This paper highlights that depowerment of women is linked to the belief and practice of patriarchy which subjugates women at various levels – political, economic, social, and cultural. Patriarchy is a social and ideological construct which considers men (who are the patriarchs) as superior to women. Patriarchy imposes masculinity and femininity character stereotypes in society which strengthen the iniquitous power relations between men and women. Feminism is an awareness of patriarchal control, exploitation, and oppression at the material and ideological levels of women’s labour, fertility and sexuality, in the family, at the place of work, and in the society in general, and conscious action by women and men to transform the present situation. Overcoming the belief and practice of patriarchy is termed as eve empowerment.

This paper distinguishes between eve empowerment and psychological empowerment. While the former (eve empowerment) is contextual in nature, the latter (psychological empowerment) is a motivational construct. If conditions favouring eve empowerment make a woman experience empowerment, then it is termed as psychological empowerment. Both these variables are linked to general well-being, which is defined as a state which allows individuals to realize their abilities, cope with the normal stresses of life, work productively and fruitfully, and make a contribution to their community.

The findings indicate that by countering patriarchy, women experience greater eve empowerment and psychological empowerment. The results also show that education level of women had no impact on eve empowerment. This is the reason why there are depowered women even among the educated middle class and upper classes of the society. This finding has important implication for agencies, institutions and the state that are using education as a medium of change and empowerment. The empowerment at the workplace and at home seems to have a spillover effect as both moderate the relation of eve empowerment and general well-being. Deep level impact on social transformation will take place only when the concept of patriarchy is shaken and conditions supporting eve empowerment are created for women to experience psychological empowerment. The limitation of the study was that it was carried out in a patriarchal society. It should also be compared with a similar survey among the matriarchal societies and from all strata of society to make it more representative. The findings can form the basis for improving affirmative action within the organizations.
Empowerment of women has been an area of study for quite some time in the past. Studies on empowerment of women have focused on factors like autonomy (Dyson & Moore, 1983; Basu & Basu, 1991; Jejeebhoy & Sathar, 2001), women’s land rights (Quisumbing, Ellen, Aidoo, & Keijiro, 1999), domestic economic power (Mason 1998), bargaining power (Beegle, Frankenberg, & Thomas, 1998; Hoddinott & Haddad 1995; Quisumbing & de la Briere, 2000; Agarwal 1997; Beegle et al., 1998; Pulerwitz, Gortmaker, & DeJong, 2000), gender equality, and countering gender discrimination (World Bank 2001a & 2000b; Mason,1998, Mason & Smith, 2000). All these studies focused on depowerment of women from perspectives like social or economic and the efforts made to create empowerment. This paper tries to highlight the point that depowerment of women is linked to the belief and practice of patriarchy which subjugates women at various levels – political, economic, social, and cultural. Overcoming the belief and practice of patriarchy is termed as eve empowerment in this paper. The paper also distinguishes between eve empowerment and psychological empowerment. While the former (eve empowerment) is contextual in nature, the latter (psychological empowerment) is a motivational construct. Both these variables are linked to the experience of general well-being.

THE CONCEPT OF PATRIARCHY

Patriarchy is a social and ideological construct which considers men (who are the patriarchs) as superior to women. According to Walby (1990), it is a social system in which the role of the male as the primary authority figure is central to social organization, and where males hold authority over women, children, and property. Patriarchy imposes masculinity and femininity character stereotypes in society which strengthen the iniquitous power relations between men and women.

