

THE EFFECT OF WORKLOAD, WORK ENVIRONMENT AND MOTIVATION ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AT PT KEJAR JEMBER

Riski Sugiarto¹
Tamriatin Hidayah²
Ahmad Sauqi³

Mandala Institute of Technology and Science, Jember Regency, Indonesia^{1,2,3}

Received : 02/01/2023

Revised : 15/08/2023

Accepted : 10/10/2023

Corresponding author:

Name: Tamriatin Hidayah

E-mail: titin@stie-mandala.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine and analyze the effect of workload, physical work environment, and motivation partially or simultaneously on the performance of PT Kejar Jember employees. The respondents of this research were 38 employees of PT Kejar Jember which were determined by a census technique. The data analysis method used is multiple linear regression analysis. The results showed that the workload affected the performance of the employees of PT Kejar Jember. The workload which consists of working conditions, use of time and targets to be achieved is perceived as high by employees so employees must be able to manage the workload to produce a good performance. The physical work environment affects the performance of PT Kejar Jember employees. The work environment which consists of lighting/lighting, documentation, space, room coloring, air temperature, noise, and work safety is perceived by employees as good so that employees can produce a good performance by company expectations. Motivation affects the performance of PT Kejar Jember employees. Motivation consisting of encouragement to achieve goals, morale, initiative, and a sense of responsibility is perceived well by employees so that employees can strive to achieve work results by company targets.

Keywords: *Workload, Employee Performance, Motivation, Physical Work Environment*

INTRODUCTION

Human resources in a company or what is called employees are one of the most important assets. because in essence employees in the company have a role as thinkers, movers, and planners of corporate strategy. Employees and companies are very closely related and cannot be separated because employees play a major role in running the company's life wheel so a company needs to have employees with good performance. Companies with good employee performance will easily achieve their goals.

Various factors can affect employee performance, one of which is workload. A workload that is too high causes tension in an employee, causing prolonged stress caused by a skill level that is too high, work speed that may be too high, and too much work volume (Sunyoto, 2012: 64). Companies need to analyze the workload of their employees to understand the ability of employees to complete their tasks to achieve performance that is in line with company expectations. Besides workload, another factor that can affect employee performance is the physical work environment. A safe, healthy, and comfortable work environment will encourage employees to work well.

Employees achieving good performance also need motivation. Hasibuan (2017: 10) argues that motivation is very important for companies because motivation is a matter of causing, channeling, and supporting human behavior so that they want to work actively and enthusiastically to achieve optimal results. Proper motivation will make employees passionate about carrying out their duties and working optimally.

Indriyanto and Solovida (2020) concluded in their research that workload and work environment affect employee performance. Gusti, et al. (2021) in his research concluded that motivation influences employee performance. PT Kejar Jember has 5 departmental units that manage cash management and distribution service processes, including CIT (Cash in Transit), ATM (Automatic Teller Machine), CPC (Cash Processing Centre), Check Clearing, and Cash Pooling. PT Kejar Jember is currently faced with employee performance problems, namely a decrease in the quality of employee performance and employees having difficulty completing their work on time.

Various things affect the decline in employee performance, the first is the workload that is felt to be too high where employees have to work for 8 hours straight to sort money. In addition, PT Kejar Jember also has an unsupportive physical work environment where the office where

the employee work is felt to be too cramped and dark, and air circulation in the company environment is not good so it can make employees easily tired at work. In addition to these two problems, several PT Kejar Jember employees stated that they needed work motivation such as incentives when working on holidays, apart from the salary that employees receive. Based on the description above, the formulation of the problem in this study is 1) what is the workload, physical work environment, and motivation partially or simultaneously affect the performance of employees at PT Kejar Jember. The aims of the research are: 1) To find out and analyze the effect of workload, physical work environment, and motivation partially or simultaneously on the performance of employees of PT Kejar Jember.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research was conducted at PT Manage Jasa Artha Jember (PT Kejar Jember) which is located at Jl. Imam Bonjol 1A, Kaliwates, Jember. This research activity was carried out at PT Prestasi Jasa Artha Jember (PT Kejar Jember). The population in this study were all employees of PT Kejar Jember, totaling 38 people. The sample of this research was 38 people. The sampling method, because the population is small, the sample is a saturated sample, meaning that the population and sample sizes are the same. The data analysis method used is multiple linear regression analysis with a validity test, reliability test, and classical assumption test first. The hypothesis test uses the t-test and F-test. The variables in this study are workload (X1), physical work environment (X2), motivation (X3), and employee performance (Y).

