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ABSTRACT
In present research an attempt was made to study the stress and suicidal tendency among youth of educated unemployed in relation to gender and area of residence. 120 educated unemployed youths (30 urban male, 30 rural male, 30 urban female and 30 rural female) were randomly selected. Stress measurement scale by Dr. Dilip Bhatt and Suicidal tendency scale by Dr. Rasikbhai Meghnathi were used for data collection. To analyse the data ‘t’ test was used. Results indicates that significant difference is existed between educated unemployed urban and rural male, educated unemployed urban male and urban female, urban female and rural female on stress. Significant difference is also existed between educated unemployed urban male and female, rural male and female and urban and rural females on suicidal tendency.

INTRODUCTION:
In today’s world the field of Education grew up at large scale but Employment on the basis of Education is not grow up as per the requirement. Refer to past, At present the relation of Education and Employment are day by day decaying, In today’s world Youth are facing tremendous pressure to get the expected
Employment/job and it becomes highly competitive for them. In India, Concerned to Government/ Public Sector jobs, because of provision of Reservation policy, Restriction/ Ban on new recruitments, etc. are reducing the scope of employment while refer to Employment/job in Private Sector because of worldwide recesses ion in the Industries, Banks, Financial institutions and in other sectors it reduces the scope of Employment/job and therefore, overall today's well Educated youth whether Male or Female are facting tremendous pressure and stress about their carrier.

Based on studies of the effects of unemployment, Gunnell, Platt and Hawton (2009) speculate that financial crises will lead to elevated levels of suicide, particularly among men. However, an Australian study by Berk, Dodd and Henry (2006) suggests that this effect may be limited to males up to the age of 34. Employment and financial security are factors to consider for male wellbeing.

Jakob smari, Elvar, Arason, Hafsteinn Hafsteinsson. Snorri Ingimarsson (2002). This study addressed the role of coping style in anxiety and depression of unemployed people, Two-hundered thirty-three checking at unemployment services participated.

Bartley (1996), Leino-Arjas (1999) found potential gender diffrensis in reactions to Unemployment have rarely been addressed indeed, many studies focus in on unemployment have included only man.

Hall (1992) and Arber (1991) found that the impact of unemployment on people's mental health could depend on their investment in their family responsibilities which typically have different meaning for man and women.

**OBJECTIVES:**
1. To study and compare highly educated unemployed of urban and rural male youth with regards to stress.
2. To study and compare highly educated unemployed of urban and rural female youth with regards to stress.
3. To study and compare highly educated unemployed of urban and rural male youth with regards to suicidal tendency.
4. To study and compare highly educated unemployed of urban and rural female youth with regards to suicidal tendency.

HYPOTHESES:

1. There will be no significant deference between highly educated unemployed urban and rural male youth with regards to stress.
2. There will be no significant deference between highly educated unemployed urban and rural female youth with regards to stress.
3. There will be no significant deference between highly educated unemployed urban and rural male youth with regards to suicidal tendency.
4. There will be no significant deference between highly educated unemployed urban and rural female youth with regards to suicidal tendency.

SAMPLE:

In present research 120 highly educated unemployed youths (30 urban male, 30 rural male, 30 urban female and 30 rural female) were randomly selected of Ahmadabad city.

VARIABLES:

In present research gender and area of residence is consider as independent variable. Scores of stress and suicidal tendency are consider as dependent variables.

TOOLS:

In present research following tools were used for data collection,
1. Educated unemployed youth stress scale by Dr. D.J. Bhatt and R. K. Jarsaniya
2. Suicide tendency scale by Dr. D.J. Bhatt and Rasik Meghnathi

**Educated unemployed youth stress scale**

**Suicide tendency scale**

**RELIABILITY:**

For the established the reliability co-efficient, the scale was administered to 160 subjects both males and females belonging to Urban and Rural area of Surendranagar (Age range 16 to 30 years) the split-half reliability has been calculated by odd-even method. The correlation coefficient was 0.92 which indicated the S.T.S. is highly reliable. (Index of reliability was found 0.96).

The test-retest reliability of this scale has also been calculated by administration twice of this scale on a sample of 80 subjects the reliability coefficient was r. 0.83 (index of reliability was 0.91).

**VALIDITY:**

The validy of the scale has been calculated for the crierion validity. The scale was administrated to two groups Normal (N=40) and Abnormal (N=40) in Abnormal group has been comprised the patients of depression, suicidal attempters, schizophrenia and other Neurosis diagnosed b psychiatrics the abnormal group was indicated high scores of suicide tendency than normal group on the scale.