According to Walby (1990), patriarchy is composed of six factors which are sources of exploitation and are interdependent in nature. They are the household, paid employment, the state, male-on-female violence, sexuality, and cultural institutions. The household refers to domestic environment where the housewife and her contribution in running the home are under-valued and looked down upon. Domestically, the husband is the expropriating class. Paid employment describes patriarchal relations on the job and refers to women being granted worse jobs and being paid less than a man for the same job. The state as an instrument of patriarchy refers to the state’s support to its patriarchal, racist, and capitalist interests by choosing not to intervene or being slow in intervening in cases of injustice against women. The male-on-female violence is the ill-treatment (violence and discrimination) being meted out to women as a consequence of belief in inferiority and subjugation of women. Often it results in violence against women which is systematically endured and tolerated by the society and also by the state’s refusal to intervene against it. Sexuality means that in a patriarchal setup, heterosexuality is and should be the norm. Other sexual preferences are seen as violation of patriarchal norms and therefore liable to be punished by society. It justifies the objectification of women and the male gaze and women being perceived as instruments of male gratification. Lastly, the cultural institutions represent the patriarchal relations in cultural institutions and regulate the behaviour of women in public places. For example, their dress code in public places, and free movement in society.

Historically, the principle of patriarchy has been central to the social, legal, political, and economic organization of many ancient civilizations like Hebrew, Greek, Roman, Indian, and Chinese cultures (Weitz, 2003).

The nature of control and subjugation of women varies from one patriarchal society to the other. Therefore, patriarchy is not a constant and gender relations which are dynamic and complex have changed over the periods of history.

Patriarchy and Indian Society

While in ancient India (Vedic and Epic period), women were by and large treated as equal to men, restrictions on women and patriarchal values regulating women’s sexuality and mobility got strengthened in the post-vedic period (Brahmanical and Medieval period). Legends highlighting the self-sacrificing, self-effacing, and pure women were widely popular. Role of women as a faithful wife and devout mother was widely acknowledged (Desai & Krishnaraj, 2004). Laws of Manu also espoused feminine subjugation (Chakravarti, 2006; Chaudhuri, 2004). In an Indian patriarchal family, the birth of male child is
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preferred to that of a female. The former is considered as the inheritor of the family while the latter is considered as ‘paraya dhan’, other’s property (Uberoi, 2005). Family plays an important role in creating a hierarchical system (Lerner, 1986; Bhasin, 1993; Bhasin & Khan 1999). The stereotypes of masculinity and femininity through socialization are internalized by both men and women.

Patriarchy and Caste System

Caste and gender are closely related and sexuality of women is directly linked to the question of purity of race (Desai & Krishnaraj, 2004; Altekar 1962; Chakravati, 2006).

Feminism and Eve Empowerment

Feminism is an awareness of patriarchal control, exploitation, and oppression at the material and ideological levels of women’s labour, fertility, and sexuality, in the family, at the place of work, and in the society in general, and conscious action by women and men to transform the present situation (Bhasin & Khan, 1999). This laid the foundation of eve empowerment.

According to Humm (1995) and Walker (1992), the history of feminism can be divided into three waves. These three waves of feminism also created different branches of feminism. The first wave focused on inequalities like gaining women’s suffrage (the right to vote) and civil and political rights. Among other things, it won legal rights concerning education, and the right to annul a marriage through divorce (Andersen, 2006; Southard, 2007; 2009; Therborn, 2004; Auður Leiknisdóttir & Sigurhansdóttir, 2003). The first wave created the Liberal (Walby, 2002), the Marxist (Engels, 1948), and the Socialist (Mandell, 1995; Millet 1970; Walby, 1990) feminism. The second wave addressed a wide range of issues, including unofficial inequalities, official legal inequalities, sexuality, inequalities in the family and workplace, and reproductive rights (Leiknisdóttir & Sigurhansdóttir, 2003, Beauvoir, 1970; Butler & Scott, 1992; John, 2004). The black feminists have prioritized differences based on race and challenged the tendency within feminism to ignore it. (Mandell, 1995; Dasgupta, 1999). While sex differences are linked to biological differences between male and female, gender differences are imposed socially or even politically by constructed contrasting stereotypes of masculinity and femininity (Beauvoir, 1970; Mandell, 1995; Bhasin & Khan, 1999).

