The influence of relationship conflict, employee turnover intention, and employee performance: Role of work burnout as a mediator
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ABSTRACT

This study discusses the influence of relationship conflict, turnover intention, and employee performance of Gladish Medical Center General Hospital on work burnout as a mediator. The purpose of this study is to examine and analyze the influence of relationship conflict on work burnout as a mediator on turnover intention and employee performance of Gladish Medical Center General Hospital Pesawaran. Researchers use census technique with 70 respondents who are employees of Gladish Medical Center General Hospital Pesawaran. The analytical test uses SmartPLS v.2.0 with SEM (Structural Equation Modelling) analysis method. The results reveal that relationship conflict has a positive and significant influence on turnover intention. Work burnout is proven to mediate the influence of relationship conflict on turnover intention. While relationship conflict has no significant influence on employee performance. Work burnout is proven to mediate the influence of relationship conflict on employee performance. Relationship conflict has a positive and significant influence on work burnout. Work burnout has a positive and significant influence on turnover intention. Work burnout has a negative and significant influence on employee performance.

Introduction

Human resources play huge role in achieving organizational goals (Mathis & Jackson 2002). Schaufeli (2003) states that obtaining reliable and quality human resources requires proper management, starting from the recruitment, selecting, clarifying, and assigning employees according to their abilities. Employee performance will decrease if there is conflict between employees (Moreno et al, 2009). Kreitner and Kinicki (2014) state that conflict is a process in which one group considers that its interests are negatively opposed or influenced by other groups. Conflict can be divided into three types, namely task conflict, relationship conflict, and conflict process. Task conflict is caused by disagreements between employees in handling work tasks. Relationship conflict occurs because of disagreements or personal problems between employees. While conflict process is caused by disagreements in task planning and delegation (Jenh et al., 2008).

A decrease on employee performance also occurs when the employee is too tired to work. Mete et al, (2014) state that the level of employee performance can decrease due to employee fatigue so that managers need to pay attention and have good employee management so that employee fatigue does not occur. In addition, company should aware of turnover intention. Turnover intention is a permanent voluntary or involuntary resignation from an organization (Robbins and Judge, 2009: 38). The intention to move can be caused by various things, one of which is conflict between employees. According to Avgar et al, (2014) employees work in unit within companies who have high cooperation are prone to have relationship conflicts. This relationship conflicts will result in employee’s intention to leave the organization.
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According to Afzal and Imran (2009), relationship conflict which occurs between superiors and subordinates as well as between employees are common problems because of unclear job descriptions and job specifications. The ambiguity or unclear job descriptions will lead to conflicts so that employees feel unnoticed by the organization and have intention to leave the organization (Hill et al., 2015). Conflicts experienced by employees between individuals, groups, and organizations can cause work fatigue (burnout) such as emotion, depression, and frustration so that it makes decrease in performance and intention to leave the organization (Shaukat et al., 2017). According to Perez et al. (2016), intragroup conflict can cause work burnout and reduce the quality of employee service.

On the other hand, the occurrence of turnover intention on employees is also caused by work burnout. Kim and Stoner (2008) explain that if work burnout increases, the intention of employees to leave the organization also increases, so the organization needs to pay attention to the factors that cause work burnout to motivate employees do their jobs. One industry that is prone to conflict and work burnout is health industry such as hospitals. Conflicts can easily occur on hospital employees and shift system work. The demands of tiring work for hospital employees will make them sensitive to matters relating to their work. One general description of conflict and work burnout in the hospital occurs at Gladish Medical Center General Hospital. Relationship conflicts or personal conflicts often occur among employees of the Gladish Medical Center General Hospital. Example of conflicts that occurs such as ignorance to one another in conducting tasks. Personal conflicts often occur among hospital nurses. It causes tension between nurses so that it interferes work activities. Conflict occurs because of the outrageous joking between one another and the passive nature of conducting work that annoys one another. The work burnout of nurses at Gladish Medical Center General Hospital occurs during night shifts. Although the fatigue that occurs is not too high, this is usually caused by limited nurses which have to deal with patients which sometimes exceed expectations. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the relationship between conflict and work burnout on turnover intention and employee performance at Gladish Medical Center General Hospital. This study also analyzes how work burnout is able to mediate the relationship between conflict on turnover intention and employee performance.

