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Abstract

High levels of trust between employees and leaders moderate the relationship between organizational management practices. A collaborative environment encourages employees to have more Psychological Empowerment, which in turn leads to better performance. Based on Intrinsic Work Motivation and Self-Evaluation, this paper uses Perceived Leader Trust as an independent variable, Employee Work Performance as a dependent variable, and introduces Psychological Empowerment to explore the internal mechanism of perceived trust. This paper proposes a total of 28 hypotheses, and 25 hypotheses have been verified. The specific research conclusions are as follows: (1) Perceived Leader Trust has a positive impact on Employee Work Performance. (2) Perceived Leader Trust positively affects employees' Psychological Empowerment. Perceived Leader Dependence has a significant impact on all dimensions of Psychological Empowerment, but the relationship between Perceived Information Disclosure and Work Meaning is not significant. (3) Psychological Empowerment is positively correlated with Employee Work Performance, in which the four dimensions of Psychological Empowerment are significantly related to Employee Task Performance, while Work Meaning and Autonomy are not significantly related to Employee Relationship Performance. (4) Psychological Empowerment, as the overall perception of employees, plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance. This paper verifies the role of Psychological Empowerment between Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance, and explores the internal mechanism of Perceived Leader Trust from the perspective of employees' Intrinsic Work Motivation, which promotes the development of organizational management practices.

1. Introduction

In recent years, interpersonal trust in organizations has become an increasingly important research topic. Especially with the rapidly changing business environment and increasing global competitive pressure, organizations face increasing uncertainty in the course of doing business\[^1\]. Companies have now realized that human resources are the key to improving organizational competitiveness, and one of the most important challenges managers face is to build organizational trust at all levels by allowing employees to participate in organizational issues\[^2,3\].

In organizational management, there are two types of trust that have an important impact on employees' attitudes and behaviors, namely upward trust and downward trust\[^4\]. Employees' perception of their leaders' trust is an important type of trust that has emerged in recent years, and is considered to be an important prerequisite for arousing employees' inner perception\[^5,6\]. Trust and Felt trust are two sides of the same coin. The two are independent constructs, and the most fundamental difference is the difference in the subject of action. The subject of trust is the giver of trust, and the subject of perceiving trust is the perceiver of trust. Sometimes the trust given by the truster may not be felt by the trustee. This is because trust and feeling trusted are different attitudes and views of two parties, which will be affected
by the personality characteristics of the trust perceiver and organizational factors that affect trust attributes\(^7\).

The fact that employees in an organization perceive superiors to be trusted only affects their behavior when they feel they are trusted. Therefore, in order to improve the relationship between superiors and subordinates in the organization, it is very important to ensure that employees perceive leader trust\(^2,5,8\). Trust is the cornerstone of improving organizational effectiveness and reducing employee management costs. Employees who perceive superior trust have higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and have better voice behavior and performance at work\(^9\). Therefore, this study takes the perception side of trust—employee as the starting point, and explores the relationship between Perceived Leader Trust, Psychological Empowerment and Employee Work Performance from the perspective of Intrinsic Work Motivation and Self-Evaluation. This has important theoretical and practical significance for solving the missing link in perceived trust theory, and provides a reference for organizations to build a high-trust organizational structure.

2. Relevant Theoretical Basis

2.1 Intrinsic Work Motivation Theory

For individuals, the value of work itself is the intrinsic motivation for work, which is derived from people's endogenous need for a sense of competence and self-determination\(^10\). Competence and self-determination are core components of Intrinsic Work Motivation\(^11\). Amabile proposed a five-factor model of intrinsic motivation, including competency, self-determination, interest, curiosity, and work engagement\(^12\). Existing studies have shown that the role of employees' Intrinsic Work Motivation depends not only on individual differences, but also on the influence of the work environment. Therefore, Intrinsic Work Motivation has individual and social characteristics\(^13\). Deci found that external factors such as trust, mentoring, and participation opportunities from superiors can enhance employees' Intrinsic Work Motivation\(^14\). When managers give employees encouragement, acknowledge each other's views, give each other trust, and provide them with guidance and choice at work, employees' Intrinsic Work Motivation is significantly enhanced, and they tend to have better performance at work\(^15\).

2.2 Self-Evaluation Theory

Self-Evaluation, as the intrinsic motivation of employees, represents how employees evaluate themselves\(^16\). The process and results of evaluation have an important impact on the formation of employees' work self-concept\(^17\). Nerstad found that Perceived Leader Trust, as an employee's internal self-cognition, can enhance employees' Self-Evaluation and make employees more recognized for their work meaning, ability and influence\(^18\). When employees perceive that their leaders trust them, self-assessments related to perceived trust can lead to a stronger sense of competence and autonomy in
employees, increase their influence at work, and promote better performance\cite{19,20}. From these findings, we can infer that superior trust in social settings is important for the Self-Evaluation process in the workplace.

### 2.3 Perceived Leader Trust

Employees who perceive the trust of their superiors have higher responsibility norms, organizational commitment and organizational self-esteem, and have a higher degree of motivation and completion for the work assigned by their superiors\cite{21,22}. Lau\cite{23} found that teachers who perceived the principal's trust had higher task performance and organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational self-esteem played a positive moderating role between perceived trust and organizational citizenship behavior and task performance. Liu Y found that Perceived Leader Trust, as an employee's individual cognition, has a positive impact on employees' knowledge sharing behavior and voice behavior\cite{24}. Ma E\cite{25} found that self-efficacy and psychological safety play a dual mediating role between Perceived Leader Trust and voice behavior\cite{26}. Thongpapanl N T and M Leppäniemi found that normative commitment and affective commitment play a mediating role between Perceived Leader Trust and project performance, and the mediating effect of continuous commitment has not been verified\cite{27,28}.

### 2.4 Psychological Empowerment

The effects of Psychological Empowerment on employee attitudes and behaviors include job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job engagement, and turnover intention\cite{29}. Khany explored the impact of trust and Psychological Empowerment on teacher job satisfaction. Employees with a high perception of Psychological Empowerment have higher job satisfaction\cite{30}. The four dimensions of Psychological Empowerment play a mediating role between work-related outcomes and employees' perceptions of their direct leaders\cite{31,32}. Lv M\cite{33} explored the effect of Psychological Empowerment on the relationship between trust in business organizations and employee engagement, and found that Psychological Empowerment had a moderating effect on the relationship between organizational trust and employee engagement. Employees with low perceptions of Psychological Empowerment have a stronger positive relationship between organizational trust and engagement\cite{34}. Sun Y L\cite{35} found that job meaning and self-determination in Psychological Empowerment have a positive impact on employee satisfaction and organizational commitment, work meaning has a negative impact on turnover intention, and self-efficacy has a positive impact on organizational commitment.

### 2.5 Employee Work Performance

The individual factors that affect the Employee Work Performance mainly include personality traits, experience, risk preference and so on. Early research on Employee Work Performance focused on the
individual factors of employees. Goldsmith P D found that employees' work experience has a significant impact on job performance. Employees with higher work experience tend to have stronger competencies at work, and therefore tend to have better performance. Cadsby found that risk takers are more inclined to take aggressive measures, and their performance improvement tends to be higher. Hastings R P explored the impact of personality traits on Employee Work Performance. The extraversion personality trait has a more significant effect on relationship performance, and the open personality trait has no significant effect on Employee Work Performance.