The third wave extended from the 1990s to the present. In recent years, the third wave feminists have changed the outlook with their increasing participation in science and scholarships which seems to have succeeded in involving them in political organizations and issues (Porgerður Einardóttir, 2001; Andermahr, Lovell, & Wolkowitz, 2000). The new field of studies on women is called ‘gender studies’ which emphasizes that, women can be seen as something other than sexual beings and accessories (Leiknisdóttir & Sigurhansdóttir, 2003). It is a struggle to achieve equality, dignity, rights, freedom for women to control their lives and bodies both within home and outside. This belief constitutes the essence of eve empowerment. As a consequence of growing realization among educated Indian women and feminist movements, the Indian government has made legal and constitutional amendments to bring about improvement in the conditions of women.

Eve Empowerment

The word ‘to empower’ means to authorize, delegate or give legal power to someone. The feminist movements resulted in feminine conscientisation against patriarchal subjugation. Consequently, many studies were carried out studying empowerment in general and women’s empowerment in particular (Kandiyoti, 1988; Mehr, 1997; Kabeer, 2001). Empowerment studies at the macro level focused on social inclusion. The growth of the civil society and participatory development methods at macro levels were proposed as mechanisms by which social inclusion and therefore, empowerment could take place (Friedmann 1992; Chambers 1997; Narayan, Chambers, Shah, & Petesch, 2000). For women, it meant gaining control of their lives in relation to family, community, and society (Jejeebhoy 2000). Based on all the studies on women upliftment, eve empowerment is defined as the ‘gradual emancipation of women from the patriarchal mindset, belief system, and behaviour in the six dimensions of patriarchy’ identified by Walby (1990). The six structures are: (a) the household (b) paid employment (c) the state (d) male-on-female violence (e) sexuality and (f) cultural sphere.

In modern India, the government is laying emphasis on the education of the girl child and on the economic em-
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powerment of women. Since education influences socialization and adoption of modern values, it is logical to hypothesize that education and employment of women will increase eve empowerment. Modern India is also witnessing the rise of nuclear families. It is the result of men and women moving out of parental home in search of employment. This trend reduces the control of the family patriarch on women leading to weakening of the practice of patriarchy. It can thus be predicted that nuclear families will lead to increased eve empowerment.

Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

\[ H_1: \text{Higher education, employment of women, and creation of nuclear families is positively associated with high eve empowerment.} \]

**Psychological Empowerment in the Household and at Workplace**

An empowered woman believes that she can adequately cope with events, situations, and/or the people she confronts. Empowerment as a construct has the notion of power embedded in it. Power in this motivational sense refers to an intrinsic need for self-determination (Deci, 1975) or a belief in personal self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986). Under this conceptualization, power has its base within an actor’s motivational disposition. Any strategy or technique that strengthens this self-determination need or self-efficacy belief of people will make them feel more powerful. Conversely, any strategy that weakens the self-determination need or self-efficacy belief of people will increase their feelings of powerlessness. This experience of empowerment is termed as psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995). It is defined as complex construct composed of four variables: meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact (Hackman & Oldham, 1980).

Meaning involves a fit between the requirements of one’s role and one’s beliefs, values, and behaviours (Brief & Nord, 1990). Competence or self-efficacy is a belief in one’s capability to perform work activities with skill (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Self-determination is a sense of choice in initiating and regulating actions (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Bell & Staw, 1989; Spector 1986). Impact (Martinko & Gardner, 1982) is the degree to which one can influence the strategic, administrative, and operative outcomes at work (Ashforth, 1989). According to Spreitzer (1995), together, these four cognitions reflect an active, rather than a passive orientation to a work role. Active orientation means one in which an individual feels able to and has choice to shape his or her role or context.