RESULT ANALYSIS

Workload Variable Description (X1)

Table 1. Description of Workload Variables (X1)

Indicator	Frequency									
	SS	%	S	%	CS	%	TS	%	STS	%
X1.1	2	5.3	10	26.3	6	15.8	11	28.9	9	23.7
X1.2	4	10.5	6	15.8	12	31.6	8	21.1	8	21.1
X1.3	3	7.9	8	21.1	12	31.6	7	18.4	8	21.1
Average	3	7.9	8	21.1	10	26.3	9	22.8	8	21.9

Source : Data Processing Result

Based on Table 1 it can be seen that the workload variable (X1) in this study is measured through three indicators. The first indicator is a statement about whether employees understand the tasks and existing SOP. The majority of respondents answered disagree, namely as many as

11 people (28.9%), this indicated that the majority of employees had difficulty understanding the tasks and SOP that had been set by PT Kejar Jember. The second indicator is regarding the use of time, whether employees have used their time well, most respondents answered quite agree, namely as many as 12 people (31.6%), this indicates that the majority of employees do not work according to the working time set by PT Kejar Jember because must be willing to work overtime. The third indicator concerns targets to be achieved,

Physical Work Environment Variables (X2)

Table 2. Description of Physical Work Environment Variables (X2)

Indicator	Frequency									
	SS	%	S	%	CS	%	TS	%	STS	%
X2.1	9	23.7	13	34.2	6	15.8	6	15.8	4	10.5
X2.2	8	21.1	14	36.8	5	13.2	8	21.1	3	7.9
X2.3	7	18.4	12	31.6	9	23.7	7	18.4	3	7.9
X2.4	7	18.4	12	31.6	9	23.7	5	13.2	5	13.2
X2.5	6	15.8	13	34.2	9	23.7	8	21.1	2	5.3
X2.6	7	18.4	10	26.3	8	21.1	10	26.3	3	7.9
Average	7	19.3	12	32.5	8	20.2	7	19.3	3	8.8

Source : Data Processing Result

Based on Table 2. it can be seen that the physical work environment variable (X2) in this study is measured through six indicators. The first indicator regarding lighting or light, most respondents answered agree, namely as many as 13 people (34.2%), this indicated that the majority of employees considered the light intensity in the PT Kejar Jember office to be good. The second indicator regarding decoration or space for movement, the majority of respondents answered agree, namely as many as 14 people (36.8%), this indicated that the majority of employees considered the room arrangement and placement of work tools at PT Kejar Jember to be good. The third indicator regarding the coloring of the room, the majority of respondents answered that they quite agreed, namely as many as 12 people (31.6%), this indicates that the majority of employees consider the room color selection at PT Kejar Jember to be appropriate so as to create pleasant working conditions for employees. The fourth indicator is about air temperature, the majority of respondents answered agree, namely as many as 12 people (31.6%), this indicates that the majority of employees think that the air condition of the work space at PT Kejar Jember is not too hot so that it makes employees comfortable while working. The fifth indicator is regarding decoration or space for movement, the majority of respondents answered agree, namely as many as 13 people (34.2%), this indicates that the majority of employees think

that the PT Kejar Jember office tends to be quiet so employees can concentrate on work. The sixth indicator regarding job security, the most respondents answered agreeing and disagreeing as many as 10 people (26.3%).

Motivation Variable Description (X3)

Respondents' assessment of each indicator on the motivation variable (X3) is presented as follows.

