They are also increasingly able to adapt to the environment, this is because the work environment does not only interact with fellow disabilities, but also with non-disabled customers. In addition, disability employees also have sensitivity and are very solid. Many old partners who recommend work to their friends (people with disabilities) who are still unemployed, even help register to become partners".

The total score on the emotional competency variable based on recapitulation is 1413. The score

is then calculated in the interval to find out the range of the score categories. Based on the calculations that have been made it is known that emotional competence is in the “very good” category.

Social competence

In the variable of social competence,, there are 5 dimensions that affect it, including teamworking influencing, leading, self-development, and directing. The 5 dimensions are contained in the five statements on the questionnaire which produce the data calculation as follows:

Table5. Recapitulation of Social Competency

Description	Score	Ave rage
Ability to work with other people	257	4,02
Ability to influence and impact others	241	3,77
Ability to lead others	235	3,67
Ability to develop themselves and others	247	3,86
Ability to give direction to others	244	3,81
Score total	1244	3,83

The results of the recapitulation of the data above show the average score of the variable social competence is 3.83. The score is still smaller when compared to the average in the previous two competencies (intellectual competence and

emotional competency) which reach a value above 4.

The dimension of the ability to lead others becomes a dimension with the lowest average score of 3.67, whereas the dimension of the ability to work with others is the only dimension in the variable of social competence with the highest average score / achieving a score of 4.02. This is actually not surprising, given the limitations of employees with disabilities resulting in obstacles to interacting with other people and their environment. However, actually there are also people with disabilities who have leadership attitudes and are able to become leaders. This is in accordance with the Personal Assisstant CEO Thisable Enterprise statement (Vony, 26 years old) as follows:

““People with disabilities can work with other people. Besides that, among them there are also those who can become leaders for others”.

The statement above shows that despite having limitations, disability employees can work together with other people as long as the assignments are in accordance with their capacity. Besides that, there are still doubts from disability employees to lead others, this is because there are obstacles in communication.

The total score on the social competency variable based on recapitulation is 1244. The score is then calculated in the interval to find out the range of the score categories. Based on the calculations that have been made it is known that social competence is in the “good” category.

Performance

The dependent variable in this study is the performance of employees which consists of 6 dimensions, namely quality, quantity, cost of effectiveness, timeliness, interpersonal impact, and need for supervision.

The quality dimension is divided into two indicators, while the other dimensions each have one indicator. The seven indicators are then included in 7 statements on the questionnaire, which include the ability to work effectively and efficiently, produce maximum output, allocate costs effectively, complete tasks on time, and work independently and without supervision. The following is a detailed explanation of the responses of respondents based on the results of questionnaires from each dimension and indicator:

Table6. Recapitulation of Performance Score

Description	Score	Average
Ability to work effectively	265	4,14
Ability to work efficiently	262	4,09
Ability to produce maximum output	252	3,94
Ability to allocate costs effectively	251	3,92
Ability to complete assignments and work on time	265	4,14
Ability to have a positive impact on colleagues	267	4,17

Ability to work independently without the need for supervision	257	4,02
Score total	1819	4,06

The results of the recapitulation of the data above show the average score of the variable performance is 4,06. Dimension of ability to have a positive impact on colleagues (interpersonal impact) is dimension with the highest average score / achieving a score of 4.17. On the contrary, dimension cost of effectiveness or ability to allocate costs effectively are dimensions with the lowest average score which only reaches 3.92.

On the quality dimension (which is divided into two indicators namely effectiveness and efficiency) there are differences in the scores that have been achieved. The average score on the effectiveness indicator is higher than the average score on the efficiency indicator, this can be attributed to the experience of respondents who have so far been able to meet customer demand (completing orders), but sometimes to fulfill demand is still inefficient because it is an obstacle that requires more resources (such as time and companion for the blind people).

The total score on the performance variable based on recapitulation is 1819. The score is then calculated in the interval to find out the range of the score categories. Based on the calculations that have been made it is known that performance in the "good" category.

Result

The Influence of Competence of Performance of Employees with Disabilities in Thisable Enterprise Company

In this research the statistical technique of multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the relationship or influence between the variables tested, namely the variable intellectual competence (X1), emotional competence (X2), and social competence (X3) on employee performance variables (Y).