The organizational factors that affect Employee Work Performance mainly involve the leadership style, organizational culture and atmosphere of their leaders. Wang P found that proper job design can affect job autonomy, integrity, and job feedback, thereby improving Employee Work Performance. Cheng C explored the impact of organizational support on Employee Work Performance based on social exchange theory. Organizational support can positively affect Employee Work Performance, and job well-being plays a moderating role between the two. Farndale's study found that employees who Perceived Leader Trust had better performance in the organization, and had a positive impact on Employee Work Performance through emotional commitment.

3. Research Design And Data Analysis

3.1 Measurement of Research Variables

3.1.1 Measurement of Perceived Leader Trust

Drawing lessons from the references in exploring the measurement scales of employees' perceived trust, this paper divides Perceived Leader Trust into Perceived Leader Dependence and Perceived Information Disclosure, and forms a measurement questionnaire including 2 dimensions and 9 items. The specific items are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Perceived Leader Trust Measurement Items
| Dimension                      | NO. | Items                                                                                                                                 |
|-------------------------------|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Perceived Leader Dependence   | A11 | My direct leader is willing to put me in charge of projects that are important to him                                                 |
|                               | A12 | My direct leader won't worry about me doing things against him at work                                                                |
|                               | A13 | What my direct leader thinks is important, he will try to get me involved and have an impact                                          |
|                               | A14 | My direct leader would be more than willing to entrust me with key tasks                                                              |
| Perceived Information Disclosure | A21 | My direct leader is willing to share his experience on the job with me                                                                |
|                               | A22 | My direct leader is willing to tell me about mistakes he made at work                                                                   |
|                               | A23 | My direct leader is willing to share his views on some sensitive issues with me                                                        |
|                               | A24 | When I have doubts at work, my direct leader will tell me the details of the problem without reservation                                 |
|                               | A25 | My direct leader is willing to share personal life or family-related information with me                                             |

### 3.1.2 Measurement of Psychological Empowerment

Drawing on the reference\cite{46}, this paper divides Psychological Empowerment into Work Meaning, Ability, Autonomy and Influence, and forms a measurement questionnaire including 4 dimensions and 12 items. The specific items are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. Psychological Empowerment Measurement Items**
### 3.1.3 Measurement of Employee Work Performance

Drawing on Borman, Motowidlo, Yao Lixia and Tao Ting's improved Employee Work Performance scale,[47] this paper divides Employee Work Performance into Task Performance and Relationship Performance, including 2 dimensions and 11 items. The specific items are shown in Table 3.

| Dimension      | NO. | Items                                                                 |
|----------------|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Work Meaning   | B11 | My work is very meaningful to me                                      |
|                | B12 | What I do at work means a lot to me personally                        |
|                | B13 | My work is very important to me                                       |
| Ability        | B21 | I can decide for myself how my work is done                            |
|                | B22 | I can decide for myself how to do the work given to me                |
|                | B23 | At work, I have a lot of autonomy and independence                    |
| Autonomy       | B31 | I have all the skills I need to get the job done                      |
|                | B32 | I am confident that I have all the abilities to do a good job         |
|                | B33 | I am confident in my ability to get the job done                      |
| Influence      | B41 | I have a greater facilitation of what happens in the department       |
|                | B42 | I have greater control over what happens in the department            |
|                | B43 | I have a greater influence on what happens in the department          |

Table 3. Employee Work Performance Measurement Items
| Dimension                        | NO. | Items                                                                 |
|---------------------------------|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Employee Task Performance       | C11 | I rarely make the same mistakes at work                             |
|                                 | C12 | My work always meets the standards required by leader              |
|                                 | C13 | I often plan work and advance work                                  |
|                                 | C14 | My work is always productive and on time                            |
|                                 | C15 | My work performance is quite outstanding in the company            |
| Employee Relationship Performance| C21 | I work well with colleagues in a work team                         |
|                                 | C22 | I provide support and encouragement when colleagues have problems   |
|                                 | C23 | I am often enthusiastic and proactive in solving problems at work   |
|                                 | C24 | I will often take the initiative to take on additional workloads and strive for better team performance |
|                                 | C25 | When the leader is not present, I still follow his instructions to complete the work |
|                                 | C26 | I expect to be assigned or placed in challenging work               |

3.2 Research Hypothesis

3.2.1 Relationship between Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance

H₁: Perceived Leader Trust positively affects Employee Work Performance.

H₁a: Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Task Performance.

H₁b: Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Task Performance.

H₁c: Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Relationship Performance.

H₁d: Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Relationship Performance.

3.2.2 Relationship between Perceived Leader Trust and Psychological Empowerment

H₂: Perceived Leader Trust positively affects Employee Psychological Empowerment.
$H_{2a}$: Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Work Meaning.

$H_{2b}$: Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Ability.

$H_{2c}$: Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Autonomy.

$H_{2d}$: Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Influence.

$H_{2e}$: Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Work Meaning.

$H_{2f}$: Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Ability.

$H_{2g}$: Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Autonomy.

$H_{2h}$: Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Influence.

### 3.2.3 Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and Employee Work Performance

$H_3$: Psychological Empowerment positively affects Employee Work Performance.

$H_{3a}$: Work Meaning positively affects Employee Task Performance.

$H_{3b}$: Ability positively affects Employee Task Performance.

$H_{3c}$: Autonomy positively affects Employee Task Performance.

$H_{3d}$: Influence positively affects Employee Task Performance.

$H_{3e}$: Work Meaning positively affects Employee Relationship Performance.

$H_{3f}$: Ability positively affects Employee Relationship Performance.

$H_{3g}$: Autonomy positively affects Employee Relationship Performance.

$H_{3h}$: Influence positively affects Employee Relationship Performance.

### 3.2.4 Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment

$H_4$: Psychological Empowerment mediates between Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance.
$H_{4a}$: Psychological Empowerment mediates between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Task Performance.

$H_{4b}$: Psychological Empowerment mediates between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Relationship Performance.

$H_{4c}$: Psychological Empowerment mediates between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Task Performance.

$H_{4d}$: Psychological Empowerment mediates between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Relationship Performance.

### 3.3 Descriptive Statistical Analysis

The survey objects selected in this paper are mainly employees of different enterprises. They come from different industries and regions, and there are certain differences in positions and working years in the enterprise, which makes the sample have strong reliability and richness. This paper distributed a total of 317 questionnaires in August 2021, and collected a total of 308 sample questionnaires, with a sample recovery rate of 97.2%. After removing 21 invalid questionnaires, 287 questionnaires were obtained, and the recovery rate of valid sample questionnaires was 90.5%. The specific information is shown in Table 4.