Table 3. Description of Motivational Variables (X3)

Indicator	Frequency									
	SS	%	S	%	CS	%	TS	%	STS	%
X3.1	11	28.9	6	15.8	8	21.1	8	21.1	5	13.2
X3.2	7	18.4	12	31.6	7	18.4	9	23.7	3	7.9
X3.3	5	13.2	12	31.6	9	23.7	8	21.1	4	10.5
X3.4	6	15.8	11	28.9	9	23.7	7	18.4	5	13.2
Average	7	19.1	10	27.0	8	21.7	8	21.1	4	11.2

Source : Data Processing Result

Based on Table 3, it can be seen that the motivational variable (X3) in this study is measured through four indicators. The first indicator is regarding the drive to achieve goals, most respondents answered strongly agree, namely as many as 11 people (28.9%), this indicates that the majority of employees think that the management of PT Kejar Jember always encourages employees to work more actively so they can achieve company goals. The second indicator is regarding work enthusiasm, most respondents answered agree, namely as many as 12 people (31.6%), this indicates that the majority of PT Kejar Jember employees have high enthusiasm to do a good job. The third indicator regarding initiative, most respondents answered that they quite agreed, namely as many as 12 people (31.6%), this indicates that the majority of PT Kejar Jember employees can take the initiative to complete their work on time. The fourth indicator is regarding a sense of responsibility, the majority of respondents answered agree, namely as many as 11 people (28.9%), this indicates that the majority of PT Kejar Jember employees have a sense of responsibility to carry out their duties properly.

Description of Employee Performance Variable (Y)

Respondents' assessment of each indicator on the employee performance variable (Y) is presented as follows.

Table 4. Description of Employee Performance Variables (Y)

Indicator	Frequency									
	SS	%	S	%	CS	%	TS	%	STS	%
Y. 1	7	18.4	12	31.6	5	13.2	9	23.7	5	13.2
Y.2	5	13.2	14	36.8	9	23.7	6	15.8	4	10.5
Y.3	10	26.3	8	21.1	9	23.7	7	18.4	4	10.5
Y.4	7	18.4	13	34.2	7	18.4	8	21.1	3	7.9
Average	7	19.1	12	30.9	8	19.7	8	19.7	4	10.5

Source : Data Processing Result

Based on Table 4, it can be seen that the employee performance variable (Y) in this study is measured through four indicators. The first indicator is quality, most respondents answered agree, namely as many as 12 people (31.6%), this indicates that the majority of PT Kejar Jember employees consider themselves capable of having good performance results. The second indicator is regarding quantity, most respondents answered agree, namely as many as 14 people (36.8%), this indicates that the majority of PT Kejar Jember mampu employees fulfill the number of tasks completed according to the company's target. The third indicator regarding the effectiveness of most respondents answered strongly agree, namely as many as 10 people (26.3%), this indicates that the majority of employees consider the level of technology use at PT Kejar Jember to be used properly in order to achieve maximum company goals. The fourth indicator is about independence, the majority of respondents answered agree, namely as many as 13 people (34.2%), this indicates that the majority of PT Kejar Jember employees are able to carry out their work tasks independently.

Instrument T-test

Validity test

Of all the indicators in the variable, it gives a value of r count $>$ compared to r table, and a significance value of <0.05 . From these results it can be concluded that all are valid.

Reliability Test

From the results of the reliability test, it was obtained that all variables had a Cronbach alpha value > 0.60 , so that it could be said to be reliable.

Classic assumption test

Normality test

The normality test results are presented as follows:

Table 5. Normality Test Results

		Unstandardized Residuals
N		38
Normal Parameters, b	Means	.0000000
	std. Deviation	.33208438
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.141
	Positive	.113
	Negative	-.141
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.868
asympt. Sig. (2-tailed)		.439

Source : Data Processing Result

Based on Table 5, it can be seen that the results of the normality test for the variable workload (X1), physical work environment (X2) and motivation (X3) on employee performance (Y) show that the asymp sig value or the resulting probability is 0.439 which is greater than 0 .05 so that it can be interpreted that the data used in this study is normally distributed.

1) Multicollinearity Test

The results of the multicollinearity test are presented as follows.

