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ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the effect of charismatic leadership on the psychological safety climate and tacit knowledge sharing. This study also investigates the central role of psychological safety climate as a mediating variable between charismatic leadership and tacit knowledge sharing. This study adopted a simple random sampling method with 61 samples of employees from five of MSME companies in Banten. With the help of SmartPLS 3.0 software, the results of this study indicate that charismatic leadership has a significant direct influence on the psychological safety climate and tacit knowledge sharing. Likewise, the psychological safety climate has a significant direct effect on tacit knowledge sharing. This study also found evidence that charismatic leadership has a significant indirect effect on tacit knowledge sharing through mediating the psychological safety climate. Thus, the psychological safety climate acts as a partial mediator in this research model.
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1. Introduction

Management systems in micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) may not be as complex as those in large, complex companies. However, MSMEs have their own complexities related to the reserves of knowledge and efforts to manage knowledge that is still in the form of tacit knowledge unstructured and even then more of the company owner or management. That is, managing the knowledge possessed by individuals to be developed into the property of the organization becomes a "complexity" in itself for MSME companies. Existing literature shows that behavior knowledge sharing at the individual level is a significant antecedent of the success of an SME. A significant advantage is when an environment that is conducive to creation, coordination, transfer, and integration of knowledge is distributed among MSME employees. Based on knowledge management research, the value of knowledge increases when shared (Agistiawati et al., 2020; Asbari et al., 2019; Asbari, Wijayanti, Hyun, et al., 2020; Basuki, Asbari, et al., 2020; Singgih et al., 2020), and this will happen only if employees are willing to share knowledge with their colleagues, and organizations can manage knowledge resources effectively (Asbari, 2020a; Asbari, Novitasari, & Goestjahjanti, 2020; Asbari, Novitasari, Gazali, et al., 2020; Asbari, Novitasari, Pebrina, et al., 2020; Asbari & Novitasari, 2020b, 2020c, 2021a, 2021b). Therefore, it is very important to find and determine which factors encourage or hinder the tendency of employees to be involved in the knowledge sharing process (Asbari & Novitasari, 2020a). Leadership has been identified as one of the most important drivers of success (Asbari, 2011; Asbari et al., 2021; Asbari, Novitasari, Gazali, et al., 2020; Jumiran et al., 2020; Novitasari, Asbari, Sutardi, et al., 2020; Novitasari & Asbari, 2020a, 2020b).
Empirical studies find evidence that charismatic leadership has a positive impact on overall organizational performance. Although the role of leadership has been significantly emphasized in much of the existing literature, by conducting a thorough analysis of the literature, the authors found that most of the previous studies looked at the impact of senior leadership on performance success at the overall organizational level. However, only a few studies have investigated the impact of leadership practices, especially charismatic leadership in teams on knowledge-sharing behavior at the individual team member level, especially in the context of employees of micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs), where knowledge sharing among individuals is very important to them to develop a deep understanding of the main tasks and functions (tupoksi) of each team member in the entire MSME organizational system. The knowledge management literature states that mid-level team leaders play an important role in influencing individuals' knowledge-sharing behavior and their motivations and attitudes (Asbari & Novitasari, 2021a), whereas the mechanisms for mediating the psychological safety climate between the two constructs have not been explored further and in depth.

This study is a step towards addressing the research gap. By leveraging charismatic leadership and psychological safety climate theory, researchers developed a theoretical model to examine the impact of charismatic leaders on individual-level knowledge-sharing behavior by mediating psychological safety climate variables. In particular, this study focuses on the knowledge-sharing mechanism of tacit knowledge among employees of MSME actors. Tacit knowledge is a type of knowledge in the form of thoughts, cognitive and intuitive perceptions of each individual. This type of knowledge is more difficult to share (Asbari et al., 2019). However, this type of knowledge is very important, because it is the source of innovation and the creation of each individual employee. This study is divided into the following steps: First, the researcher reviewed the literature on charismatic leadership, psychological safety climate, and tacit knowledge sharing. Second, the researcher proposes a theoretical model and articulates the appropriate research hypothesis. Third, describe the operationalization of constructs, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques, and present the results of data analysis. The theoretical and practical implications of the empirical findings are discussed at the end of this research report.