The following is a summary of the regression models of intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence on performance using SPSS version 24.0 software:

Table7. Summary of the Regression Model

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,860 ^a	,739	,726	2,216

a. Predictors: (Constant), Social Competence (X3), Intellectual Competence (X1), Emotional Competence (X2)

Based on the information above, it is known that the correlation coefficient value is 0.860. To find out how strong the relationship between the two variables is based on the

correlation coefficient, you can use the correlation interval limitation table as follows:

Table8. Inter-Variable Correlation

Correlation Interval	Interpretation
0,00 - 0,199	Very weak
0,20 - 0,399	Weak
0,40 - 0,599	Moderate
0,60 - 0,799	Strong
0,80 - 1,000	Very strong

Source : Sugiyono (2016)

The correlation coefficient shown in table 7 (R = 0.860), if adjusted based on the table of boundaries the correlation between the variables above shows that the relationship of the variables studied is in the very strong category.

The coefficient of determination (R Square) is used to determine the percentage of influence between competency variables simultaneously on the performance variable. The coefficient of 0.739 obtained from the regression results shows that the variables of intellectual competence (X1), emotional competence (X2), and social competence (X3) simultaneously have an influence on the variable employee performance (Y) of 73.9%, while the other 26.1% are influenced by other variables not examined.

Furthermore, hypothesis testing is done to prove whether the proposed hypothesis is accepted or rejected. Testing the hypothesis based on the following table:

Table 9. Analysis of the Regression Model Variance

		ANOVA ^a				
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	834,885	3	278,295	56,655	,000 ^b
	Residual	294,725	60	4,912		
	Total	1129,609	63			

a. Dependent Variable: Peformance (Y)

b. Predictors: (Constant), Social Competence (X3), Intellectual Competence (X1), Emotional Competence (X2)

Based on the information above, hypothesis testing can be done by looking at the value of the F test and the significance value / p-value (Sig.) In the regression results obtained compared to the hypothesis proposed. The F test or the regression coefficient test is simultaneously carried out to determine whether the independent variables (X1, X2, and X3) together have a significant effect on the dependent variable (Y). The significance level used in this study is 5% or 0.05. The hypothesis proposed in the F test is:

Ho: There is no significant influence between intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence simultaneously on employee performance

Ha: There is a significant influence between intellectual competence, emotional competence, social competence simultaneously on employee performance

Based on the regression results in table 9, the calculated F value is 56,655. Furthermore, the F table value is 2.758 with the hypothesis test criteria used as follows: If the value of F count > value of F table, then Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. If the value of F count < value of F table, then Ho is accepted and Ha is rejected

After comparison, the calculated F value obtained based on the results of regression analysis > F table value (56,655 > 2,758). Based on these results, then Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. This shows that there is an influence between intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence simultaneously on the performance of employees with disabilities.

In addition, significant influence between variables can also be known by looking at the significance value / p value (Sig.). If the significance value / p-value (Sig.) < Significance

level (α), then H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Because the significance value / p value obtained based on the regression results in table 4.18 is smaller than the significance level (Sig. = 0,000 $< \alpha = 0.05$), then H_a is accepted. That is, there is a significant influence between the three competency variables with the variable performance of disability employees.

Moreover, the following is the model / result of the regression coefficient T test of the competency variable on the performance variable based on the results of the regression analysis that has been carried out :

Table10. Regression Coefficient Model

Model		Coefficients ^a				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1,927	2,267		,850	,399
	Intellectual Competence (X1)	,848	,131	,592	6,464	,000
	Emotional Competence (X2)	,270	,142	,192	1,905	,062
	Social Competence (X3)	,172	,096	,173	1,794	,078

a. Dependent Variable: Performance (Y)

The first T test was carried out on the intellectual competence variable to see the effect on the performance variable. Hypothesis testing is done by comparing the calculated T value with the T table value. The testing criteria is if the value of T count $>$ T value of the table, then there is an influence between intellectual competence on employee performance or H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. The results in table 10 show that the calculated T value is 6.464 $>$ the T table value is 2,000 or H_a is accepted. That is, the results of

the t test show that intellectual competence has an influence on employee performance.

Then, to find out the significant effect on the variables of intellectual competence on employee performance, the hypothesis test is done by comparing the significance values with the significance level used in the study. If the significance value (Sig.) $<$ Significance level (α), then there is a significant effect between intellectual competence on employee performance or H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted.

