

PSYCHOLOGY OF STRESS RESISTANCE OF TEACHER

Irkhanova Nurjamal Abdushukurova

Samarkand temir yul technical school psychologists

Annotation

The article proposes a psychological model of teacher stress resistance. It is shown that the psychological mechanisms that ensure resistance to stress in master teachers have a constructive orientation that promotes personal and professional growth, and the existing system of mechanisms that determine the stress resistance of low-skilled teachers reflects a situational gene principle that does not relieve stress, the nature of the adaptation process that inhibits their professional and personal development.

Keywords: teachers, psychology, stress resistance, educational psychology, pedagogical activity

The research problem is defined, its relevance and novelty are substantiated, the object and subject of the research, the theoretical and practical significance of the results obtained are highlighted. The purpose and objectives of the study, its hypothesis, as well as the provisions submitted for defense are also formulated here, and a brief description of the structure and scope of the dissertation is presented.

“Stress as a systemic human reaction” examines theoretical and empirical work carried out within the framework of the phenomenology of stress, and carries out a categorical analysis of the concepts: stress, mental stress state, stressful situation, resistance to mental stress. In the considered formulations of foreign authors, such as M. Arnold, N. Selye, C. Ulrich, C. N. Coter, stress is largely presented as a hormonal syndrome, however, its understanding as a nonspecific reaction of the body has been included in the definitions of researchers seeking to identify the psychological essence of this phenomena. From these positions, stress is considered, for example, as nonspecific physiological and mental manifestations of adaptive activity under the influence of any factors significant for the body (L.A. Kitaev-Smyk), or as a nonspecific reaction to a situation requiring functional restructuring of the body (L.P. Grimak).



Close to these definitions is the idea of stress as extreme mental tension (M.I. Dyachenko et al., N.I. Naenko), which can be expressed in the disintegration of behavior and activity up to the appearance of a neuro-emotional breakdown.

In some cases, they talk about information stress, which arises in situations of information overload (V.A. Bodrov, A.A. Oboznov, P.S. Turzin) and emotional stress, which manifests itself in situations of threat, danger, resentment, etc. (F.E. Vasilyuk, B.A. Vyatkin, R. Lazarus, V.V. Suvorova, K.V. Sudakov).

The main unifying idea of the behavioristic, interactionist, transactionist, psychoanalytic and domestic psychological points of view on the nature of stress presented in the work is the proposition that stress can have different effects on human behavior - from improving activity to its disorganization, both increasing adaptive capabilities and decreasing human adaptability to the environment.

In accordance with the systems approach, stress is studied from the perspective of physiological, psychological and behavioral levels. One of the first such attempts was made by R.S. Lazarus (1967), who emphasized that the distinctive features of psychological stress are that it is caused by mental stimuli that are assessed as threatening.

That is, the development of psychological stress is possible without the material presence of its source. In this regard, the work examines two directions in the psychology of stress - objectivist (L. Levi, 1974; A. Fishman, 1983; I. Udris, 1982; T. Cox, 1981; etc.) and subjectivist (S. Breznitz, 1983; N. Endler, 1989; A. Lehtonen, 1982;

Both approaches, along with their disadvantages, also have their advantages, but from the point of view of stress management, in our opinion, the more productive is the subjectivist direction, which carries the beginning that can be used in psychocorrectional practice.

The constructive combination of two approaches in understanding stress was demonstrated by L.A. Kitaev-Smyk (1983), noting that stress is a pluricausal syndrome. Following V.A. Ganzen, E.P. Ilyin and V.I. Medvedev, we understand stress as a holistic response of the individual to external and internal stimuli, aimed at achieving a useful result. In this regard, the work presents an analysis of the process of social adaptation of the individual. Most authors of personological theories believe that personality is a plastic formation, to one degree or another



capable of adaptation. In many concepts of personality (G. Allport, N. Eysenck, K. Jung), adaptation mechanisms perform an integrating, system-forming function.

A comparison of personal concepts showed that one of the leading factors of maladjustment, as in the process of stress genesis, is the cognitive factor, described by such concepts as the structuring of the personal space and the rigidity of the structure of the "I" (K. Levin, K. Jung, H.S. Sullivan), cognitive unrepresentation of the situation (N. Thomae), irrational beliefs and feelings (E. Fromm). N.A. Miloslavova (1975) believes that the process of social adaptation can act not only as an objective mechanism of adaptation, adjustment to the social environment (passive adaptation of someone to something), but also as a mechanism of subjective activity aimed at adapting the individual to certain norms, standards, measures (active adaptation by someone to someone).