This paper consists of several parts. The first one is introduction, which will then followed by literature review that explains the relationship between the variables. The third is research method which explains about the method, analytical tools, variables, and item measurement used in the study. The fourth is results and discussion, and the last part is conclusion which includes the conclusion of the results, implication, and suggestion for future studies.

Literature Review

Empirical Review and Hypothesis Development

Relationship Conflict and Employee Turnover Intention

According to Kreitner & Kinicki (2014), conflict is a process in which a group perceives that its interest is opposed or negatively affected by other groups. Conflict can be divided into three types, namely task conflict, relationship conflict, and process conflict. Task conflict is a conflict due to disagreements among employees regarding work tasks. Relationship conflict is a conflict that occurs because of disagreements or personal problems between employees. Process conflict is a conflict because of disagreements that occur in planning and task delegation (Jenh et al., 2008). Relationship conflict that occurs between employees can cause employees to have an intention to leave the organization. Aloysius (2017) added that relationship conflicts that occur between superiors and subordinates as well as between employees are a common problem for several reasons. It can happen due to unclear job description and job specification, or due to experience, which plays an important role in the resolution of conflicts that occur. People who have high experience will understand how to fit in the organization and make a decision. The role ambiguity or job ambiguity might as well cause conflict that occur in employees so that they feel unnoticed by the organization, and even think about leaving the organization (Hill et al., 2015). Based on the study conducted by Aloysius (2017) and Hill et al. (2015), it is proven that relationship conflict has an influence on employee turnover intention.

H1: Relationship conflict has a significant influence on employee turnover intention

Relationship Conflict and Employee Performance

Performance and abilities possessed by employees can decrease if there is a conflict between employees. Employee performance owned by employees can result in a decrease if employees experience burnout which is caused by many work demands from the organization to the employee. Relationship conflict has a significant impact on employee performance, and the existence of this negative impact requires organization to maintain the integrity of employee team work so that there is no conflict that occur (Afzal et al., 2009). Good communication between employees as well as good relationship between employees or teamwork can minimize relationship conflict that can results in decreased employee performance (Moreno et al., 2009). According to Donkor et al. (2015), relationship conflict has a negative relation to worker output. This result indicates that in a conflict, it is necessary to have effective conflict policies and management to resolve it. On the other hand, task conflict has a positive but not significant relationship with worker output. This implies that the diversity of ideas in the group is very important to support organizational process. Lastly, process conflict also has a positive but not significant relationship with worker output. In the study from Afzal et al. (2009) and Donkor et al. (2015), it is concluded that there is a positive relationship between relationship conflict and employee performance.

H2: Relationship conflict has a significant influence on employee performance
Relationship Conflict and Burnout

Conflicts experienced by employees between individuals, groups, and organizations can cause burnout such as emotions, depression, and frustration, so it can cause a decrease in performance, and increase the desire of employee turnover intention. The research findings from Yoon et al. (2014) shows that high levels of conflict among oh-gyn doctors were triggered by patients and fellow doctors (Yoon et al., 2014). According to Sword and Ellis (2018), relationship conflict is a predictor of work burnout experienced by employees. Burnout can be defined as a fatigue caused by excessive demands on employees in the organization. Burnout usually occurs when employees work in the organization for more than a year, because at that time there are many factors that can cause burnouts (Freudenberg, 1974). Partners at work is one source of happiness and comfort. Likewise, someone who gives praise for what we have achieved can be a source of happiness. However, it is different when there is a conflict at work with co-workers, as it can cause tension so that it can have a negative impact on work (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

H3: Relationship conflict has a significant influence on burn out

Burnout and Employee Turnover Intention

Too much work and too high organizational demands can make employees experience burnouts, and it may cause them to have the intention to leave the organization because they feel uncomfortable at work. This statement is supported by Ahmad and Afgan (2016) who explained that when burnout increases, the employees’ desire to leave the organization would also increases. Organizations need to pay attention to the factors that cause burnout to motivate employees to do their job. According to Kim and Stoner (2008), burnout can trigger employee turnover intention. It occurs because employees already feel uncomfortable with excessive workloads.