Table 6. Multicollinearity Test Results

Variable	VIF	<i>tolerance</i>	Information
Workload (X1)	3,023	0.331	Multicollinearity Does Not Occur
Physical Work Environment (X2)	6,747	0.148	Multicollinearity Does Not Occur
Motivation (X3)	7,419	0.135	Multicollinearity Does Not Occur

Source : Data Processing Result

Based on Table 6, it can be seen that the results of the multicollinearity test for the variable workload (X1), physical work environment (X2) and motivation (X3) on employee performance (Y) show that each variable obtains a VIF value of less than 10 and a tolerance value of more than 0.1 so it can be interpreted that there is no multicollinearity.

2) Heteroscedasticity Test

The results of the heteroscedasticity test are presented as follows

Table 7. Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Variable	Sig	Information
Workload (X1)	0.872	There is no Heteroscedasticity
Physical Work Environment (X2)	0.103	There is no Heteroscedasticity
Motivation (X3)	0.285	There is no Heteroscedasticity

Source : Data Processing Result

Based on Table 7, it can be seen that the results of the heteroscedasticity test for the workload variable (X1), physical work environment (X2) and motivation (X3) on employee performance (Y) show that each variable obtains a sig value of more than 0.05 so that it can be interpreted that there is no heteroscedasticity.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis aims to determine whether each independent variable is positively or negatively related and to predict the value of the dependent variable to increase or decrease. The results of multiple linear regression analysis are presented as follows.

Table 8. Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	1025	.496		2064	047
	Workload (X1)	-.179	.085	-.179	-2.109	042
	Work environment Physical (X2)	.381	.134	.360	2,833	008
	Motivation (X3)	.456	.131	.463	3,482	001

Source : Data Processing Result

Based on Table 10, the equations formed in this study are as follows.

$$Y = 1.025 - 0.179X1 + 0.381X2 + 0.456X3$$

From the equation above, it can be seen that the relationship between performance and workload is negative, this means that if the workload increases, the performance will decrease. For work environment variables and motivation the relationship is positive, meaning that if the work environment is good then employee performance will increase, as well as motivation if motivation is increased then employee performance will increase.

Determination Coefficient

The results of the test for the coefficient of determination are presented as follows.

Table 9. Test Results for the Coefficient of Determination

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	std. Error of the Estimates
1	.959a	.919	.912	.34643

Source : Data Processing Result

Based on Table 9, it can be seen that the results of the coefficient T-test for determining the workload variable (X1), physical work environment (X2) and motivation (X3) on employee performance (Y) show an R Square or R² value of 0.919 which means that the workload variable (X1), physical work environment (X2) and motivation (X3) affect the performance of PT Kejar Jember employees by 91.9% (0.919X100%) while the remaining 8.1% (100% -91.9%) are influenced by factors or other variables not used in this study.

Hypothesis test

t-test

The T-test was carried out to test whether there is influence of workload (X1), physical work environment (X2) and motivation (X3) partially on employee performance (Y) of PT Kejar Jember. If t count > t table and significance value <0.05, it means that there is a significant influence of the independent variable partially on the dependent variable. The results of the T-test are presented as follows.

Table 10. Test Results t

Variable	T table	T count	Sig	Information
Workload (X1)	2,024	2,109	0.042	H0 is rejected
Physical Work Environment (X2)	2,024	2,833	0.008	H0 is rejected
Motivation (X3)	2,024	3,482	0.001	H0 is rejected

Source : Data Processing Result

Based on Table 10. partial test results were obtained between workload (X1), physical work environment (X2) and motivation (X3) on employee performance (Y), while the results are as follows.

- 1.) The results of testing the effect of the workload variable on employee performance obtained a calculated t value greater than t table ($2.109 > 2.024$) and a significance value lower than the predetermined significant level ($0.042 < 0.05$), so that workload is suspected to have no effect partially on employee performance (H_0) is rejected, and the alleged workload has a partial effect on employee performance (H_a) is accepted, which means that workload has a partial effect on employee performance at PT Kejar Jember.
- 2) The results of testing the effect of the physical work environment variable on employee performance obtained a t value greater than t table ($2.833 > 2.024$) and a significance value lower than the predetermined significant level ($0.008 < 0.05$) so that the physical work environment is thought to have no effect partially on employee performance (H_0) is rejected, while the allegation that the physical work environment has a partial effect on employee performance (H_a) is accepted, which means that the physical work environment has a partial effect on employee performance at PT Kejar Jember.
- 3) The results of testing the influence of motivational variables on employee performance obtained a t value greater than t table ($3.482 > 2.024$) and a significance value lower than the predetermined significant level ($0.001 < 0.05$) so that motivation is thought to have no partial effect on employee performance (H_0) is rejected, while motivation which is thought to have a partial effect on employee performance (H_a) is accepted, which means that motivation has a partial effect on employee performance at PT Kejar Jember.