It can be seen from Table 4 that there is little difference between male and female ratios (52.96% vs 47.04%). In terms of age, 94.08% of employees are under the age of 40. This is because most of the employees in the current corporate environment are around 20-40 years old, so the number of questionnaires is the largest. From the perspective of educational background, the proportion of "undergraduate" is the largest (49.48%), followed by "master" (35.19%), with a higher degree of education. The higher percent of masters is because the sample includes more MBA. From the work distribution, most of the samples are "General Employee" (58.54%). From the perspective of working age distribution, there are more samples of "1-3 years" and "4-6 years", accounting for 48.08% and 30.31% respectively. Among them, the proportion of "Private Enterprise" is the largest, at 48.43%.

**Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Basic Information**
| Name          | Option                      | Frequency | Percentage(%) |
|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Gender        | Male                        | 135       | 47.04         |
|               | Female                      | 152       | 52.96         |
| Age           | <25                         | 54        | 18.82         |
|               | 26-30                       | 132       | 45.99         |
|               | 31-40                       | 84        | 29.27         |
|               | 41-50                       | 13        | 4.53          |
|               | >50                         | 4         | 1.39          |
| Education     | High school and below       | 5         | 1.74          |
|               | Junior College              | 39        | 13.59         |
|               | Undergraduate               | 142       | 49.48         |
|               | Master and above            | 101       | 35.19         |
| Position      | General Employee            | 168       | 58.54         |
|               | Grassroots manager          | 66        | 23.01         |
|               | Middle manager              | 48        | 16.72         |
|               | Senior management           | 5         | 1.73          |
| Length of service | <1 year                | 11        | 3.83          |
|                 | 1-3 years                   | 138       | 48.08         |
|                 | 4-6 years                   | 87        | 30.31         |
|                 | 7-9 years                   | 42        | 14.64         |
|                 | >10 years                   | 9         | 3.14          |
| Unit nature   | Private Enterprise          | 139       | 48.43         |
|               | State-owned enterprise      | 78        | 27.18         |
|               | Institutions                | 45        | 15.68         |
|               | Joint venture               | 21        | 7.32          |
|               | Foreign companies           | 4         | 1.39          |

**Data Availability Statement**
The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

**Ethics Declaration**

All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations.

All experimental protocols were approved by Institute of Psychology, Chinese Academy of Sciences.

Consent was obtained from all subjects and/or their legal guardian(s).

### 3.4 Reliability and Validity Analysis

#### 3.4.1 Reliability Test of Scale

(1) Reliability analysis of Perceived Leader Trust

As shown in Table 5, the CITC values of 9 items in the 2 dimensions of Perceived Leader Trust are all greater than 0.6, indicating that there is a good correlation between the items of the scale. The Cronbach's α value of Perceived Leader Dependence was 0.853, and the Cronbach's α value of Perceived Information Disclosure was 0.871, indicating that the reliability of the scale was good. Data on Perceived Leader Trust is of high quality and can be used for further analysis.

| Variable                   | Item | CITC | α coefficient | Cronbach's α |
|----------------------------|------|------|---------------|--------------|
| Perceived Leader Dependence| A11  | 0.699| 0.812         | 0.853        |
|                            | A12  | 0.684| 0.818         |              |
|                            | A13  | 0.71 | 0.807         |              |
|                            | A14  | 0.689| 0.817         |              |
| Perceived Information Disclosure | A21 | 0.651| 0.855         | 0.871        |
|                             | A22  | 0.714| 0.839         |              |
|                             | A23  | 0.73 | 0.835         |              |
|                             | A24  | 0.717| 0.839         |              |
|                             | A25  | 0.672| 0.849         |              |

(2) Reliability analysis of Psychological Empowerment
As shown in Table 6, the CITC values of 12 items of Psychological Empowerment are all greater than 0.6, indicating that there is a good correlation coefficient between the items of the scale. The Cronbach's \( \alpha \) corresponding to the 4 dimensions of Psychological Empowerment is all greater than 0.8, indicating a good level of reliability. The data reliability of Psychological Empowerment is of high quality and can be used for further analysis.

**Table 6. Reliability Analysis of Psychological Empowerment**

| Variable     | Item | CITC  | \( \alpha \) coefficient | Cronbach's \( \alpha \) |
|--------------|------|-------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Work Meaning | B11  | 0.701 | 0.790                     | 0.843                   |
|              | B12  | 0.707 | 0.784                     |                         |
|              | B13  | 0.719 | 0.772                     |                         |
| Ability      | B21  | 0.741 | 0.797                     | 0.860                   |
|              | B22  | 0.738 | 0.802                     |                         |
|              | B23  | 0.727 | 0.811                     |                         |
| Autonomy     | B31  | 0.689 | 0.753                     | 0.826                   |
|              | B32  | 0.695 | 0.746                     |                         |
|              | B33  | 0.663 | 0.779                     |                         |
| Influence    | B41  | 0.673 | 0.789                     | 0.833                   |
|              | B42  | 0.726 | 0.736                     |                         |
|              | B43  | 0.683 | 0.779                     |                         |

(3) Reliability analysis of Employee Work Performance

As shown in Table 7, the CITC values of 11 items in the two dimensions of work performance are all greater than 0.6, indicating that there is a good correlation coefficient between the items of the scale. The Cronbach's \( \alpha \) corresponding to the two dimensions of job performance is greater than 0.8, indicating a good level of reliability. The data reliability of job performance is of high quality and can be used for further analysis.

**Table 7. Reliability Analysis of Employee Work Performance**
### Variable CITC α coefficient Cronbach's α

| Variable                        | Item | CITC | α coefficient | Cronbach's α |
|---------------------------------|------|------|---------------|--------------|
| Employee Task performance       | C11  | 0.864| 0.940         | 0.951        |
|                                 | C12  | 0.868| 0.940         |              |
|                                 | C13  | 0.843| 0.944         |              |
|                                 | C14  | 0.887| 0.937         |              |
|                                 | C15  | 0.868| 0.939         |              |
| Employee Relationship performance| C21  | 0.801| 0.908         | 0.925        |
|                                 | C22  | 0.782| 0.908         |              |
|                                 | C23  | 0.782| 0.904         |              |
|                                 | C24  | 0.784| 0.908         |              |
|                                 | C25  | 0.787| 0.911         |              |
|                                 | C26  | 0.779| 0.902         |              |

### 3.4.2 Validity Test of Scale

(1) Validity analysis of Perceived Leader Trust

The KMO value and Bartlett's sphericity test results of Perceived Leader Trust are shown in Table 8. The KMO value of Perceived Leader Trust was 0.862, and the Bartlett sphericity test was significant at the 0.000 level. The sample data illustrating the variable of Perceived Leader Trust can be subjected to factor analysis.