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.1. Charismatic Leadership

The term charisma comes from an ancient Greek word meaning ‘gift’. Later, Max Weber applied the word ‘charisma’ in the context of leadership and defined it as the heroism or exemplary character of an individual. Charismatic leadership is identified as one of the individual behaviors that most influence critical leadership styles. Conger et al. (1997) defined charismatic leadership as attribution based on followers' perceptions of their leader behavior. Waldman & Yammarino (1999) further define charismatic leadership as the relationship between leader and follower, resulting in 'an internalized commitment to the leader's vision, a very strong admiration and respect for the leader, and the identification of followers with the leader, vision, and collectives formed by the leader. Conceptualization suggests that charisma only exists if followers say it or followers behave in a certain way (Banks et al., 2017; Grabo et al., 2017).

Charismatic leaders are good at inspiring followers by speaking optimistically about what needs to be achieved in the future, and instilling in their followers the positive ideals associated with the desired outcome. Employees engage emotionally with charismatic leaders because they believe in the leader's ability to achieve the mission and goals of the organization (Banks et al., 2017). In the last few decades, the concept of charismatic leadership has been widely applied in research to examine the impact of leadership on successful knowledge sharing and its implications for performance in general. In this study, the authors apply charismatic leadership in the context of the MSME organization to examine its impact on the tacit knowledge sharing behavior of MSME employees.

2.2. Psychological Safety Climate

The concept of climate has received a lot of attention from psychologists and sociologists in the last three decades. Based on a cognitive theoretical perspective, climate is conceptualized as individuals' perceptions and understanding of their work environment, which are related to shared perceptions of group events, practices, procedures, and behaviors that are valued and expected by groups (Dennison 1996; Anderson and West 1998; Pullig et al. 2002). In contrast to cultures that are rooted in history and deeply ingrained values, climate usually refers to a contextual situation at a point in time. As such, it is temporal, subjective, and often subject to direct manipulation by people in power and influence (Denison 1996; Bock et al. 2005; Boh and Wong 2013).

The psychological safety climate was identified as a significant dimension of a team climate characterized by interpersonal trust and mutual respect in which people feel comfortable being themselves. This construction is rooted in previous research on organizational change in which researchers discussed the need to create psychological safety for individuals if they are to feel safe and capable of change. Edmondson (1999) introduced the construction of a psychological safety climate in the context of team learning and defined it as the 'shared belief held by members that teams are safe for interpersonal risk-taking'. Empirical results suggest that a psychological safety climate can
facilitate learning behavior in team work because it relieves individuals' excessive concern for others' reactions to potentially embarrassing or threatening actions, and increases individuals' confidence that teams will not reject or punish any member who speaks up. (Edmondson 1999).

In recent decades, the psychological safety climate has been widely applied in organizational and IS research, and empirical studies have found that this type of team climate has a significant effect on individuals' normative beliefs, motivation, and knowledge sharing behavior (Edmondson 1999; Shao, Feng, and Liu 2012; Shen et al. 2015).

2.3. Tacit Knowledge Sharing

Based on the knowledge-based literature, knowledge is the foundation of organizational competitive advantage and the main driver of company performance (López-Cabarcos et al., 2019; Rumanti et al., 2018). The existing literature classifies knowledge into two types, namely: explicit and tacit knowledge. Explicit knowledge refers to knowledge that has been described, recorded, or documented, which is visible, objective, and formally articulated. This type of knowledge is usually contained in reports and stored in knowledge repositories (Masri & et al., 2018). Meanwhile, tacit knowledge refers to the skills and assumptions developed by individuals, whose context is specific and subjective, and this type of knowledge is basically in the minds of individuals and is expressed in the form of human actions such as attitudes, commitments, and motivation (Anand et al., 2010; Jasimuddin et al., 2005; Nikolić & Natek, 2018).

In the context of organizational learning, tacit knowledge Sharing is defined as sharing and exchanging individual personal experiences, expertise, and individual skills with respect to knowledge how, know where, and know who at the request of other members through the entire organization or team (Shao, Feng, Wang, et al., 2016). The organization must ensure that tacit knowledge is shared freely and openly among its members. Organizations need to condition an organizational environment that allows each member to access new knowledge and a variety of ideas that they may not have encountered on their own, and allows them to utilize knowledge and experience to improve performance (Asbari, Novitasari, Siiltonga, et al., 2020; Asbari & Novitasari, 2021b; Gazali et al., 2020; Novitasari, Asbari, Sutardi, et al., 2020; Novitasari & Asbari, 2020a, 2020b). Because of tacit knowledge Sharing is based on personal experiences and skills, usually difficult to share without the active participation and cooperation of the individual. Empirical studies find that sharing behavior is tacit knowledge not only influenced by psychological motivation but also influenced by contextual factors such as organizational climate (Shao, Feng, Wang, et al., 2016), and the desired climate can create a beneficial environment to encourage knowledge sharing.