Patriarchal beliefs and practices de-power women. Women feel powerless when they believe they are unable to cope with the physical and social demands of the environment. As discussed earlier, empowerment initiatives by the feminist movements, the state, and non-governmental organizations (NGO) may create conditions favouring eve empowerment (lessening of belief and practice of patriarchy). But the women still may not necessarily feel empowered. For example, a woman may have the freedom to move around and earn a livelihood but may not have control over the money earned by her. It could be still managed by the patriarchs in the family. Therefore, there is a distinction between creating conditions conducive for empowerment and experience of empowerment. The favourable conditions created for empowerment are present in the environment and are external to the woman (termed as eve empowerment). If conditions favouring eve empowerment make a woman experience empowerment, then it is termed as psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995). Psychological empowerment is a motivational construct and is present within the individual.

Since eve empowerment is a measure of overcoming patriarchal beliefs and practices, it would enable women to experience control and choice on domestic matters. In this study, psychological empowerment in the home-front refers to experience of components of psychological empowerment (meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact) related to household work and activities. Therefore, it is safe to assume that eve empowerment will lead to experience of psychological empowerment in the home-front. According to Spreitzer (1995), there are some assumptions about the definition of psychological empowerment. First, empowerment is not an enduring personality trait generalizable across all situations, but rather, a set of cognitions shaped by work environment (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Second, empowerment is a continuous variable; people can be viewed as more or less empowered, rather than empowered or not empowered. Third, empowerment is not a global construct generalizable across different life situations and roles but specific to work/activities. The first and third assumptions given by Spreitzer (1995) support the argument given above about eve empowerment creating the context for the experience of psychological empowerment to be ex-
experienced at home.

Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

\[ H2: \text{Eve empowerment (or countering of patriarchy) increases the experience of psychological empowerment in the household sphere of women.} \]

The dimensions of eve empowerment include factors like economic, cultural, and social empowerment. Thus, it will also create the context for women to experience psychological empowerment at workplace.

Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

\[ H3: \text{Eve empowerment (or countering of patriarchy) increases the experience of psychological empowerment in the workplace sphere of women.} \]

According to the second assumption of Spreitzer, (1995), empowerment is a continuous variable. People can be viewed as more or less empowered, rather than empowered or not empowered. Therefore if the actor (the woman in this case) experiences more or less empowerment in the home front and in the workplace or vice versa due to the contextual variable of eve empowerment, it would influence psychological empowerment levels at both situations. This means that it is possible that psychological empowerment in the home-front can moderate the effect of eve empowerment on psychological empowerment in the workplace. Similarly, psychological empowerment in the workplace can moderate the relationship of eve empowerment and psychological empowerment in the home-front.

Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

\[ H4: \text{Psychological empowerment in the home-front will have a moderating effect on the relationship of eve empowerment and psychological empowerment in the workplace.} \]

\[ H5: \text{Psychological empowerment at workplace will have a moderating effect on the relationship of eve empowerment and psychological empowerment in the home-front.} \]

General Mental Well-Being (GWB)

The concept of General Well-Being (GWB) was developed by Dupuy (1970). It assesses self representations of subjective well-being and distress. The World Health Organization while declaring positive mental health to be the foundation for well-being and effective functioning for both the individual and the community, defined it as a state which allows individuals to realize their abilities, cope with the normal stresses of life, work productively and fruitfully, and make a contribution to their community. It is a complex construct, covering both affect and psychological functioning with two distinct perspectives: the hedonic perspective, which focuses on the subjective experience of happiness and life satisfaction, and the eudaimonic perspective, focusing on psychological functioning and self-realization (Ryan & Deci, 2001).

It deals with what we are after in life, what we consider to be desirable, and what gives our lives direction — engaging in eudaimonic pursuits, or simply eudaimonia. It means being motivated and committed to use and develop the best in oneself, in a way that is congruent with one’s true self, and it includes concepts such as striving for excellence, acting with virtue, and having concerns beyond self and the immediate moment. Engaging in hedonic pursuits, or hedonia, means seeking personal pleasure, enjoyment, and comfort, whether through physical means or emotional-cognitive means, such as enjoyment of social interaction or art (Huta, 2012). Thus eudaimonia and hedonia are the two main ways through which people seek well-being in life (Ryan & Deci, 2001). A study by Karatzias, Chouliara, Power, & Swanson (2006) showed that general well-being was related to self-esteem and affectivity.