#### Table 8. KMO and Bartlett Tests of Perceived Leader Trust

| Sampling adequacy of KMO metrics       | 0.862 |
|----------------------------------------|-------|
| Bartlett sphericity test               |       |
| Approximate chi-square                 | 812.476|
| df                                     | 36    |
| p.                                     | 0.000 |

The factor analysis results of Perceived Leader Trust are shown in Table 9 and Table 10. The total variance of the Perceived Leader Trust extraction factor is explained as 67.739%, and two dimensions are extracted by the maximum variance method in the rotation component matrix, which correspond to Perceived Leader Dependence and Perceived Information Disclosure of Perceived Leader Trust respectively. Therefore, the Perceived Leader Trust scale has good construct validity.
Table 9. Perceived Leader Trust Total Variance Explained

| Element | Initial Eigenvalue | Extract the Sum of Squares of the Load | Rotating Load Sum of Squares |
|---------|--------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|         | Total              | Variance%                              | Total                       | Variance%                                | Total   | Variance% |
| A11     | 4.088              | 45.426                                 | 4.088                       | 45.426                                   | 3.295   | 36.608    |
| A12     | 2.008              | 22.313                                 | 2.008                       | 22.313                                   | 2.802   | 31.131    |
| A13     | 0.554              | 6.155                                  |                             |                                          |         |           |
| A14     | 0.477              | 5.3                                    |                             |                                          |         |           |
| A21     | 0.437              | 4.857                                  |                             |                                          |         |           |
| A22     | 0.407              | 4.524                                  |                             |                                          |         |           |
| A23     | 0.376              | 4.179                                  |                             |                                          |         |           |
| A24     | 0.364              | 4.042                                  |                             |                                          |         |           |
| A25     | 0.288              | 3.203                                  |                             |                                          |         |           |

Table 10. Rotated Composition Matrix of Perceived Leader Trust

| Variable                     | Item | Element | 1 | 2 |
|------------------------------|------|---------|---|---|
| Perceived Leader Dependence  | A11  | 0.820   |   |
|                              | A12  | 0.835   |   |
|                              | A13  | 0.829   |   |
|                              | A14  | 0.804   |   |
| Perceived Information Disclosure | A21 | 0.774   |   |
|                               | A22  | 0.816   |   |
|                               | A23  | 0.811   |   |
|                               | A24  | 0.818   |   |
|                               | A25  | 0.783   |   |

(2) Validity analysis of Psychological Empowerment

The KMO value and Bartlett's sphericity test results of Psychological Empowerment are shown in Table 11. The KMO value for Psychological Empowerment was 0.833, and the Bartlett test of sphericity was
significant at the 0.000 level. The sample data illustrating the variables of Psychological Empowerment can be subjected to factor analysis.

Table 11. KMO and Bartlett Tests of Psychological Empowerment

| Sampling adequacy of KMO metrics | 0.833 |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| Bartlett sphericity test        |       |
| Approximate chi-square          | 1109.732 |
| df                              | 66    |
| p.                              | 0.000 |

The factor analysis results of Psychological Empowerment are shown in Table 12 and Table 13. The total variance of the Psychological Empowerment extraction factor was explained as 76.469%, and 4 dimensions were extracted by the maximum variance method in the rotation component matrix, which were the Work Meaning, Ability, Autonomy and Influence of Psychological Empowerment. Therefore, the Psychological Empowerment scale has good construct validity.

Table 12. Psychological Empowerment Total Variance Explained

| Element | Initial Eigenvalue | Extract the Sum of Squares of the Load | Rotating Load Sum of Squares |
|---------|--------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|         | Total              | Variance%                               | Total                        | Variance% | Total | Variance% |
| B11     | 4.708              | 39.232                                  | 4.708                         | 39.232    | 2.328 | 19.4      |
| B12     | 1.769              | 14.742                                  | 1.769                         | 14.742    | 2.321 | 19.341    |
| B13     | 1.506              | 12.549                                  | 1.506                         | 12.549    | 2.284 | 19.036    |
| B21     | 1.194              | 9.946                                   | 1.194                         | 9.946     | 2.243 | 18.692    |
| B22     | 0.443              | 3.688                                   |                               |           |       |           |
| B23     | 0.426              | 3.552                                   |                               |           |       |           |
| B31     | 0.384              | 3.197                                   |                               |           |       |           |
| B32     | 0.362              | 3.021                                   |                               |           |       |           |
| B33     | 0.346              | 2.882                                   |                               |           |       |           |
| B41     | 0.314              | 2.619                                   |                               |           |       |           |
| B42     | 0.292              | 2.431                                   |                               |           |       |           |
| B43     | 0.257              | 2.141                                   |                               |           |       |           |

Table 13. Rotated Composition Matrix of Psychological Empowerment
| Variable      | Item | Element |
|--------------|------|---------|
|              | 1    | 2       | 3   | 4                |
| Work Meaning | B11  | 0.836   |     |                  |
|              | B12  | 0.864   |     |                  |
|              | B13  | 0.853   |     |                  |
| Ability      | B21  | 0.840   |     |                  |
|              | B22  | 0.840   |     |                  |
|              | B23  | 0.831   |     |                  |
| Autonomy     | B31  | 0.794   |     |                  |
|              | B32  | 0.824   |     |                  |
|              | B33  | 0.833   |     |                  |
| Influence    | B41  | 0.832   |     |                  |
|              | B42  | 0.836   |     |                  |
|              | B43  | 0.835   |     |                  |

(3) Validity analysis of Employee Work Performance

The KMO value and Bartlett's sphericity test results of Employee Work Performance are shown in Table 14. The KMO value of Employee Work Performance was 0.944, and the Bartlett sphericity test was significant at the 0.000 level. The sample data illustrating the variables of Employee Work Performance can be subjected to factor analysis.

**Table 14. KMO and Bartlett Tests of Employee Work Performance**

| Sampling adequacy of KMO metrics | 0.944 |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| Bartlett sphericity test        |       |
| Approximate chi-square          | 1824.774 |
| df                              | 45    |
| p.                              | 0.000 |

The factor analysis results of Employee Work Performance are shown in Table 15 and Table 16. The total variance of the extraction factor of Employee Work Performance was explained as 80.712%, and two dimensions were extracted by the maximum variance method in the rotation component matrix, corresponding to the Employee Task Performance and Employee Relationship Performance in the Employee Work Performance. Therefore, the Employee Work Performance scale has good construct validity.
### Table 15. Employee Work Performance Total Variance Explained

| Element | Initial Eigenvalue | Extract the Sum of Squares of the Load | Rotating Load Sum of Squares |
|---------|--------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|         |                    | Total         | Variance%     | Total          | Variance%     | Total         | Variance%     |
| C11     | 6.704              | 6.704         | 67.04         | 4.181          | 41.815        |
| C12     | 1.367              | 1.367         | 13.671        | 3.89           | 38.897        |
| C13     | 0.339              | 0.339         | 3.386         |                |               |
| C14     | 0.298              | 0.298         | 2.975         |                |               |
| C15     | 0.277              | 0.277         | 2.766         |                |               |
| C21     | 0.262              | 0.262         | 2.617         |                |               |
| C22     | 0.226              | 0.226         | 2.257         |                |               |
| C23     | 0.193              | 0.193         | 1.933         |                |               |
| C24     | 0.18               | 0.18          | 1.803         |                |               |
| C25     | 0.168              | 0.168         | 1.732         |                |               |
| C26     | 0.155              | 0.155         | 1.552         |                |               |

### Table 16. Rotated Composition Matrix of Employee Work Performance
4. Regression Analysis

4.1 Regression Analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Employee Work Performance

(1) Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Employee Task Performance

Table 17 shows the results of regression analysis of Employee Task Performance on each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust. The multiple correlation coefficient between each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Task Performance is 0.663, indicating that there is a positive correlation between the variables. The coefficient of determination $R^2=0.440$ indicates that the data explanation degree of Perceived Leader Trust to Employee Task Performance is 44.0%. In the analysis of variance, $F=76.950$, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, indicating that the model is highly significant and statistically significant. In addition, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Dependence was 0.483, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Perceived Information Disclosure is 0.617, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, indicating that Perceived Leader Dependence and Perceived Information Disclosure are significantly positively correlated with Employee Task Performance. Therefore, the research hypothesis $H_{1a}$ and $H_{1b}$ hold.