**PROCEDURE:**

Stress measurement scale and Suicidal tendency was administered in small manageable group of participant, before this rapport was established with
each subject. After completion the data collection responses of each participants of each scale was scored by the scoring key of each scale.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

To analyze the data t-test was used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Table 1

Mean, SD and t value of Stress of various groups of highly educated unemployed youth,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Level of sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.87</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64.07</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.87</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.20</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.20</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68.27</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64.07</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68.27</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table no 1 attempt is made to find out the difference between urban and rural highly educated unemployed male youth on stress with the t test. The ‘t’ ratio of urban and rural highly educated unemployed male youth on Stress is 2.66. Which is significant at .01 level. It means urban highly educated unemployed male youth differ significantly as compared to rural highly educated male youth. It can be seen in mean score also. The mean score of urban highly educated unemployed male youth is 54.87 (SD=12.58) and mean score of rural highly educated unemployed male youth is 64.07 (SD=14.19).
The ‘t’ ratio of male and female highly educated unemployed urban youth on Stress is 2.66. Which is significant at .01 level. It means male highly educated unemployed urban youth differ significantly as compared to female highly educated urban youth. It can be seen in mean score also. The mean score of male highly educated unemployed urban youth is 54.87 (SD=12.58) and mean score of female highly educated unemployed urban youth is 62.20 (SD=12.30).

The ‘t’ ratio of urban and rural highly educated unemployed female youth on Stress is 2.10. Which is significant at .01 level. It means urban highly educated unemployed female youth differ significantly as compared to rural highly educated female youth. It can be seen in mean score also. The mean score of urban highly educated unemployed female youth is 62.20 (SD=12.30) and mean score of rural highly educated unemployed female youth is 62.20 (SD=9.92).

The ‘t’ ratio of male and female highly educated unemployed rural youth on Stress is 1.33. Which is not significant. It means male highly educated unemployed rural youth do not differ significantly as compared to female highly educated rural youth. It can be seen in mean score also. The mean score of male highly educated unemployed rural youth is 64.07 (SD=14.19) and mean score of female highly educated unemployed rural youth is 68.27 (SD=9.92).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suicidal tendency</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Level of sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59.07</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64.60</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Urban</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female rural</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean, SD and t value of suicidal tendency of various groups of highly educated unemployed youth,
In table no 1 attempt is made to find out the difference between urban and rural highly educated unemployed male youth on suicidal tendency with the t test. The ‘t’ ratio of urban and rural highly educated unemployed male youth on Suicidal tendency is 1.33. Which is not significant. It means urban highly educated unemployed male youth do not differ significantly as compared to rural highly educated male youth. It can be seen in mean score also. The mean score of urban highly educated unemployed male youth is 59.07 (SD=12.58) and mean score of rural highly educated unemployed male youth is 64.07 (SD=14.19).

The ‘t’ ratio of male and female highly educated unemployed urban youth on suicidal tendency is 2.14. Which is significant at .05 level. It means male highly educated unemployed urban youth differ significantly as compared to female highly educated urban youth. It can be seen in mean score also. The mean score of male highly educated unemployed urban youth is 59.07 (SD=17.45) and mean score of female highly educated unemployed urban youth is 78.33 (SD=17.36).

The ‘t’ ratio of urban and rural highly educated unemployed female youth on suicidal tendency is 2.21. Which is significant at .05 level. It means urban highly educated unemployed female youth differ significantly as compared to rural highly educated female youth. It can be seen in mean score also. The mean score of urban highly educated unemployed female youth is 68.67 (SD=17.36) and mean score of rural highly educated unemployed female youth is 62.20 (SD=16.54).

The ‘t’ ratio of male and female highly educated unemployed rural youth on suicidal tendency is 3.40. Which is significant at .01 level. It means male highly educated unemployed rural youth differ significantly as compared to female highly educated rural youth. It can be seen in mean score also. The mean score of male highly educated unemployed rural youth is 64.60 (SD=14.71) and mean score of female highly educated unemployed rural youth is 78.33 (SD=16.54).
Conclusion:

1. Male urban differ significantly as compared to male rural educated unemployed youth with regards to stress.
2. Male urban differ significantly as compared to female urban educated unemployed youth with regards to stress.
3. Female urban differ significantly as compared to female rural educated unemployed youth with regards to stress.
4. Male urban differ significantly as compared to female urban educated unemployed youth with regards to suicide tendency.
5. Female urban differ significantly as compared to female rural educated unemployed youth with regards to suicide tendency.
6. Male rural differ significantly as compared to female rural educated unemployed youth with regards to suicide tendency.
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