2.4. Charismatic Leadership and Psychological Safety Climate

Charismatic leadership is identified as critical anticipation of organizational climate by showing personal charisma and paying attention to individual emotional attractiveness (Banks et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2005). Previous literature has argued that charismatic leaders are good at emphasizing the relationship between effort and important values, expressing confidence in subordinates' abilities, and communicating high performance expectations by earning the trust and respect of their followers (Banks et al., 2017). This charismatic leadership style is useful for fostering a teamwork climate, where people feel comfortable being themselves and can trust each other regardless of interpersonal risk, which is a significant characteristic of the psychological safety climate (Edmondson, 1999).

In the context of organizational learning, a group of members come together in a temporary team outside of traditional authoritative management and hierarchical structures, and charismatic leadership plays an important role in facilitating the coordination and communication of team members (Wang et al., 2005). If the team leader can gain trust and respect among followers and demonstrate high confidence in a subordinate's ability to achieve his key performance indicators, team members will believe that participating in open communication such as discussing mistakes and proposing innovative ideas is driven by feeling without feeling worry from unexpected risk and embarrassment caused by technical errors. This is useful for fostering a climate of psychological safety in learning organizations (Edmondson, 1999). Based on the above analysis, the following research hypothesis was developed.

H1: Charismatic leadership has a significant effect on the psychological safety climate.

2.5. Psychological Security Climate and Tacit Knowledge Sharing

Previous research has discussed the need to create a psychological safety climate for individuals if they are to feel safe and able to share, as people tend to act in ways that inhibit learning and knowledge-sharing behavior when they are faced with potential threats (Javed et al., 2019; Maximo et al., 2019). The existing literature suggests that a climate of high psychological safety can lead to mutual respect and trust among team members (Edmondson, 1999). Team members with higher trust are more likely to treat others as partners and family members, and are more likely to cooperate cooperatively and share personal experiences with each other (Sun & Huang, 2019). This is useful for facilitating behavior tacit knowledge sharing, which is usually found in individual minds and expressed in informal communication and interactions among team members (Guibrunet, 2019). In the context of learning organization,
perceptions about the psychological safety climate will alleviate excessive individual concerns about mistakes made in the work process. Individuals are more likely to feel that they are cared for and respected, and the benefits of exchanging personal experiences and skills serve to enhance organizational capacity (Edmondson, 1999). This is useful for improving individual behavior to share work-related knowledge (Guibrunet, 2019). Based on the above analysis, the following research hypothesis was developed.

H2: The psychological safety climate is positively related to tacit knowledge sharing.

2.6. Charismatic Leadership and Tacit Knowledge Sharing

Charismatic leadership practices will undoubtedly provide an experience positive for every manager in the history of the relationship between himself and his subordinates, because this practice is the main paradigm of leadership, where leaders strive to work in serving their followers (Asbari, 2020b; Asbari, Santososo, & Prasetya, 2020; Asbari & Novitasari, 2020d, 2021b; Basuki, Novitasari, et al., 2020; Goestjahjanti et al., 2020; Novitasari, Asbari, Wijayanti, et al., 2020; Novitasari, Goestjahjanti, et al., 2020; Novitasari, , Kumoro, et al., 2020; Silitonga et al., 2020; Sudiyono, Fikri, et al., 2020; Suprapti et al., 2020; Zaman et al., 2020). Furthermore, charismatic leadership acts as a means of developing the nature of the trust that exists between the leader and followers. This is done in accordance with the philosophy that underlies it is the leader's duty to serve the people who follow him (Asbari et al., 2021; Asbari, Novitasari, & Goestjahjanti, 2020; Asbari, Novitasari, Gazali, et al., 2020; Asbari & Novitasari, 2020b; Asbari & Prasetya, 2021; Sudiyono, Goestjahjanti, et al., 2020), and by showing concern for those who enable them to be their leaders, they are changing social systems to be more trusting and where people will communicate at a level that is more personal. If the goal is to create trust and that there is activity tacit knowledge sharing between employees and managers, charismatic leadership appears to be an effective leadership strategy to use as an influencer.