GWB contains 18 items that are combined to produce a general indicator of well-being and six subscales, namely anxiety, depression, positive well-being, self-control, vitality, and general health. It is used primarily in large, population-based studies (Dupuy, 1978; Fazio, 1977; Jonas Franks, & Ingram, 1997; McDowell & Newell, 1987). All the items consider the past month as the time frame of interest.

Since eve empowerment is aimed at countering patriarchy, it is assumed that it will also lead to higher self-esteem and affectivity.

Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

\[ H6: \text{Eve empowerment (or countering of patriarchy) increases the experience of psychological empowerment in the household sphere of women.} \]

\[ H7: \text{Eve empowerment (or countering of patriarchy) increases the experience of psychological empowerment in the workplace sphere of women.} \]

\[ H8: \text{Eve empowerment (or countering of patriarchy) increases the experience of psychological empowerment in the workplace sphere of women.} \]

\[ H9: \text{Psychological empowerment in the home-front will have a moderating effect on the relationship of eve empowerment and psychological empowerment in the workplace.} \]

\[ H10: \text{Psychological empowerment at workplace will have a moderating effect on the relationship of eve empowerment and psychological empowerment in the home-front.} \]
**H6:** Eve empowerment will lead to general well-being.

Since empowerment leads to the experience of sense of choice and self-efficacy, it is logical to assume that it will have a positive effect on the well-being. A study on the association between GWB and personality in adolescents has also shown that there is a high association between self-esteem and GWB (Huebner, et al., 2004). Similarly, a study by McCullough, Huebner, and Laughlin (2000), established the association between well-being and positive affectivity. Since psychological empowerment is linked to positivity and self-esteem, it can safely be assumed that psychological empowerment will influence the relationship between eve empowerment and GWB.

Therefore it is hypothesized that:

**H7:** Psychological empowerment (at workplace and home-front) will moderate the relationship of eve empowerment and general well-being.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**Research Design**

Data was collected through questionnaires aimed at measuring eve empowerment (countering patriarchy), psychological empowerment both at home-front and workplace, and general well-being scales. A total of 289 responses were gathered from working women. There were 113 unmarried women and 176 married women. The sample comprised of 19 women with education up to class 12, while 270 women had graduate and post-graduate education. Of them, 194 lived in nuclear families, while 95 lived in joint families. Nuclear family was defined as households consisting of husband and wife (with or without children). Joint family was defined as households consisting of husband, and wife living with parents-in-law or uncle- or aunt-in-law along with or without children.

**RESULTS AND ANALYSIS**

The results were analysed using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). All the tables are given in Annexure 1. Tables 1-4 show factor analysis of all the scales using principal component analyses with varimax rotation and eigen value of 1.0 and above. Table 1 shows the rotated factor structure of the self-developed scale measuring eve empowerment (countering patriarchal values). The items were constructed around the six dimensions of eve empowerment. There were 35 items in all. The factor analysis showed eight factors (not six as proposed earlier) of eve empowerment. There were 35 items in all. The factor analysis showed eight factors (not six as proposed earlier) of eve empowerment. They were named as socio-cultural right, income and property right, legal right, sex and procreation right, violence & discrimination, political right, and matrimony right. Three items were deleted. Together, all the factors of eve empowerment explained 62.15 percent of cumulative variance.
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* Due to space constraint, only the eigen values and percentage of variance explained are displayed in the tables.
Table 2 shows the rotated factor structure of the psychological empowerment in the home-front. The factor structure supported the four dimensions as identified by Spreitzer (1995). It explained 71 percent of cumulative variance.

Table 3 shows the rotated factor structure of the psychological empowerment in the workplace. The dimension of self-determination and the impact loaded onto a single variable while the meaning and the competence showed distinct factor loadings. It explained 64.23 percent of cumulative variance.