The results in the table show the significance value of intellectual competence (0,000) <probability level used (0.05) or H_a accepted. The results of the comparison of significance values indicate that intellectual competence has a significant influence on employee performance.

The second T-test is then conducted to determine the relationship of emotional competency variables to performance variables. Based on the output results in table 10, the T value is 1.905 <T table value is 2,000 or H_a is rejected. The results of the t test show that emotional competence has no effect on employee performance.

The significance test results in the table show the significance value of emotional competence (0.062) > the probability level used (0.05) or H_a is rejected. So, the result is emotional competence does not have a significant effect on employee performance.

The third T test is conducted to find out whether social competence has an influence on employee performance. Based on the output results in the table shows the value of t count equal to 1.794 <t table value which is 2,000 or H_a is rejected. Which means, the results of the t test show that social competence has no influence on employee performance.

The significance test results in the table show the significance value of social competence (0.078) > the probability level used

(0.05) or H_a is rejected. So, the result is social competence does not have a significant effect on employee performance.

Based on the results shown in the regression coefficient model above, the regression equation is obtained as follows:

$$Y = 1,927 + 0,848X1 + 0,270X2 + 0,172X3$$

From the equation above, a value or constant is 1.927 means that if the value of the variable intellectual competence (X1), emotional competence (X2), social competence (X3) is 0, the consistent value of performance variable (Y) is 1.927. Furthermore, the regression coefficient of intellectual competence variable (X1) is 0.848; means that if the other independent variables are fixed and there is an increase of 1% in the level of intellectual competence (X1), then it will affect the increase in employee performance by 0.848. The regression coefficient on the variable emotional competence (X2) is 0.270; means that if the other independent variables are fixed values and there is an increase of 1% the level of emotional competence (X2), it will affect the increase in employee performance by 0.270. Whereas, the regression coefficient on the variable social competence is 0.172. This value implies that if the other independent variables are fixed values and there is an increase of 1% the level of emotional competence (X2), then it will affect the increase in employee performance by 0.172.

Correlation coefficients that are positive on the three competency variables in the equation show that intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence have a positive relationship to employee performance variables.

In practice, good competencies are expected to be able to produce good performance. As previously explained, competence can be a reference for employers because it is directly related to the personal abilities and characteristics of employees with disabilities and non-disabled people.

People with disabilities actually have the potential to work, both as employees and as entrepreneurs. Due to the variety and nature of people with disabilities, they also have diverse work capacities. Sometimes, it is not a lack of skills / skills / competencies that become reasons for persons with disabilities to be productive individuals, but physical barriers and organizations to utilize their skills at work.

The results of the scores recapitulation on the 3 independent variables studied showed that intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence of employees with disabilities were in good categories. These findings are inversely proportional to the negative stigma of persons with disabilities that was discussed by Niyu (2017) in a previous study, which suggested that the inherent "defect" stigma in persons with disabilities is often associated with people who have deficiencies or imperfections so the value and quality are not

good, it is a growing stereotype in the community that people with disabilities are portrayed negatively and are seen as low.

If we examined more deeply, the low work participation of persons with disabilities and the high level of concern of companies in employing them can be attributed to the existence of the negative stigma. The findings that persons with disabilities also have competencies should be considered by the company when recruiting employees so that the practice of discrimination can be eliminated.

In the performance variable, the average score obtained based on the results of the descriptive analysis is also included in the good category. The findings are in line with previous research on persons with disabilities that have been conducted by Unger (2002) which states that in reality, employees with disabilities have an average or above average score on performance, safety records, and attendance based on company ratings / employers.

Other studies that are also in line with the findings in this study are studies from Graffam et al. (2002) which shows that, in general, employers consider disability employees as productive and trustworthy employees with the cost of employee empowerment that is not too expensive.