A quality leader-member exchange relationship is something that has the potential to support activities tacit knowledge sharing, namely by sharing knowledge, experiences and personal values (Banks et al., 2017). Bock & Kim (2002) show that the quality of tacit knowledge sharing leader-member will support employees' ability to gain quality experience. Previous research has determined that there is a relationship between tacit knowledge sharing leader-member and charismatic leadership (Shao, Feng, & Wang, 2016; Shao, Feng, Wang, et al., 2016). Research on the correlation and influence between charismatic leadership styles and knowledge sharing, especially tacit knowledge sharing, is still relatively rare. Therefore, this research is important to explore the phenomenon of the influence of this type of leadership in supporting knowledge-sharing activities. Based on the above analysis, the following research hypothesis was developed.

H3: Charismatic leadership has a significant effect on tacit knowledge sharing.

H4: Charismatic leadership has a significant effect on tacit knowledge sharing through mediating the psychological safety climate.

According to Sekaran & Bougie (2016) the theoretical framework is the foundation that underlies all research projects. From the theoretical framework, a hypothesis can be formulated that can be tested to determine whether the theory is valid or not. Then the next step will be measured by appropriate statistical analysis. Referring to previous theory and research, the authors build a research model as follows:
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3. Method

3.1. Data collection

According to Creswell & Creswell (2017), if the purpose of this study is to determine the relationship of influence between the variables studied, then a quantitative approach is the best. Quantitative research methods are suitable in testing theories and hypotheses through the use of a set of statistical tools (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Therefore, this study uses a quantitative survey method to test the formulated hypotheses. Therefore, a questionnaire was adopted as an instrument to collect the required data. The study population consisted of 74 employees from five MSMEs in Banten. Using simple random sampling, 74 questionnaires were sent online to the population. A total of 61 questionnaires were returned and valid, making up a response rate of 82.4%. According to Roscoe (1975) the rule of thumb states that the sample size is more than 30 and less than 500 is suitable for most studies, therefore, the sample size obtained for this study is considered appropriate.

3.2. Measurement and Scale

Due to the nature of this study which involves a dependent effect between the latent construct and the manifest variable, a reflective measurement model is suitable for this study (Hair Jr et al., 2017). Charismatic leadership is
measured using three items (CAL1-CAL3) from Shao, Feng, & Wang (2016) and Wang et al. (2005). Psychological safety climate was measured using three items (PSY1-PSY3) from Edmondson (1999) and Shao, Feng, & Wang (2016). Tacit knowledge sharing is measured using three items (TAC1-TAC3) from Shao, Feng, & Wang (2016). All variables are measured on a five-point Likert-type scale. Each closed question / statement item is given five answer options, namely: strongly agree score 5, agree score 4, neutral / doubtful score 3, disagree score 2, and strongly disagree score 1. The method for processing data is by using PLS and using the software SmartPLS version 3.0 as its tools. A more complete list of items used in this study can be seen in Table 1.

3.3. Data analysis

The most popular statistical techniques under Structural Equation Model SEM are covariance-based approach (CB-SEM) and variant-based partial least squares technique (PLS-SEM) (Sarstedt et al., 2014). However, PLS-SEM has recently received wide attention in many disciplines such as marketing, strategic management, management information systems, and other branches of science (Hair et al., 2012). The ability of PLS-SEM to handle problematic modeling problems that are common in social science environments such as unusual data characteristics (e.g. non-normal data) and highly complex models are important reasons behind the increasing use of this approach. Given the advantages of this approach, this study uses PLS-SEM to test the overall hypothesis proposed. SmartPLS 3.0 software is used to evaluate each outer model and inner model. Testing of the outer model is carried out to ensure the reliability and validity of the measurement, while the introduced hypothesis is examined through the inner model.

Table 1. List of Research Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notasi</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAL</td>
<td>The owner of the MSME is our role model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL1</td>
<td>I have faith on my leader’s ability to solve the problems that occur inside the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL2</td>
<td>I put much respect towards the leader and feel proud to work with him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL3</td>
<td>I don’t think it’s difficult to ask other members of the team for help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY</td>
<td>I feel safe from being overly punished when I make mistakes on the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY1</td>
<td>In my opinion, group members are able to raise problems, no matter how difficult the problems are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY2</td>
<td>I am happy to communicate with my fellow workers related to my experience in the company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY3</td>
<td>Tacit Knowledge Sharing (TAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC1</td>
<td>I want to share what I can do to the others for the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC2</td>
<td>I am pleased to share my knowledge about how, where, and whom if my fellow workers asked me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Sample Description