F-test

F-test was conducted to test whether there is influence of workload (X1), physical work environment (X2) and motivation (X3) variables on employee performance (Y) of PT Kejar Jember simultaneously. If $F \text{ count} > F \text{ table}$ and significance value < 0.05 , it means that there is a significant influence of the independent variables simultaneously or together on the dependent variable. The results of the F-test are presented as follows.

Table 11. F-test results

Variable	F table	F count	Sig
Burden Work (X ₁), Physical Work Environment (X ₂) Motivation (X ₃)	2.88	128,297	0.000

Source : Data Processing Result

Based on Table 11, the results of simultaneous testing of the variables workload (X₁), physical work environment (X₂) and motivation (X₃) on employee performance (Y) obtained an F count greater than F table ($128.297 > 2.88$) and the significance value is smaller than the predetermined significant level ($0.000 < 0.05$) so that H_0 is rejected H_a is accepted which means that workload (X₁), physical work environment (X₂) and motivation (X₃) simultaneously influence PT employee performance Pursue Jember.

INTERPRETATION

1. Effect of Workload on Employee Performance

Workload affects the performance of employees of PT Kejar Jember as shown by the results of the t-test which shows the t count t count is greater than the t table ($2.109 > 2.024$) and the significance value is lower than the predetermined significant level ($0.043 < 0.05$). The value of the regression coefficient which is negative indicates that the higher the workload, the performance of the employees of PT Kejar Jember will decrease. According to Koesomowidjojo (2017: 21), a workload is the number of jobs given to employees or human resources to be completed within a certain period. Too much workload in a company can cause tension in an employee it can cause prolonged stress, and work fatigue which will ultimately result in a decrease in employee performance. Likewise, at PT Kejar Jember, the workload felt by employees is considered high enough so that employee performance decreases. The results of this study indicate that workload affects employee performance, this is in line with previous research conducted by Indriyanto and Solovida (2020), Ramadhani, et al. (2020), and Januariski and Wihara (2021).

2. Effect of Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance

The physical work environment affects the performance of PT Kejar Jember employees as indicated by the results of the t-test which shows the t count t count is greater than the t table ($2.833 > 2.024$) and the significance value is smaller than the predetermined significant level ($0.008 < 0.05$). The positive value of the regression coefficient indicates that the better the work

environment at PT Kejar Jember, the performance of the company's employees will increase. Nitisemito (2019: 183) suggests the physical environment, namely everything that is around workers can influence them in carrying out the tasks assigned to them. Juniasari (2018) suggests that the work environment can influence employees' emotions in doing work, if the employee likes the work environment where he works then the employee will feel at home in his workplace to carry out various activities so that work time is used effectively. Similarly, at PT Kejar Jember, the physical work environment in PT Kejar Jember's office is mostly perceived as good even though the office is considered to lack safety employees can produce good performance due to the support of a comfortable and pleasant physical work environment. The results of this study indicate that workload affects employee performance, this is in line with previous research conducted by Indriyanto and Solovida (2020), Hajiali, et al. (2021), Juliani and Saputra (2021) and Lompoliuw, et al. (2021).