Table 17. Regression Analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Employee Task Performance
Table 18 shows the regression analysis results of each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust on Employee Relationship Performance. The multiple correlation coefficient between each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Relationship Performance is 0.668, indicating that there is a positive correlation between the variables. The coefficient of determination $R^2=0.446$ indicates that the data explanation degree of Perceived Leader Trust on Employee Relationship Performance is 44.6%. In the analysis of variance, $F=78.765$, $Sig.=0.000$, indicating that the model is highly significant and statistically significant. In addition, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Dependence is 0.428, $Sig.=0.000$, and the regression coefficient of Perceived Information Disclosure is 0.494, $Sig.=0.000$, indicating that Perceived Leader Dependence and Perceived Information Disclosure are significantly positively correlated with Employee Relationship Performance. Therefore, the research hypothesis $H_{1c}$ and $H_{1d}$ hold.

### Table 18. Regression Analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Employee Relationship Performance

| Model                          | Model Summary | Variance Analysis | Unstandardized Coefficients | $t$  | $Sig.$ |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|------|--------|
|                               | $R$  | $R^2$ | $F$   | $Sig.$ | $B$  | $Std. Error$ |
| (Constant)                    | 0.427 | 0.285 | 1.501 | 0.135 |
| Perceived Leader Dependence   | 0.668 | 0.446 | 78.765 | 0.000 | 0.428 | 0.062 | 6.888 | 0.000 |
| Perceived Information Disclosure | 0.494 | 0.065 | 7.596 | 0.000 |

(3) Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Employee Work Performance

The results of the regression analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Employee Work Performance are shown in Table 19. The multiple correlation coefficient between Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance was 0.744, indicating a positive correlation between the variables. The coefficient of determination $R^2=0.554$ indicates that the data explanation degree of Perceived Leader Trust to Employee Work Performance is 55.4%.
Work Performance is 55.4%. In the analysis of variance, $F=244.646$, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, indicating that the model is highly significant and statistically significant. In addition, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Trust is 1.123, and $\text{Sig.}=0.000$ indicates that Perceived Leader Trust is significantly positively correlated with Employee Work Performance. Therefore, the research hypothesis $H_1$ holds.

Table 19. Regression Analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Employee Work Performance

| Model                  | Model Summary | Variance Analysis | Unstandardized Coefficients | $t$ | Sig. |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----|------|
|                        | $R$ | $R^2$ | $F$  | Sig. | $B$ | Std. Error |
| (Constant)             | 0.199 | 0.278 | 0.716 | 0.475 |
| Perceived Leader Trust | 0.744 | 0.554 | 244.646 | 0.000 | 1.123 | 0.072 | 15.641 | 0.000 |

4.2 Regression Analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Psychological Empowerment

(1) Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Work Meaning

The results of the regression analysis of each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust on Work Meaning are shown in Table 20. The multiple correlation coefficient between each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust and Work Meaning is 0.294, indicating that there is a positive correlation between the variables. The coefficient of determination $R^2=0.086$, $F=9.240$ and $\text{Sig.}=0.000$ in the analysis of variance, indicating that the model is highly significant and statistically significant. In addition, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Dependence is 0.254, $\text{Sig.}=0.001$, indicating that Perceived Leader Dependence is positively correlated with Work Meaning, the regression coefficient of Perceived Information Disclosure is 0.104, and $\text{Sig.}=0.184$, indicating that there is no significant relationship between Perceived Information Disclosure and Work Meaning. Therefore, the research hypothesis $H_{2a}$ holds and $H_{2e}$ does not hold.

Table 20. Regression Analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Work Meaning

| Model                        | Model Summary | Variance Analysis | Unstandardized Coefficients | $t$ | Sig. |
|------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----|------|
|                             | $R$ | $R^2$ | $F$  | Sig. | $B$ | Std. Error |
| (Constant)                   | 2.592 | 0.341 | 7.610 | 0.000 |
| Perceived Leader Dependence  | 0.294 | 0.086 | 9.240 | 0.000 | 0.254 | 0.074 | 3.408 | 0.001 |
| Perceived Information Disclosure | 0.104 | 0.078 | 1.334 | 0.184 |
(2) Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Ability

The results of the regression analysis of each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust on Ability are shown in Table 21. The multiple correlation coefficient between each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust and Ability is 0.418, indicating that there is a positive correlation between the variables. The coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.174$, indicating that the data explanation degree of Perceived Leader Trust to Ability is 17.4%. In the analysis of variance, $F = 20.705$, $\text{Sig.} = 0.000$, indicating that the model is highly significant and statistically significant. In addition, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Dependence was 0.223, $\text{Sig.} = 0.003$, the regression coefficient of Perceived Information Disclosure is 0.340, $\text{Sig.} = 0.000$, indicating that Perceived Leader Dependence and Perceived Information Disclosure are significantly positively correlated with Ability. Therefore, the research hypothesis $H_{2b}$ and $H_{2f}$ hold.

| Model | Model Summary | Variance Analysis | Unstandardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---|------|
|       | $R$ | $R^2$ | $F$ | $\text{Sig.}$ | $B$ | Std. Error |
| (Constant) | | | | | 1.762 | 0.341 | 5.166 | 0.000 |
| Perceived Leader Dependence | 0.418 | 0.174 | 20.705 | 0.000 | 0.223 | 0.074 | 2.996 | 0.003 |
| Perceived Information Disclosure | | | | | 0.340 | 0.078 | 4.371 | 0.000 |

(3) Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Autonomy

The results of regression analysis on Autonomy of each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust are shown in Table 22. The multiple correlation coefficient of each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust and Autonomy is 0.477, indicating that there is a positive correlation between the variables. The coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.228$, indicating that the data explanation degree of Perceived Leader Trust to Autonomy is 22.8%. In the analysis of variance, $F = 28.864$, $\text{Sig.} = 0.000$, indicating that the model is highly significant and statistically significant. In addition, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Dependence is 0.267, $\text{Sig.} = 0.000$; the regression coefficient of Perceived Information Disclosure is 0.363, $\text{Sig.} = 0.000$, indicating that Perceived Leader Dependence and Perceived Information Disclosure are significantly positively correlated with Autonomy. Therefore, the research hypothesis $H_{2c}$ and $H_{2g}$ hold.

| Model | Model Summary | Variance Analysis | Unstandardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---|------|
|       | $R$ | $R^2$ | $F$ | $\text{Sig.}$ | $B$ | Std. Error |
| (Constant) | | | | | 1.762 | 0.341 | 5.166 | 0.000 |
| Perceived Leader Dependence | 0.477 | 0.228 | 28.864 | 0.000 | 0.267 | 0.074 | 2.602 | 0.000 |
| Perceived Information Disclosure | | | | | 0.363 | 0.078 | 4.371 | 0.000 |
(4) Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Influence

The results of the regression analysis of Influence on each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust are shown in Table 23. The multiple correlation coefficient between each dimension of Perceived Leader Trust and Influence is 0.466, indicating that there is a positive correlation between the variables. The coefficient of determination $R^2=0.217$, indicating that the data interpretation of Perceived Leader Trust to Influence is 21.7%. In the analysis of variance, $F=27.219$, $Sig.=0.000$, indicating that the model is highly significant and statistically significant. In addition, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Dependence is 0.192, $Sig.=0.001$; the regression coefficient of Perceived Information Disclosure is 0.434, $Sig.=0.000$, indicating that Perceived Leader Dependence and Perceived Information Disclosure are significantly positively correlated with Influence. Therefore, the research hypothesis $H_{2d}$ and $H_{2h}$ hold.