Table 4 shows the rotated factor structure of the general well-being (GMB) scale. The scale did not cleanly load onto six factors as given in the original scale (Dupuy, 1975). Other studies in the past using the GWB (Dupuy, 1970) scale have also shown problems of poor factor loadings when used with non-American samples (Taylor, et al., 2003). A study (Veit & Ware, 1983) using the same scale showed hierarchical factor model composed of two factors namely psychological distress and well-being. Even from the present study, two factors emerged: positive well-being and negative well-being. It explained 44 percent of cumulative variance.

Table 5 shows the reliability of all the scales used. All the alpha values are high (> 0.80) in all the scales (Nunnally, 1978). Table 6 shows positive and significant correlation between all the variables. This means that eve empowerment has some effect on the experience of psychological empowerment in the home and workplace. It also affects the general well-being of women.

Table 7 gives the significant difference of means (t-test), between the demographic variables on all the dimensions studied. According to the results, eve empowerment is stronger in nuclear families ($M=2.70$) than in joint families ($M=2.59$) resulting in better experience of psychological empowerment in the nuclear families ($t=2.46, p<0.01$). Women belonging to nuclear families also showed higher psychological empowerment, both in the workplace ($M=3.30, t=0.56, p<0.01$) and at home ($M=2.71, t=0.56, p<0.01$). Married women (including widowed and divorced) experienced more empowerment than the unmarried women, both at home ($M=3.24, t=4.37, p<0.05$) and at workplace ($M=3.31, t=2.35, p=0.001$). General well-being was significantly higher among women from nuclear families ($M=3.87$) than that of the joint families ($M=3.62, t=0.56, p<0.05$). Education seemed to have no impact on the experience of eve empowerment and psychological empowerment.

Tables 8 and 9 give the regression and the moderated regression analyses. The results show that eve empowerment significantly influences psychological empowerment at home ($R^2=0.06, p<0.001$) and workplace ($R^2=0.03, p<0.001$). It also has a significant impact on the general well-being (GWB) of women ($R^2=0.06, p<0.001$). Psychological empowerment at workplace and home significantly influences GWB of women ($R^2=0.08, p<0.001$).

The study has also tested for the moderating influence of psychological empowerment in the home-front and workplace. The results in Table 9 show that psychological empowerment in the home front moderates the effect of eve empowerment on psychological empowerment in the workplace ($R^2=0.10, p<0.001$). On similar lines, psychological empowerment in the workplace moderates the effect of eve empowerment on psychological empowerment in the home front ($R^2=0.13, p<0.001$). The regression results support the hypotheses. The results also show that general well-being is influenced by the moderation of psychological empowerment at home ($R^2=0.11, p<0.001$) and workplace ($R^2=0.09, p<0.001$).

**DISCUSSION**

The paper is about empowerment of women and its impact on their general well-being. It highlights that women in India operate within the socio-cultural milieu of patriarchy which is depowering for women. The reasons for this depowering effect of patriarchy on women are three-fold. First, patriarchy is internalized as an ideology and expressed as *stridharma* or *pativetadharma* (duties and obligation of a woman). Second, patriarchy through the laws, customs, and rituals (prescribed by the Brahmanical social code) reinforce the concept of chastity and wife fidelity as the highest duty of women. Third, the state supports the patriarchal control over women and thus establishes patriarchy firmly not only as an ideology but as an actuality (Chakravarti, 2004). One of the objectives of the paper was to develop the concept of eve empowerment which is briefly explained as overcoming the patriarchal beliefs and practice.