3. The Effect of Motivation on Employee Performance

Motivation affects the performance of PT Kejar Jember employees as shown by the results of the t-test which shows the t-count value is greater than t table ($3.482 > 2.024$) and the significance value is less than the significant level that has been determined ($0.001 < 0.05$). The value of the regression coefficient which is positive indicates that the better the motivation, the performance of the employees of PT Kejar Jember will increase. According to Mulyasa (2003: 113) motivation is the driving force. Recipients of motivation will seriously carry out their duties because of high motivation so that the employee's performance will increase. Likewise, at PT Kejar Jember, the leadership seeks to motivate employees to work better, such as by providing additional incentives to achieve company targets so that employees are excited to be able to complete their duties and responsibilities. The results of this study indicate that motivation influences employee performance, this is in line with research conducted by Ramadhani, et al. (2020), Gusti, et al.

4. Effect of Workload, Physical Work Environment and Motivation on Employee Performance

Workload, physical work environment, and motivation have a simultaneous effect on the performance of PT Kejar Jember employees as indicated by the calculated F value greater than the F table ($128.297 > 2.88$) and the significance value is lower than the predetermined significant level ($0.000 < 0, 05$). This indicates that together the variables of workload, physical work

environment, and motivation affect the performance of employees of PT Kejar Jember. In a normal workload that allows employees to carry out within a certain period, it means that there is a suitability of workload, time, and abilities of employees, supported by a good physical work environment that provides a sense of security and comfort for employees as well as the right motivation that can encourage or move employees.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research on workload, physical work environment, motivation and performance at PT Kejar Jember, the conclusions of this study include the following.

1. Workload has a partial effect on the performance of PT Kejar Jember employees.
2. The physical work environment has a partial effect on the performance of employees of PT Kejar Jember.
3. Motivation has a partial effect on the performance of employees of PT Kejar Jember.
4. Workload, physical work environment, and motivation simultaneously influence the performance of employees of PT Kejar Jember.

REFERENCES

- Hajiali Ismail, Mahfud Nurna Jamuddin, Suriyanti dan Aditya Halim Perdana Kusuma Putra, 2021, Pengaruh Kompetensi dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Bank Rakyat Indonesia Cabang Makasar, *Jurnal Magister Manajemen Universitas Muslim Indonesia*. Vol 8 No 1. Hal 92 – 104.
- Hasibuan, Malayu S P, 2017, *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*, Edisi Revisi, Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Indriyanto, Donny dan Grace Tianna Solovida, 2020, Pengaruh Beban Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Melalui Burnout sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi Kasus pada Pegawai KCP Bank BPD Jateng di Kabupaten Pemalang), *Jurnal Magisma*, Vol 8 No 1. Hal 66 – 72.
- Januariski, Tety Ramadhani dan Dhiyan Septa Wihara, 2021, Pengaruh Stres Kerja, Beban Kerja dan Komunikasi Interpersonal terhadap Kinerja Karyawan BPR Artha Samudra Indonsia, *Jurnal Penelitian Manajemen Terapan*, Vol 6 No 1. Hal 16 – 38.

Juliani, Ni Putu Sintia dan Gusti Alit Suputra, 2021, Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT BPR Desa Sangeh Abiansemal Badung, Jurnal Widya Amrita, Vol1 No 1. Hal 335 – 348.

Komarudin, 2002, Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Bandung: Kappa Sigma. Koesomowidjojo, Suci R. Mar'ih, 2017, Paduan Praktis Menyusun Analisa Beban Kerja, Jakarta: Raih Asa Sukses.

Koesomowidjojo, Suci R. Mar'ih, 2017, *Panduan Praktis Menyusun Analisa Beban Kerja*, Jakarta: Raih Asa Sukses.

Lompoliuw, Beiferly Tamara, Bernhard Tewal, Mac Donald Walangitan, 2021, Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi dan Lingkungan Kerja terhadap Kinerja Karyawan pada Bank BRI Kantor Cabang Manado, Jurnal EMBA, Vol 9 No 1. Hal 493 – 502.

Mangkunegara, Anwar Prabu, 2013, Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan, Bandung: PT Remaja Rosda Karya.

Mulyasa, 2003, Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia, Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya Munandar, Ashar S. 2001, Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi, Jakarta: UI Press Nitisemito, Alex S, 2002, Manajemen Personalial: Sumber Daya Manusia, Jakarta:Ghalia Indonesia.

Nitisemito, Alex S, 2019, Manajemen Personalial (4 th ed). Jakarta:Ghalia Indonesia.