H4: Burnout has a significant influence on employee turnover intention

Burnout and Employee Performance

Employee performance can be decrease if employees are too tired at work and experience burnout due to the many demands of work from the organization to employees. Mete et al. (2014) stated that the level of employee performance can decrease due to burnout, therefore, managers are required to pay attention. Leaders can lead employees well so that burnout does not occur and can improve employee performance. Ozel and Hacioglu analysed the relationship between burnout and job satisfaction sub-dimensions with a target population of 254 international flight crew. Their study demonstrated that cockpit and cabin crews’ job satisfaction and performance have been affected by stress and fatigue causing burnout (Ozel & Hacioglu, 2021a; Ozel & Hacioglu, 2021b). Burnout can be reduced by training employees with certain treatments such as skills training or programs for employees, so it can improve employee performance. When it is conducted by the organization, it is expected that the employees feel happy about their work (Schaufeli, 2003). The study from Kwag and Kim (2009) found that burnout has a negative impact on employee performance. Employees who experience stress with heavy workload will have a burnout that has an impact on decreased performance.

H5: Burnout has a significant influence on employee performance

H6: Burnout mediates the relationship between relationship conflict and employee turnover intention

H7: Burnout mediates the relationship between relationship conflict and employee performance

Research Method

This study approach uses quantitative method. The population are all employees of the Gladish Medical Center Hospital Pesawaran, Lampung, Indonesia, which are 70 people. This study is census because the population as same as the sample. The data in this study is primary data which is obtained using questionnaires and unstructured interviews with employees to obtain more in-depth information. This study is analyzed by Structural Equation Model (SEM) with PLS (Partial Least Square) software. SEM is one type of multivariate analysis in social science. Multivariate analysis is a statistical method application to analyze several research variables simultaneously (Solihin and Ratmono, 2013: 2).

This study has one exogenous variable, namely relationship conflict and three endogenous variables, namely work burnout, turnover intention, and employee performance. The main operational variables and sub elements are presented in Appendix 1. Main operational variables in this study are as follows:

i. Relationship Conflict (KH)
ii. Work burnout (KK)
iii. Turnover intention (KBK)
iv. Employee Performance (Kin)

Result and Discussion

Description of Respondent Characteristics

Respondent characteristics provide a description of the respondent, whether the characteristics of different respondents have the same thinking or not. In this study, the characteristics of the respondents are age, gender, and education as shown in Table 1.
**Table 1**: Respondent’s Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent’s Characteristics</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>≤ 20 years old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 years old</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40 years old</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Degree (D1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Degree (D3)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Degree (D4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis test**

The tool to test the hypothesis in this study is Partial Least Square (PLS) method. The following results can be seen below.

**Measurement Model**

**Validity and Reliability Test of Latent Variables**

This test is used to assess the outer model, which includes convergent validity, measured by the outer loading value. Discriminant validity is measured by the AVE value, while composite reliability or CR to measure the reliability level (Abdillah and Jogiayanto, 2016).

**Convergent Validity**

Convergent validity of the measurement model with reflexive indicators can be seen from the correlation between the item/indicator and the construct score. Individual indicators are considered valid if they have a correlation value above 0.50. Based on the analysis results, there were some constructs or items from the variables that do not meet the convergent validity (invalid) because these items had loading value below 0.5 and had to be dropped from the study. After the invalid items are dropped, the results of the path diagram testing have met the convergent validity (valid), as shown in Figure 1.
The results of loading factors on the outer model can be seen in table 2.