A.A. Rean also points out the active nature of the mechanism of social adaptation when analyzing the types of adaptation process. He states that "simply passive acceptance of the value orientations of the environment without active self-change cannot exist if we are really talking about the process of adaptation." Summarizing the above opinions of the above authors, we can conclude that behind the adaptive activity of social and professional adaptation we can see the transformative nature of this activity, which is characteristic only of the highest level of organization of the biosystem - man.

Moreover, its transformative effect can be directed both outside and at restructuring the personal structure. Such transformative activity, in our opinion, brings together the social, psychological, physiological and general biological aspects of the concepts of the general adaptation syndrome - stress and adaptation.

Adaptation and stress are expressed in specific discrete manifestations of a person as an individual and a subject of activity, in connection with which the work carried out an analysis reflecting different points of view on the nature of the "stressful state" and its types (L.M. Abolin, 1987; B.A. Vyatkin, 2000; L.Y. Ganzen, V.N. Denisov, 1992; Kulikov, 1999; N.D. Makhnach, 1995; N.I. Naenko, 1979; Nekrasova, 1994; G.S. Nikiforov, 1996; A.S. Suntsova, 1996; N. Basowits at.el., 1955; What is common in the studies reviewed is the understanding of the mental state as an active holistic mental formation, which represents a reaction (or reflection) by an individual of a situation considered as a complex of external and internal conditions of human life.



An adequate understanding of the mental state of an individual outside a specific life situation is impossible, since an inextricable connection is found between a person and the conditions of his life.

In the most general form, a life situation is understood as a natural segment of social life, determined by the people involved in it, the place of action, the essence of the activity, etc. (E.Yu. Korzhova, 1997). According to A.S. Suntsova (1997), in psychology two main directions towards understanding the situation can be distinguished. In the first approach, the situation is interpreted as external conditions for the course of life at a certain stage (Magnusson D., 1983; Fergusson L., 1952; Mischel W., 1984, etc.).

The second approach carries the idea of a situation as a system of subjective and objective elements that are combined in life activity (Shibutani T., 1969; Thomae N., 1988). In this regard, objective and subjective situations are distinguished depending on the predominant role of external circumstances or personality. Currently, psychologists tend to adhere to the model of personal-situational interaction in the determination of mental stress states. There is a mediating factor between the external cause - the stress genetic situation and the stressful state of the individual.

According to E.P. Ilyin (1980,2001), a certain threshold duration and intensity of exposure to any factor (stressogen) is necessary for the development of a particular stress state. The value of this threshold determines a person's resistance to the development of unfavorable (stressful) conditions. From a dialectical point of view (N.A. Bernstein, 1991, 1997; N.A. Podymov, 1999), sustainability is considered as a dynamic characteristic of phenomena and processes of the material world, as an inseparable side of development, in turn, "development" appears as a unity stability and variability, equilibrium and nonequilibrium states.

Sustainability, unlike conservation, is active in nature, i.e. expresses, as V.M. notes. Genkowska (1990) "... the moment of resistance that a given system exhibits to external influences." B.C. Preobrazhensky (1983) defines system stability as not only the ability to return to its original state after the cessation of impact, but also the ability to experience external influences without destruction. In the works of leading psychologists L.I. Antsifirova, L.S. Vygotsky, L.G. Dikoy, B.F. Lomova, V.A. Ponomarenko, V.E. Chudnovsky and others, stability and maturity of



personality are associated with a person's ability to focus on certain goals, with the nature of the time perspective, and the organization of one's activities.

LITERATURES

1. Баранов А.А. Стрессоустойчивость и мастерство педагога. Ижевск: Изд-во Удмуртского университета, 1997. 108 с. (6,04 п.л.)
2. Баранов А.А. Психология адаптации личности. СПб.: «Медицинская пресса», 2002. (В соавторстве с А.А.Реаном и А.Р.Кудашевым) 352 с. (авт. 7,3 п.л.)
3. Баранов А.А. Стресс-толерантность педагога: теория и практика. Москва Ижевск. Изд-во «АСТ», 2002. 422 с. (24,87 п.л.)