The questionnaire includes two parts. In the first part, respondents were asked to complete personal information including gender, educational background, and work experience in MSMEs. In the second part, respondents were asked to evaluate the charismatic leadership of the team leader who is responsible for the learning process in the workplace, their perception of the psychological safety climate and tacit knowledge sharing within the team. A total of 74 questionnaires were sent and 67 questionnaires were returned. We deleted incomplete questionnaires or missing data and finally got 61 valid questionnaires. All respondents have participated in the entire research process and the profiles of respondents are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Sample Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (per March 2021)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30 years old</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 40 years old</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 40 years old</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 years old</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years old</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 years old</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Vocational</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Test Results of the Validity and Reliability of Research Indicators

The measurement model testing phase includes testing for convergent, validity discriminant validity. Meanwhile, to test the construct reliability, used Cronbach’s alpha values were and composite reliability. The results of the PLS analysis can be used to test the research hypothesis if all indicators in the PLS model have been implemented meet the requirements of convergent validity, discriminant validity and reliability test. Convergent validity test is done by looking at the value loading factor of each indicator against the construct. In most references, a factor weight
of 0.5 or more is considered to have sufficiently strong validation to explain latent constructs (Chin, 1998; Ghozali, 2014; JF Hair et al., 2010). In this study, the minimum limit for loading factor the accepted is 0.5, provided that the AVE value of each construct is > 0.5 (Ghozali, 2014). After going through SmartPLS 3.0 processing, all indicators have a value loading factor above 0.5 or provided that the AVE value is above 0.5. The fit or valid model of this study can be seen in Figure 2. Thus, the convergent validity of this research model has met the requirements. The value of loadings, cronbach's alpha, composite reliability and AVE for each complete construct can be seen in Figure 2 and Table 3.

Discriminant validity is carried out to ensure that each concept of each latent variable is different from other latent variables. The model has good discriminant validity if the AVE square value of each exogenous construct (the value on the diagonal) exceeds the correlation between this construct and other constructs (values below the diagonal) (Ghozali, 2014). The results of testing discriminant validity are by using the AVE square value, namely by looking at the Fornell-Larcker Criterion Value obtained as shown in Table 4. The results of the discriminant validity test in table 3 above indicate that all constructs have an AVE square root value above the correlation value with other latent constructs (via Fornell-Larcker criteria). Likewise, the cross-loading value of all items from an indicator is greater than the other indicator items as mentioned in Table 4, so it can be concluded that the model has met discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Furthermore, a collinearity evaluation is carried out to determine whether there is collinearity in the model. To find collinearity, it is necessary to calculate the VIF of each construct. If the VIF score is higher than 5, then the model has collinearity (JF Hair et al., 2014). As shown in Table 5, all VIF scores are less than 5, meaning that this model does not have a problem collinearity.

The construct reliability can be assessed from the Cronbach’s alpha value and the composite reliability of each construct. The recommended values composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha are more than 0.7 (Ghozali, 2014). The reliability test results in table 2 above show that all constructs have values composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha greater than 0.7 (> 0.7). In conclusion, all constructs have met the required reliability.

4.3. Hypothesis Test

Hypothesis testing in PLS is also known as the inner model test. This test includes a significance test for direct and indirect effects as well as a measurement of the magnitude of the influence of exogenous variables on endogenous variables. To determine the effect of charismatic leadership on tacit knowledge sharing through the mediation of the psychological safety climate variable, a direct and indirect effect test is needed. The effect test was performed using the t-statistical test in the analysis model partial least squared (PLS) using the software SmartPLS 3.0. With the technique bootstrapping, the values for R Square and significance test values as shown in Table 6 and Table 7.

![Picture 2. Valid Research Model](image-url)
Table 3. Items Loadings, Cronbach's Alpha, Composite Reliability, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic Leadership (CAL)</td>
<td>CAL1</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAL2</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAL3</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Safety Climate (PSY)</td>
<td>PSY1</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSY2</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSY3</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacit Knowledge Sharing (TAC)</td>
<td>TAC1</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAC2</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAC3</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed by SmartPLS 3.0 output (2021)

Table 4. Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>IKP</th>
<th>KK</th>
<th>TKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Safety Climate (PSY)</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic Leadership (CAL)</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacit Knowledge Sharing (TAC)</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed by SmartPLS 3.0 output (2021)