**Table 2: Convergent Validity - Outer Loading Test Result**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading Value</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship conflict</td>
<td>KH1</td>
<td>0.639981</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH2</td>
<td>0.574272</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH5</td>
<td>0.545388</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH6</td>
<td>0.680592</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH8</td>
<td>0.831719</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH9</td>
<td>0.749497</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KH10</td>
<td>0.805687</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Burnout</td>
<td>KK1</td>
<td>0.824783</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KK2</td>
<td>0.677531</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KK3</td>
<td>0.793924</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KK4</td>
<td>0.766494</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KK5</td>
<td>0.743254</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KK6</td>
<td>0.840845</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KK7</td>
<td>0.578880</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KK8</td>
<td>0.683491</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>KBK 1</td>
<td>0.745675</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KBK 2</td>
<td>0.647261</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KBK 3</td>
<td>0.774689</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KBK 4</td>
<td>0.700195</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KBK 5</td>
<td>0.605646</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KBK 6</td>
<td>0.763458</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KBK 8</td>
<td>0.800557</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KBK 9</td>
<td>0.731668</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee performance</td>
<td>Kin1</td>
<td>0.807493</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin2</td>
<td>0.810851</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin3</td>
<td>0.615328</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin6</td>
<td>0.716660</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin7</td>
<td>0.674859</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin8</td>
<td>0.781459</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin10</td>
<td>0.587632</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin11</td>
<td>0.552436</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin12</td>
<td>0.580649</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the loading value in table 2, it can be concluded that all item of variables are valid and have met the convergent validity because all items have loading value above 0.5. From this test it can be concluded that at this testing stage, all item of the variables are valid.

**Discriminant Validity**

Discriminant validity is used to ensure that each concept of a latent variable is different from other variables. The model has good discriminant validity if the average variance extracted (AVE) value is (≥ 0.5). The results of the discriminant validity test with the AVE value are as shown in table 3.

**Table 3: Discriminant Validity Test Results - AVE Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship conflict</td>
<td>0.5186093</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Burnout</td>
<td>0.552357</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.523912</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee performance</td>
<td>0.512835</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the results in table 3, it can be explained that four variables have an AVE value above 0.5 so that the data has good discriminant validity.

Reliability test with composite reliability
The reliability criteria can be seen from the composite reliability value of each variable. The limit value for the reliability level is above 0.7. The results of the reliability test as shown in table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship conflict</td>
<td>0.866263</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Burnout</td>
<td>0.906983</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.897317</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee performance</td>
<td>0.887808</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of the reliability test analysis informs that all variables meet Cronbach's Alpha above 0.7 and have met the criteria of being reliable and suitable for use in further study. Based on overall evaluation (convergent validity, discriminant validity, and reliability tests with composite reliability as described above), it can be concluded that the item statements as a variable measure are valid and reliable.

R-Square Value
This analysis shows the magnitude influence of the exogenous variables on the endogenous variables. The magnitude of the R-Square value on the relationship between the constructs shown in table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Burnout</td>
<td>0.448018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.550088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee performance</td>
<td>0.155971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 explains the influence of exogenous variables on endogenous variables. The R Square value on work burnout construct is 0.448018, which means the relationship conflict is able to explain its influence on work burnout by 44.80%. Furthermore, R Square value on the turnover intention construct is 0.550088, which means relationship conflict and work burnout are able to explain the influence on turnover intention by 55.00%. R Square value in the employee performance construct is 0.155971, which means that relationship conflict and work burnout are able to explain the influence on employee performance by 16.54%.

Structural Model Testing (Inner Model)
This test shows whether there is an influence of exogenous variables on endogenous variables. The results of the structural model analysis can be seen in Figure 2.
Based on figure 2, it can be explained that the results of testing the structural model of the relationship between variables are explaining in table 6.

**Table 6: Structural Model Testing Results**

| Relationship of each variables | Original Sample (O) | T (|O/STERR|) | Statistics | Descriptions |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------|--------------|
| Relationship Conflicts -> Turnover Intention | 0.434386 | 4.603162 | Significant Accepted |
| Relationship Conflicts -> Employee performance | 0.257708 | 0.997308 | Not Significant |
| Relationship Conflicts -> Work Burnout | 0.669341 | 9.729594 | Significant Accepted |
| Work Burnout -> Turnover Intention | 0.809151 | 11.304919 | Significant Accepted |
| Work Burnout -> Employee performance | -0.402799 | -2.246596 | Significant Accepted |

The description of hypothesis testing in this study is as follows:

*First hypothesis test*

Based on the t test result, the original sample estimate value is 0.434386 and the t count value is 4.603162. Due to the t count value > from the t table value (4.603162 > 1.96), this means that the relationship conflict has a significant influence on turnover intention.