The assessment of the customer is certainly a self-assessment balancer of respondents who are vulnerable to subjectivity. Of the 64 respondents, 77% of respondents have a higher rating than their assessment of themselves. This

shows that the majority of respondents did have good performance. Conversely, as many as 23% of respondents have a smaller rating compared to the results of their assessment of themselves, so it can be said that there are a small number of respondents who have a subjective tendency to judge themselves. The explanation shows that the competencies of disability employees who are partners of Go Life are already in the good category, thus influencing the performance they produce.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research and discussions that have been conducted, the following are some conclusions that can be taken:

1. The results of descriptive analysis show that employees with disabilities in this company Enterprise have good intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence.
2. In the employee performance variable, the results of the descriptive analysis also show that the average score is also good. The results of the questionnaire recapitulation showed that most respondents were able to provide effective, efficient and optimal performance. This is reinforced by a direct assessment of the customer (rating on the application), which shows a positive average rating.
3. T test that has been carried out shows that the first hypothesis statement (H1): intellectual competence significantly influences employee performance, proven. This is indicated by the calculated T value of 6.464 which is greater than the T table value of 2,000; and the significance value (p value) of 0,000 which is smaller than 0.05. Regression coefficient value of 0.848 shows there is a positive relationship between the two variables. So it can be concluded that intellectual competence has a positive and significant relationship to performance.
4. The T test that has been done shows that the statement of the second hypothesis (H2) that emotional competence significantly influences the performance of employees is not proven. This is indicated by the calculated T value of 1.905 which is smaller than the T table value of 2,000; and the significance value (p value) of 0.062 which is greater than 0.05. Regression coefficient value of 0.270 shows there is a positive relationship between the two variables. So it can be concluded that emotional competence has a positive but not significant relationship to performance.
5. The T test that has been done also shows that the statement of the third hypothesis (H3) that social competence has a significant effect on employee performance is not proven. This can be indicated by the calculated T value of 1.794 which is smaller than the T table value of 2,000; and the significance value (p value) of 0.078 which is greater than 0.05. Regression coefficient value of 0.172 indicates there is a positive relationship between the two variables. So it can be concluded that social competence has a positive but not significant relationship to performance.

6. The F test that has been conducted shows that the statement of the fourth hypothesis (H4) that intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence simultaneously have a significant effect on proven performance. This can be indicated by the calculated F value of 56.655 which is greater than the table F value of 2.758; and the significance value (p value) of 0,000 which is smaller than 0.05. The regression coefficient value that is positive for intellectual competence (X1), emotional competence (X2), and social competence (X3) shows there is a positive relationship to performance. So that it can be concluded that intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence have a positive and significant relationship simultaneously to performance

The results of the regression analysis performed on the four research variables, resulting in a regression equation $Y = 1,927 + 0,848X1 + 0,270X2 + 0,172X3$. Regression coefficient values indicate that intellectual competence, emotional competence, and social competence have a positive influence on employee performance

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Benardin, H. J., & Russel, E. A. J. (1998). *Human Resources Management: An Expriential Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Buck, L. L., & Barrick, R. K. (1987). They're Trained, but are They Employable? *Vocational Education Journal*, 62, 29–31.

Dass, P., & Parker, B. (1999). Strategies for managing human resource diversity: From

resistance to learning. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 13(2), 68–80. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1999.1899550>

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group Processes and Outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2), 229. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2667087>

Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A., Smith, K., & Polzin, U. (2002). Employer Benefits and Costs of Employing a Person with A Disability. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 17, 251–263.

Johnson, V. A., Greenwood, R., & Schriener, K. F. (1998). Work Performance and Work Personality: Employer Concerns about Workers with Disabilities. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 32, 50–57.

Ju, S., Zhang, D., & Pacha, J. (2012). Employability Skills Valued by Employers as Important for Entry-Level Employees With and Without Disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 35(1), 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885728811419167>

Millington, M. J., Rosenthal, D., & Alan Lott. (1998). Employment Expectation Profiles as a Differential Measure of Employment-Relevant Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities. *Utah State University*, 28, 39–41.

Noe, R. A. (2010). *Employee Training and Development* (5th Editio). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Powers, T. (2008). *Recognizing Ability: The Skills and Productivity of Persons with Disabilities*.

Ruben, Brent D., & Stewart, Lea. P. (2006). *Communication and Human Behavior, 5th Edition*. United States : Pearson.

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*. Bandung : Alfabeta.

Unger, D. D. (2002). Employers' attitudes toward persons with disabilities in the workforce: myths or realities? *Pro-Ed Inc*, 17(1), 1–15.

Winanti, M. B. (2011). Pengaruh Kompetensi terhadap Kinerja Karyawan (Survei pada PT. Frisian Flag Indonesia Wilayah Jawa Barat). *Majalah Ilmiah Unikom*, 7(2), 249–267.