### Table 23. Regression Analysis of Perceived Leadership Trust on Influence

| Model                          | Model Summary | Variance Analysis | Unstandardized Coefficients | t  | Sig. |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|----|------|
|                               | $R$ | $R^2$ | $F$ | $Sig.$ | $B$ | Std. Error |
| (Constant)                    | 1.573 | 0.322 |        | 4.887 | 0.000 |
| Perceived Leader Dependence   | 0.466 | 0.217 | 27.219 | 0.000 | 0.192 | 0.074 | 2.609 | 0.001 |
| Perceived Information Disclosure | 0.363 | 0.077 |        | 4.941 | 0.000 |

(5) Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Psychological Empowerment

The regression analysis results of Perceived Leader Trust on Psychological Empowerment are shown in Table 24. The multiple correlation coefficient between Perceived Leader Trust and Psychological Empowerment was 0.568, indicating a positive correlation between the variables. The coefficient of determination $R^2=0.323$, indicating that the data explanation degree of Perceived Leader Trust to Psychological Empowerment is 32.3%. In the analysis of variance, $F=94.010$, $Sig.=0.000$, indicating that
the model has high significance and statistical significance. In addition, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Trust is 0.545, *Sig.*=0.000, indicating that Perceived Leader Trust is significantly positively correlated with Psychological Empowerment. Therefore, the research hypothesis \( H_2 \) holds.

Table 24. Regression Analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Psychological Empowerment

| Model | Model Summary | Variance Analysis | Unstandardized Coefficients | \( t \) | \( Sig. \) |
|-------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|
|       | \( R \) | \( R^2 \) | \( F \) | \( Sig. \) | \( B \) | \( Std. Error \) |
| (Constant) | 1.852 | 0.218 | 8.512 | 0.000 | | |
| Perceived Leader Trust | 0.568 | 0.323 | 94.010 | 0.000 | 0.545 | 0.056 | 9.696 | 0.000 |

4.3 Regression Analysis of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Work Performance

(1) Regression analysis of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Task Performance

Table 25 shows the regression analysis results of each dimension of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Task Performance. The multiple correlation coefficient between each dimension of Psychological Empowerment and Employee Task Performance is 0.800, indicating that there is a positive correlation between the variables. The coefficient of determination \( R^2=0.640 \), indicating that the data explanation degree of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Task Performance is 64.0%. In the analysis of variance, \( F=86.284, \text{Sig.}=0.000 \), indicating that the model is highly significant and statistically significant. In addition, the regression coefficient of Work Meaning is 0.199, \( \text{Sig.}=0.001 \); the regression coefficient of Ability is 0.259, \( \text{Sig.}=0.000 \); the regression coefficient for Autonomy is 0.506, \( \text{Sig.}=0.000 \); the regression coefficient of Influence is 0.376, \( \text{Sig.}=0.000 \), indicating that Work Meaning, Ability, Autonomy, and Influence are positively related to Employee Task Performance. Therefore, the research hypothesis \( H_{3a}, H_{3b}, H_{3c}, H_{3d} \) hold.

Table 25. Regression Analysis of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Task Performance
Table 26 shows the regression analysis results of each dimension of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Relationship Performance. The multiple correlation coefficient of each dimension of Psychological Empowerment and Employee Relationship Performance is 0.626, indicating that there is a positive correlation between the variables. The coefficient of determination $R^2=0.392$, indicating that the data explanation degree of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Relationship Performance is 39.2%. In the analysis of variance, $F=31.332$, $Sig=0.000$, indicating that the model is highly significant and statistically significant. In addition, the regression coefficient of Work Meaning is 0.115, $Sig=0.080$, indicating that there is no significant relationship between Work Meaning and Employee Relationship Performance. The regression coefficient of Ability is 0.294, $Sig=0.000$, indicating that Ability has a significant positive correlation with Employee Relationship Performance. The regression coefficient of Autonomy is 0.097, $Sig=0.162$, indicating that there is no significant relationship between Autonomy and Employee Relationship Performance. The regression coefficient of Influence is 0.350, $Sig=0.000$, indicating that Influence is positively correlated with Employee Relationship Performance. Therefore, the research hypothesis $H_{3f}$ and $H_{3h}$ hold, but $H_{3e}$ and $H_{3g}$ do not hold.
The results of the regression analysis of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Work Performance are shown in Table 27. The multiple correlation coefficient between Psychological Empowerment and Employee Work Performance was 0.787, indicating a positive correlation between the variables. The coefficient of determination $R^2=0.620$ indicates that the data explanation degree of Psychological Empowerment to Employee Work Performance is 62.0%. In the analysis of variance, $F=320.877$, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, indicating that the model is highly significant and statistically significant. In addition, the regression coefficient of Psychological Empowerment is 1.240, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, indicating that Psychological Empowerment is significantly positively correlated with Employee Work Performance. Therefore, the research hypothesis $H_3$ holds.

Table 27. Regression Analysis of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Work Performance

| Model                  | Model Summary | Variance Analysis | Unstandardized Coefficients | $t$   | $\text{Sig.}$ |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------|---------------|
| (Constant)             |               |                   |                            |       |               |
| Work Meaning           | 0.626         | 0.392             | 31.332                     | 0.000 |               |
| Ability                | 0.294         | 0.068             |                            | 4.344 | 0.000         |
| Autonomy               | 0.097         | 0.069             |                            | 1.403 | 0.162         |
| Influence              | 0.350         | 0.063             |                            | 5.521 | 0.000         |

5. Analysis Of The Mediating Effect Of Psychological Empowerment

In this paper, the independent variable is $X$, the dependent variable is $Y$, and the mediating variable is $M$ to construct a Psychological Empowerment Mediation Model. The specific situation is shown in Figure 1.