The results of the study (Table 7) show that eve empowerment is higher among the working women staying in...
nuclear families than those in joint families. This is due to the fact that economic constraints of buying a bigger house, or getting jobs in a different city forces the younger couples move out of the patrilineal homes and establish their independent homes. This frees the younger women from the clutches of a patriarchal setup of parents-in-law. Therefore, they score higher on eve empowerment. The results in Table 7 also show that the psychological empowerment of married women is better than the unmarried women both at home and workplace. This shows that women have internalized the patriarchal values whereby married women are perceived as senior in stature compared to the unmarried women (Kandiyoti, 1988). Another reason for this result is pointed out by Lerner (1986) who believes that patriarchy has been a system of benevolent paternalism in which obedient women are accorded certain rights and privileges. This makes them feel more empowered. Thus family plays an important role in creating a hierarchical system also among women (Lerner, 1986; Bhasin, 1993). Therefore, the hypothesis that employment and nuclear families lead to higher eve empowerment is proved.

The results also show that education level of women has no impact on eve empowerment. This means that though it is widely claimed that education is the medium of improvement of the conditions of women, in reality it may not be the case. This is the reason why there are depowered women even among the educated middle class and upper classes of the society. The result also points out that economic independence does lead to higher eve empowerment. The implication of this finding is that any initiative by state and other institutions to enable women to get employment would make the women empowered. Therefore it can be said that the present education system is geared towards making women economically empowered but does not address the need to change the cultural values of patriarchy (increasing eve empowerment). On the contrary, it seems to maintain the status quo. Therefore, all efforts to counter patriarchy and increase eve empowerment would have an insignificant effect. This finding has important implications for agencies, institutions, and the state that are using education as a medium of change and empowerment. Perhaps, a relook at the contents of the education process and the value system of matrilineal societies would help in identifying ways of improving eve empowerment. Historically, the condition of women was very good during the Vedic period. One can look into those times and the values for eve empowerment.

The women from nuclear families also experience more of psychological empowerment at home and higher general well-being. The reason is that in such families, they get the control of running the home front which leads to an empowering experience. Thus, the second hypothesis is proved. On similar lines, when the context at the workplace gives the women freedom and control, they feel empowered. This proves the third hypothesis that eve empowerment is linked to psychological empowerment in the workplace.

Empowerment at the workplace and at home seems to have a spillover effect. This can be seen from Table 9 where psychological empowerment in the home front moderated the empowerment at workplace and vice versa. Thus, Hypotheses 4 and 5 are proved.

Psychological empowerment also moderates the relationship between eve empowerment and general well-being. This means that when there is meaningfulness in the activities performed by women and also when they think they are competent in managing the situation, they feel a sense of control and therefore feel empowered. It proves that eve empowerment is contextual in nature and creates a positive environment for experiencing empowerment (termed as psychological empowerment). The $R^2$ value improves when psychological empowerment moderates the relationship between eve empowerment and well-being. This also proves that eve empowerment is different from psychological empowerment and true empowerment of women can take place only when eve empowerment, which forms the contextual conditions of empowerment, combines with the experience of psychological empowerment, which is motivational in nature.

**IMPLICATIONS**

Organizations may introduce women-friendly policies like flexi-time, second career, removing the glass-ceiling, and reservation for women. But in the current scenario, when the society is driven by patriarchal values, the effort towards changing the condition of women will have only surface-level impact. Deep-level impact will take place only when the concept of patriarchy is shaken and conditions supporting eve empowerment are created for women to experience psychological empowerment.
LIMITATIONS

The sample size is small. Therefore the conclusions can best be seen as providing pointers. The study should be carried out on a larger sample to get more reliable conclusions. Moreover, the study was carried out in a patriarchal society. To get more clarity, it should be compared with a similar survey among the matriarchal societies. Further, the survey comprised women primarily from the middle class. Inclusion of women from the lower and upper economic strata would make the study more comprehensive.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This study can form the basis for studying the decision-making styles, leadership styles, and other organizational variables like attribution of causality and fear of failure of women coming from patriarchal and matriarchal societies and help in improving the affirmative action within the organization.