Table 5. Collinearity Statistics (VIF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>IKP</th>
<th>KK</th>
<th>TKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Safety Climate (PSY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic Leadership (CAL)</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacit Knowledge Sharing (TAC)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed by SmartPLS 3.0 output (2021)

Table 6. R Square Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Safety Climate (PSY)</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacit Knowledge Sharing (TAC)</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed by SmartPLS 3.0 output (2021)

Table 7. Hypotheses Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T Statistics</th>
<th>P-Values</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>CAL -&gt; PSY</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>4.028</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>PSY -&gt; TAC</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>CAL -&gt; TAC</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>5.694</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>CAL -&gt; PSY</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>2.069</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed by SmartPLS 3.0 output (2021)

Based on Table 6 above, the value of R Square of psychological safety climate (PSY) is 0.209, which means that the psychological safety climate variable (PSY) can be explained by the charismatic leadership variable (CAL) amounted to 20.9%, while the remaining 79.1% was explained by other variables not discussed in this study. Value of R Square of tacit knowledge sharing (TAC) of 0.481, which means that the variable (TAC) can be explained by the variable charismatic leadership (CAL) and psychological safety climate (PSY) of 48.1%, while the remaining
51.9% is explained by other variables not discussed in this study. Meanwhile, Table 7 shows the t-statistics and p-values which show the influence between the research variables that have been mentioned. The four lines hypothesized in this study were validated and supported at a significance level of 0.05. The psychological safety climate is influenced positively and significantly by charismatic leadership (H1 supported). Tacit knowledge sharing is positively and significantly influenced by the psychological safety climate (H2 supported). Tacit knowledge sharing is positively and significantly influenced by charismatic leadership. Tacit knowledge sharing is positively and significantly influenced by charismatic leadership through mediation of the psychological safety climate (H3 and H4 supported).

4.4. Discussion

In terms of theoretical implications, this study at least contributes to the existing literature by uncovering the impact of charismatic leadership practices on tacit knowledge sharing. Although a large number of studies have acknowledged the importance of leadership in the success of MSMEs, most of the previous studies were conducted at the level of large business organizations, but similar studies with the MSME unit of analysis are still rare, both in Indonesia and abroad. Therefore, the results of this study enrich the repertoire and body of knowledge related to charismatic leadership practices and their influence on the psychological safety climate and tacit knowledge sharing. The findings of this research can also expand the leadership literature, especially charismatic leadership styles from the theoretical perspective of social psychology.

5. Conclusion

Based on the theory of charismatic leadership and organizational climate, we developed a research model to examine the mechanism of the impact of leader’s charism on individual behavior in knowledge-sharing activities, tacit knowledge sharing in the context of MSME organizations, through mediation of organizational climate, particularly psychological safety climate. A field survey was conducted with a total of 61 respondents. Valid questionnaires were collected from employees of five UMKM companies in Banten. SEM technique is used to test the research model of four hypotheses. The results of the SmartPLS analysis show that charismatic leadership has a positive and significant effect directly on the psychological safety climate and tacit knowledge sharing, as well as the psychological safety climate directly has a positive and significant effect on tacit knowledge sharing. Likewise, charismatic leadership indirectly affects tacit knowledge sharing through mediating the psychological safety climate. So, in this study, psychological safety climate acts as a partial mediator variable.

This study can provide guidance to top management and/or owners of MSMEs in the selection and appointment of organizational leaders. This research shows that a charismatic leader can facilitate tacit knowledge sharing, both directly and through a climate of psychological safety. Thus the management of MSMEs needs to consider charismatic leadership traits as an important evaluation dimension when selecting a team leader who is responsible for organizational learning. The study could also offer team leaders guidance on how to focus on the psychological safety climate in organizations. Thus the team leader himself must pay attention to his leadership style, and influence followers by displaying idealized influence and personal charisma rather than using authoritative power, to gain trust and respect among team members.

There are several limitations that exist in this study. First, data collection was carried out in Banten province, and the generalizability of research findings may be limited to location. Future studies need to test the research model with large-scale data samples collected from various locations, to further test the external validity of the study. Future research should also include cultural variables and factors in the research model to test whether there are cultural interactions with the constructs recorded in the research model. Second, this study focuses on the impact of the leadership practice of a charismatic leader on tacit knowledge sharing. Leadership theory suggests that leadership is a multi-dimensional construct consisting of several leadership traits, and future studies could explore the mechanisms for the impact of other leadership traits, such as inspirational stimulation, intellectual motivation and personal judgment, on tacit knowledge sharing individual.
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