**Step 1**: Exploring whether the regression analysis coefficient $a$ of $X$ to $M$ is significant. If it is not significant, stop the mediation test; if it is significant, go to **Step 2**.
Step 2: Explore whether the regression analysis coefficient $b$ of $Y$ to $M$ is significant. If it is not significant, stop the mediation test; if it is significant, go to Step 3;

Step 3: Introducing $X$ and $M$ into the regression equation to explore the combined effect of $X$ and $M$ on $Y$. If the regression coefficient $c$ of $X$ and the regression coefficient $d$ of $M$ are both significant, it means that $M$ plays a partial mediating role. If the regression coefficient $c$ of $X$ is significant, the regression coefficient $d$ of $M$ is not significant, indicating that $M$ plays a complete mediating role. If the regression coefficient $c$ of $X$ is not significant, a Sobel test is required. If the Sobel test is significant, it means that $M$ plays a partial mediating role; if the Sobel test is not significant, it means that there is no mediating effect.

5.1 Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Task Performance

As shown in Table 28:

Model 1: Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Dependence on Employee Task Performance. $R^2=0.263$, $F=70.356$, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Trust is 0.679 ($\text{Sig.}=0.000$), and the regression effect is significant.

Model 2: Regression analysis of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Task Performance. $R^2=0.616$, $F=316.535$, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Psychological Empowerment is 1.360 ($\text{Sig.}=0.000$), and the regression effect is significant.

Model 3: Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Dependence and Psychological Empowerment on Employee Task Performance. $R^2=0.653$, $F=184.093$, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Psychological Empowerment is 1.200, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Dependence is 0.280, and the significance level has not changed.

The above results suggest that Psychological Empowerment plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Task Performance, so hypothesis $H_{4a}$ holds.

Table 28. Test of the Mediating Effect of Psychological Empowerment between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Task Performance
### 5.2 Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Relationship Performance

As shown in Table 29:

Model 1: Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Dependence on Employee Relationship Performance. 
\[ R^2 = 0.282, \quad F = 77.513, \quad Sig. = 0.000, \]  
the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Dependence is 0.586 (\( Sig. = 0.000 \)), and the regression effect is significant.

Model 2: Regression analysis of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Relationship Performance.  
\[ R^2 = 0.366, \quad F = 113.832, \quad Sig. = 0.000, \]  
the regression coefficient of Psychological Empowerment was 0.873 (\( Sig. = 0.000 \)), and the regression effect was significant.

Model 3: Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Dependence and Psychological Empowerment on Employee Relationship Performance.  
\[ R^2 = 0.455, \quad F = 81.764, \quad Sig. = 0.000, \]  
the regression coefficient of Psychological Empowerment is 0.665, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Dependence is 0.365, and the significance level has not changed.

The above results indicate that Psychological Empowerment plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Relationship Performance, so hypothesis \( H_{4b} \) holds.
Table 29. Test of the Mediating Effect of Psychological Empowerment between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Relationship Performance

| Regression Model | Variance Analysis | Coefficient Analysis |
|------------------|------------------|----------------------|
|                  | $R^2$ | $F$ | Sig. | $B$ | Sig. |
| X = Perceived Leader Dependence; M = Psychological Empowerment; Y = Employee Relationship Performance |
| Model 1: X$\rightarrow$Y | 0.282 | 77.513 | 0.000 | 0.586 | 0.000 |
| Model 2: M$\rightarrow$Y | 0.366 | 113.832 | 0.000 | 0.873 | 0.000 |
| Model 3: X and M$\rightarrow$Y | M$\rightarrow$Y | 0.455 | 81.764 | 0.000 | 0.665 | 0.000 |
| Model 3: X and M$\rightarrow$Y | X$\rightarrow$Y | | | 0.365 | 0.000 |

Conclusion: Psychological Empowerment plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Relationship Performance.

5.3 Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Task Performance

As shown in Table 30:

Model 1: Regression analysis of Perceived Information Disclosure on Employee Task Performance. $R^2=0.322$, $F=93.482$, Sig.$=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Trust is 0.786 (Sig.$=0.000$), and the regression effect is significant.

Model 2: Regression analysis of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Task Performance. $R^2=0.616$, $F=316.535$, Sig.$=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Psychological Empowerment is 1.360 (Sig.$=0.000$), and the regression effect is significant.

Model 3: Regression analysis of Perceived Information Disclosure and Psychological Empowerment on Employee Task Performance. $R^2=0.660$, $F=190.472$, Sig.$=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Psychological Empowerment is 1.156, the regression coefficient of Perceived Information Disclosure is 0.333, and the significance level has not changed.

The above results indicate that Psychological Empowerment plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Task Performance, so hypothesis $H_{4c}$ holds.
Table 30. Test of the Mediating Effect of Psychological Empowerment between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Task Performance

| Regression Model | Variance Analysis | Coefficient Analysis |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
|                  | $R^2$             | $F$                 | $Sig.$  | $B$     | $Sig.$  |
| $X \rightarrow Y$ | 0.322             | 93.482              | 0.000   | 0.786   | 0.000   |
| $M \rightarrow Y$ | 0.616             | 316.535             | 0.000   | 1.360   | 0.000   |
| $X$ and $M \rightarrow Y$ | 0.660             | 190.472             | 0.000   | 1.156   | 0.000   |
| Conclusion       |                   |                     |         | 0.333   | 0.000   |

Psychological Empowerment plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Task Performance.

5.4 Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Relationship Performance

As shown in Table 31:

Model 1: Regression analysis of Perceived Information Disclosure on Employee Relationship Performance. $R^2=0.311$, $F=89.085$, $Sig.=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Trust is 0.643 ($Sig.=0.000$), and the regression effect is significant.

Model 2: Regression analysis of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Relationship Performance. $R^2=0.366$, $F=113.832$, $Sig.=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Psychological Empowerment was 0.873 ($Sig.=0.000$), and the regression effect was significant.

Model 3: Regression analysis of Perceived Information Disclosure and Psychological Empowerment on Employee Relationship Performance. $R^2=0.456$, $F=82.222$, $Sig.=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Psychological Empowerment is 0.629, the regression coefficient of Perceived Information Disclosure is 0.397, and the significance level has not changed.
The above results indicate that Psychological Empowerment plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Relationship Performance, so hypothesis $H_{4d}$ holds.

Table 31. Test of the Mediating Effect of Psychological Empowerment between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Relationship Performance

| Regression Model | Variance Analysis | Coefficient Analysis |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| $X =\text{Perceived Information Disclosure;}$; $M =\text{Psychological Empowerment;}$; $Y =\text{Employee Relationship Performance}$ | $R^2$ | $F$ | $\text{Sig.}$ | $B$ | $\text{Sig.}$ |
| Model 1: $X \rightarrow Y$ | 0.311 | 89.085 | 0.000 | 0.643 | 0.000 |
| Model 2: $M \rightarrow Y$ | 0.366 | 113.832 | 0.000 | 0.873 | 0.000 |
| Model 3: $X$ and $M \rightarrow Y$ | $M \rightarrow Y$ | 0.456 | 82.222 | 0.000 | 0.629 | 0.000 |
| | $X \rightarrow Y$ | | | 0.397 | 0.000 |

Conclusion: Psychological Empowerment plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Relationship Performance.

5.5 Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment between Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance

As shown in Table 32:

Model 1: Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Trust on Employee Work Performance. $R^2=0.554$, $F=244.646$, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Trust is 1.123 ($\text{Sig.}=0.000$), and the regression effect is significant.