*Second hypothesis test*

Based on analysis results, the t value of relationship conflict on work burnout is 9,729594 and t value on work burnout on the turnover intention is 11.304919. Since the two influence paths are significant or have t count value greater than t table value, it can be stated that there is an indirect influence of relationship conflict on the employee’s turnover intention through work burnout.

*Third hypothesis test*

Based on the t test result, the original sample estimate value is 0.257708 and t count value of 0.257708 <1.96, this means that the relationship conflict has no influence on employee performance.

*Fourth hypothesis test*
Based on the analysis result, the t value on relationship conflict to work burnout is 9.729594 and t value of work burnout on employee performance is 2.246596. The two pathways of influence are significant or have t-calculated value greater than the t-table value, it can be stated that there is an indirect influence of relationship conflicts on employee performance through work burnout.

Fifth hypothesis test

Based on the t test result in Table 4.12, the original sample estimate value is 0.669341 and t count value of 9.729594. Due to the t count value > t table value (9.729594> 1.96), this means that relationship conflict has a significant influence on work burnout.

Sixth hypothesis test

Based on the t test result in Table 4.12, the original sample estimate value is 0.809151 and t count value is 11.304919. Due to t count value > t table value (11.304919> 1.96), this means that work burnout has a significant influence on turnover intention.

Seventh hypothesis test

Based on the t test results in Table 4.12, the original sample estimate value is -0.402799 and t count value is -2.246596. Due to t count value > t table value (2.246596> 1.96), this means that work burnout has a significant influence on employee performance.

Discussion

The result of this study indicates that relationship conflicts have a positive and significant influence on employee’s turnover intention, so that the higher conflict in the company, the higher employee’s intention to look for work elsewhere to get a better job. This result is in line with Hill et al (2015), which state that an increase in employee relationship conflicts over time have a positive impact on the employee’s intention to move. The result also explain that work burnout is able to mediate the relationship between relationship conflicts and the employee’s turnover intention, so that the increase in relationship conflicts experienced by employees will increase their intention to leave the workplace and even higher when employees are in work burnout. The result of this study is in line with Shaukat and Youasf (2017), relationship conflict is positively related to burnout and each dimension (work burnout, cynicism and tension between employees) mediates the relationship between relationship conflicts with performance, and relationship conflicts have positive relationship with the employee’s turnover intention and each dimensions (work burnout, cynicism, and tension between employees) mediates the relationship between relationship conflicts with employee’s turnover intention except for the cynicism dimension.

The result of this study indicates that relationship conflict has no influence on employee performance, so that changes that occur in relationship conflicts within the company have not made employee’s performance lower. This result is not in line with Joyce and William (1985), which state that relationship conflict and task conflict have a significant relationship that affects employee performance and job satisfaction. The result of this study explains that work burnout is able to mediate the relationship between relationship conflict and employee performance, so that the high relationship conflict that occurs between employees will make their performance decrease. When the employee experiences excessive work burnout, the employee’s performance will be low. In line with Shaukat and Yousaf (2017), relationship conflict has a positive relationship with work burnout and each dimension (work burnout, cynicism, and tension between employees) mediates the relationship between relationship conflicts with performance, and relationship conflicts have a positive relationship with the employee’s turnover intention and each of the dimensions (work burnout, cynicism and tension among employees) mediate the relationship between relationship conflicts with the employee’s turnover intention except for the cynicism dimension.