APPENDIX

Table 1: Factor Analysis of the Eve Empowerment Scale Measuring Patriarchal Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component/Dimensions</th>
<th>Socio-cultural Right</th>
<th>Income &amp; Property Right</th>
<th>Control in running the Family</th>
<th>Legal Right</th>
<th>Sex &amp; Procreation Right</th>
<th>Right against Violence &amp; Discrimination</th>
<th>Political Right</th>
<th>Matrimonial Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigen Value</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance explained</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative % of variance explained</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td>45.85</td>
<td>50.71</td>
<td>54.86</td>
<td>58.75</td>
<td>62.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization
Rotation converged in 9 iterations

Table 2: Rotated Factor Analysis of Psychological Empowerment (in the home front) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Self-determination</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigen Value</td>
<td>4.730</td>
<td>1.893</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance explained</td>
<td>39.418</td>
<td>15.773</td>
<td>9.197</td>
<td>6.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative % of variance explained</td>
<td>39.418</td>
<td>55.191</td>
<td>64.388</td>
<td>70.895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization
Rotation converged in 6 iterations

Table 3: Rotated Factor Analysis of Psychological Empowerment (in the workplace) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Impact &amp; Self-determination</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigen Value</td>
<td>4.245</td>
<td>2.224</td>
<td>1.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance explained</td>
<td>35.375</td>
<td>18.532</td>
<td>10.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative % of variance explained</td>
<td>35.375</td>
<td>53.907</td>
<td>64.225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization
Rotation converged in 6 iterations
Table 4: Rotated Factor Analysis of General Well-Being Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Positive Well-being</th>
<th>Negative Well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigen Value</td>
<td>6.281</td>
<td>1.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Variance explained</td>
<td>34.897</td>
<td>8.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative % of variance explained</td>
<td>34.897</td>
<td>43.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

Table 5: Reliability of the Scales Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eve empowerment scale</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment (home) scale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Psychological empowerment (workplace) scale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>General well-being scale</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=289

Table 6: Correlation between the Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>PEHF</th>
<th>PEWP</th>
<th>GWB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEHF</td>
<td>0.253***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEWP</td>
<td>0.175**</td>
<td>0.297***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWB</td>
<td>0.256***</td>
<td>0.255***</td>
<td>0.202**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<0.001,**p<0.01,*p<0.05

EE: Eve Empowerment; PEHF: Psychological Empowerment in Home Front; PEWP: Psychological Empowerment at Workplace; GWB: General Well-Being

Table 7: Test for all Variables and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Score Unmarried</th>
<th>Mean Score Married</th>
<th>Mean Score Widowed</th>
<th>Mean Score Working and Living in Nuclear Family</th>
<th>Mean Score Working and Living in Joint Extended Family</th>
<th>Mean Score Education Mean Score Up to Class 12</th>
<th>Mean Score Education Mean Score Graduation and Post Graduation</th>
<th>T Test</th>
<th>Education Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=113</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.46**</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment @ Home front</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>-4.37*</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.71**</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment @ Workplace</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>-2.35***</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Well-being</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.46**</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<0.001,**p<0.01,*p<0.05
**Table 8: Regression Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t values</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment in the Home-Front</td>
<td>Eve Empowerment</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4.43***</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</td>
<td>Eve Empowerment</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>3.01***</td>
<td>0.03***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Well-being</td>
<td>Eve Empowerment</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>4.49***</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological Empowerment in the Home Front</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>3.61***</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.34*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<0.001, **p<0.01, *p<0.05

**Table 9: Moderated Regression Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent and Moderating Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t values</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</td>
<td>Eve Empowerment*Psychological Empowerment in the Home Front</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>5.59***</td>
<td>0.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment in the Home Front</td>
<td>Eve Empowerment*Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>6.62***</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Wellbeing</td>
<td>Eve Empowerment*Psychological Empowerment in the Home Front</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>5.92***</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eve Empowerment*Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>5.58***</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<0.001, **p<0.01, *p<0.05
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