Model 2: Regression analysis of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Work Performance. $R^2=0.620$, $F=320.877$, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Psychological Empowerment is 1.240 ($\text{Sig.}=0.000$), and the regression effect is significant.

Model 3: Regression analysis of Perceived Leader Trust and Psychological Empowerment on Employee Work Performance. $R^2=0.750$, $F=293.684$, $\text{Sig.}=0.000$, the regression coefficient of Psychological Empowerment is 0.847, the regression coefficient of Perceived Leader Trust is 0.662, and the significance level has not changed.
The above results indicate that Psychological Empowerment plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance, so hypothesis $H_4$ holds.

**Table 32. Test of the Mediating Effect of Psychological Empowerment between Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance**

| Regression Model | Variance Analysis | Coefficient Analysis |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| $X = \text{Perceived Leader Trust}$; $M = \text{Psychological Empowerment}$; $Y = \text{Employee Work Performance}$ | $R^2$ | $F$ | $\text{Sig.}$ | $B$ | $\text{Sig.}$ |
| Model 1: $X \rightarrow Y$ | 0.544 | 244.646 | 0.000 | 1.123 | 0.000 |
| Model 2: $M \rightarrow Y$ | 0.620 | 320.877 | 0.000 | 1.240 | 0.000 |
| Model 3: $X$ and $M \rightarrow Y$ | $M \rightarrow Y$ | 0.750 | 293.684 | 0.000 | 0.847 | 0.000 |
| | $X \rightarrow Y$ | | | | 0.662 | 0.000 |

**Conclusion**

Psychological Empowerment plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance.

**5.6 Test Results of Research Hypotheses**

A total of 28 research hypotheses are proposed in this paper, of which 25 research hypotheses are valid and 3 research hypotheses are not valid. The specific results are shown in Table 33.

The verification results show that the research hypotheses $H_{2e}$, $H_{3e}$, and $H_{3g}$ do not hold. The specific situation is as follows: Perceived Information Disclosure is not related to Employee Work Meaning; Employee Work Meaning and Employee Autonomy are not related to Employee Relationship Performance. In addition, Psychological Empowerment, as an overall mediating variable, played a partial mediating role in the testing of all mediating effects.

**Table 33. Summary of Research Hypotheses**
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| NO. | Research Hypotheses                                                                 | Test Result |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| H₁  | Perceived Leader Trust positively affects Employee Work Performance.                | Valid       |
| H₁a | Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Task Performance.          | Valid       |
| H₁b | Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Task Performance.     | Valid       |
| H₁c | Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Relationship Performance.  | Valid       |
| H₁d | Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Relationship Performance. | Valid       |
| H₂  | Perceived Leader Trust positively affects Employee Psychological Empowerment.      | Valid       |
| H₂a | Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Work Meaning.              | Valid       |
| H₂b | Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Ability.                   | Valid       |
| H₂c | Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Autonomy.                 | Valid       |
| H₂d | Perceived Leader Dependence positively affects Employee Influence.                | Valid       |
| H₂e | Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Work Meaning.         | Non-valid   |
| H₂f | Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Ability.              | Valid       |
| H₂g | Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Autonomy.             | Valid       |
| H₂h | Perceived Information Disclosure positively affects Employee Influence.            | Valid       |
| H₃  | Psychological Empowerment positively affects Employee Work Performance.            | Valid       |
| H₃a | Work Meaning positively affects Employee Task Performance.                         | Valid       |
| H₃b | Ability positively affects Employee Task Performance.                               | Valid       |
| H₃c | Autonomy positively affects Employee Task Performance.                             | Valid       |
| H₃d | Influence positively affects Employee Task Performance.                            | Valid       |
| H₃e | Work Meaning positively affects Employee Relationship Performance.                 | Non-valid   |
| H₃f | Ability positively affects Employee Relationship Performance.                      | Valid       |
| H₃g | Autonomy positively affects Employee Relationship Performance.                     | Non-valid   |
| H₃h | Influence positively affects Employee Relationship Performance.                    | Valid       |
| $H_4$ | Psychological Empowerment mediates between Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance. | Partial Mediation |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| $H_{4a}$ | Psychological Empowerment mediates between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Task Performance. | Partial Mediation |
| $H_{4b}$ | Psychological Empowerment mediates between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Relationship Performance. | Partial Mediation |
| $H_{4c}$ | Psychological Empowerment mediates between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Task Performance. | Partial Mediation |
| $H_{4d}$ | Psychological Empowerment mediates between Perceived Information Disclosure and Employee Relationship Performance. | Partial Mediation |

### 6. Conclusion

This paper explores the mechanism and influence of Perceived Leader Trust from the perspective of employees, selects Perceived Leader Trust as an independent variable, Employee Work Performance as a dependent variable, and explores the mediating role of Psychological Empowerment in Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance from the perspective of intrinsic work motivation and self-evaluation. The conclusions of this paper are as follows:

1. **Perceived Leader Trust positively affects Employee Work Performance**

   The regression coefficients of Perceived Leader Dependence and Perceived Information Disclosure on Employee Task Performance are 0.483 and 0.617; the regression coefficients of Perceived Leader Dependence and Perceived Information Disclosure on Employee Relationship Performance are 0.428 and 0.494. This result shows that employees will more actively complete the tasks assigned by their leaders because they perceive their leaders' dependence and information disclosure, and thus have better performance at work.

2. **Perceived Leader Trust positively affects employees’ Psychological Empowerment level**

   The empirical results show that Perceived Leader Trust has a positive impact on the overall Psychological Empowerment of employees. Perceived Leader Dependence has a significant positive effect on the Work Meaning, Ability, Autonomy and Influence of Psychological Empowerment, and Perceived Information Disclosure has a positive impact on employees' Ability, Autonomy and Influence. Perceived trust based on dependence and information disclosure is built on the emotional connection, interpersonal interest, and support of leaders and subordinates, while employees' perception of Psychological Empowerment is closely linked to superiors' communication and support. Therefore, Perceived Leader Trust can positively affect employees' Psychological Empowerment.

3. **Psychological Empowerment positively affects Employee Work Performance**
The empirical results show that employees' overall Psychological Empowerment has a positive impact on Employee Work Performance. Employees with high Psychological Empowerment tend to be proactive in their work, and have more input in their work, which in turn promotes employees to have higher Employee Work Performance. The four dimensions of Psychological Empowerment can positively affect Employee Task Performance, the Ability and Influence of Psychological Empowerment have a positive impact on Employee Relationship Performance, and Work Meaning and Autonomy have no significant impact on Employee Relationship Performance. The reason for this result is that Employee Relationship Performance is more dependent on the performance and influence of employees at work. However, employees' perception of Autonomy emphasizes the degree of employees' self-determination of work, which is not much related to Employee Relationship Performance.

(4) Psychological Empowerment plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Leader Trust and Employee Work Performance

Psychological Empowerment, as a whole, plays a partial mediating role between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Task Performance, and partially mediates between Perceived Leader Dependence and Employee Relationship Performance. When employees feel the trust of their leaders, their Employee Work Performance is positively affected, and the effect of Perceived Leader Trust can be explained by changes in employees' Psychological Empowerment.
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Figures
Figure 1

Construction of Psychological Empowerment Mediation Model