The result of this study indicates that relationship conflict has a positive and significant effect on work burnout, this means that the higher the relationship conflict that occurs in employees, the higher work burnout experienced by these employees. This is in line with Perez et al (2016), where there is a positive relationship between work burnout and relationship conflict but the relationship is weak. When employees feel tired from demanding work, the conflict that occurs is higher. The result of this test shows that work burnout has positive and significant influence on the employee’s turnover intention. This illustrates that if an employee feels tired at work, it would make them want to move to another job in the hope that they will have better job. This is in line with Kim and Stoner's (2008) which state that work burnout has a significant positive relationship to the employee’s turnover intention, the higher the work burnout that occurs in employees, the higher the employee's intention to leave the organization. The result of this study indicates that work burnout has negative and significant influence on employee performance. It means that if employees experience fatigue at work, it would lower employee's performance. Kwag and Kim (2009) state that work burnout has negative influence on employee performance.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion above, several conclusions can be drawn. Relationship conflict has a positive and significant influence on the employee’s turnover intention and work burnout, but it has no influence on employee performance. Work burnout has a positive and significant influence on employee’s turnover intention and employee performance. Finally, this study found that work burnout mediates the relationship between relationship conflicts and employee’s turnover intention, as well as the relationship between relationship conflicts and employee performance.
This study contributes to the enrichment of studies related to human resource management, mainly regarding the relationship between relationship conflict, turnover intention, work burnout, and employee performance. This study also provides several suggestions for both the management and employee of the Gladish Medical Center General Hospital. As the employee often experience conflicts that occurs while carrying out their tasks and lead to the burnout as well as reduce their performance, it is suggested that the management add or manage the work load, especially during the night shifts. Future studies can look for other variables that may mediate the relationship between relationship conflicts, employee’s turnover intention, and employee performance. It is also recommended to use situational factors that may influence the relationship between the variables used in this study.
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Appendix

Appendix 1: The main operational variables and sub elements

i. Relationship Conflict (KH)

The measurement of relationship conflict in this study refers to Jehn’s (1995) and Hill et al, (2015) with 11 items as follows:

a. Many conflicts occur between members in the workplace.

b. Personality conflicts can be seen in the workplace.

c. Emotional conflicts occur at workplace

d. Members of your workplace disagree with your opinion.

e. Conflicts over opinion occur in the workplace.

f. I caused conflict at work.

h. There are differences in the workplace.

i. Interaction between individuals is hostile.

j. There is often hostility feeling between co-workers.

e. You are often weakened by your co-workers.

ii. Work burnout (KK)

Measurement of work burnout variables refers to the indicators developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981) as follows:

a. Emotional Exhaustion

i. I feel emotionally exhausted by my work.

ii. I feel tired when I wake up in the morning and have to face work.

iii. I feel frustrated with my job.

iv. I feel I am working too hard at my job.

v. Working with people face-to-face makes me depressed

b. Depersonalization

i. I am worried that this job might make me emotional.

ii. I don’t really care what happens to other people.

iii. I feel that other people blame me for their problems.

c. Inefficacy (reduced personal accomplishment)

i. I can handle problems with other people very effectively

ii. I can influence others in positive ways through my work.

iii. I can create a relaxed atmosphere with other people.

iv. I feel happy after working with others.

v. I have accomplished many valuable things in this work.

vi. In my work I handle emotional problems calmly.

iii. Turnover intention (KBK)

Measurement of employee’s turnover intention in this study refers to Hill et al, (2015) and Wesley and Krishnan, (2013) with 9 items as follows:

a. If I am offered a job in similar conditions somewhere, I will most likely accept the job.

i. I often think about quitting my job.

ii. I plan to find a new job over the next 12 months.

b. If I am leaving this organization I will most likely look for a job in another organization.

ii. I will leave my workplace in the next year.

b. If I am leaving this organization I will most likely look for a job in another organization.

ii. I will leave my workplace in the next year.

b. If I am leaving this organization I will most likely look for a job in another organization.

ii. I will leave my workplace in the next year.
iii. If I had my own way, I'd be working for a year from now.
iv. I want to leave my current workplace.
v. I plan to leave my workplace as soon as possible.

iv. Employee Performance (Kin)
Measurements in this study refer to Koopmans et al, (2012) as follows:
a. Task Performance: the skills of an employee in doing main task.
i. The quality of my work is good in the last three months.
ii. The quantity of my work is good in the last three months.
iii. I always manage to do my job on time.
iv. I have trouble setting priorities in my work.
v. I do my job with little time

b. Contextual Performance: performance outside the employee's job, namely behavior that supports the organizational, social and psychological environment outside the main task, usually also known as voluntary duty.
i. I can fulfill my promise.
ii. I can fulfill my responsibilities.
iii. I can cooperate with my co-workers.
iv. I can take the initiative when there is a problem to solve.
v. I always start a new task by myself, when I am done with my old task.
vi. I try to learn from the feedback I get from other people.
vii. I like challenging assignments.
viii. I think customers are satisfied with my work.
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