

TOPIC: STRESS RESISTANCE OF MANAGERS

Rozikova Nazokat

Associate Professor of the "Management in Education" Department of the Institute for the Development of Professional Education, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Pedagogical Sciences

Abstract: The decisions made by a leader will be radically different in the case of stress resistance or a sense of dependence on external circumstances. Stress resistance does not mean a complete absence of non-resource states, but, on the contrary, the ability to recognize your non-resource state and the ability to change it with the help of meditation techniques.

Key words: Leadership activity, management style, stress tolerance, stressful situations, psychological approach, stress in management, coping with stress.

INTRODUCTION

In the fast-paced business environment, managers face increasing stress due to evolving organizational demands, rapid technological changes, and external economic pressures. While stress resistance is recognized as a crucial leadership trait, existing research lacks a comprehensive analysis of its role in decision-making and long-term strategic success. This study employs a qualitative methodology, examining stress resistance through psychological and managerial lenses, focusing on coping mechanisms and their impact on leadership effectiveness. Findings reveal that stress-resistant managers exhibit higher adaptability, better decision-making capabilities, and improved organizational performance. The results highlight the importance of integrating stress management techniques, such as mindfulness and cognitive reframing, into managerial training programs. These insights contribute to the development of evidence-based strategies to enhance leadership resilience, ultimately fostering sustainable business practices.

METHODS

This study explores the stress resistance of managers by examining both external and internal factors that impact their ability to handle high-pressure environments. The research identifies a critical knowledge gap in understanding how modern stressors, such as rapid technological changes, increased information flows, and shifting managerial responsibilities, influence stress tolerance. A mixed-method approach was adopted, combining qualitative analysis of managerial experiences with quantitative assessments of stress-related variables. Key findings highlight that external factors, including legislative changes, information overload, and business complexity, significantly impact stress resistance, while internal factors such as emotional involvement and decision-making tendencies further exacerbate stress vulnerability. The results suggest that effective stress management strategies, including mindfulness and cognitive resilience training, can enhance managerial performance. These findings have practical implications for leadership training programs, emphasizing the need for psychological resilience in management practices.

RESULT and DISCUSSION

In our approach, stress resistance of a manager is understood as a high level of concentration and the ability to defocus - the ability to feel and hold on one sheet of internal territory the external context and internal processes of the company. In other words, a good business manager should be able to include all the social contexts that exist at the moment, that is, not only each area of his business, but also competitors, suppliers, clients, control services, government agencies. The concentration of a top manager should be so high that his internal volume includes a vision of the distant future - the ability to choose a direction now that is not quoted, but is a priority in the long term.

The structure and quality of the business, the success of the strategies and decisions depend on the stress resistance of the top manager. The current situation is characterized by an increase in simultaneously implemented projects, an increase in obligations to partners, government agencies, employees. The level of problems for managers is increasing, and the cost of an error is becoming increasingly high.

To understand the modern causes of stress for a leader, we can distinguish 3 conditional stages of social development. Each stage is characterized by the speed of change. To understand such speeds, it is convenient to compare the lifespan of a person and the lifespan of a technology.

At the first stage of social development, the lifespan of a person was short compared to the lifespan of technologies. This means that several generations pass before one technology is replaced by another. For example, metal processing technology could be passed from generation to generation without any changes. In such a situation, each person lived relatively easily. By the age of 15-17, he mastered almost all the knowledge that was in society. Further, there were no information flows, because everything remained the same, as it was at the time of completion of training. This stage lasted for centuries.

Then came the second period, where the lifespan of a person became comparable to the lifespan of a technology. During a person's life, technologies changed 1-2 times. At the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, there was an intensive development of intelligence and science, this was the time of scientific thinking, which contributed to the birth of new technologies. This period lasted about 150 years.

The situation has changed radically in recent decades. The main source of problems in modern life is a sharp increase in the number and scale of projects in which a person is involved. This is accompanied by a constant change of technologies, as well as a change in life positions and stereotypes of thinking and behavior. This situation is typical for the current stage of human evolution. The third stage of this evolution has arrived.

At this stage, the lifespan of a technology becomes much shorter than a human life. During the average time of a human life, many technologies are replaced. They are replaced at such a speed that a person can hardly keep up with them. The growth of information flows, retraining becomes a complex and conscious task. In this regard, the need for stress resistance of the leader's personality increases sharply.

The stress resistance of a leader is influenced by external and internal aspects.

On the one hand, interaction with the outside world through information flow, scale of activity, number of projects and external contacts has a huge impact on the leader. On the other hand, the stress resistance of the leader affects the volume of perception and the nature of the highlighted accents of external plots.

Two aspects are important: an increase in information flows and a decrease in psychological confidence in the present and future of the project. The stronger the threat experienced by a modern top manager, the lower the stress resistance. On the other hand, a decrease in stress resistance encourages finding shades of threat in each new information.

Then we can talk about external and internal sources of threat to stress resistance. This is determined by the state of the leader at the time of interaction with the outside world.

In the trends of modern business, several options for external threats can be distinguished:

1. Stressful situations in changing legislation, the introduction of new rules, often a past date.
2. Experiencing stress in connection with the emergence of new projects, and an increase in the volume of old ones.
3. The emergence of different concepts regarding the same phenomenon in business. For example, different motivation and performance monitoring systems, scientific and technological concepts.

4. Information begins to become very disconnected. The speed of information flows is manifested in the fact that different parts of the world begin to lose touch with each other. The simplest example is the diversity of computer programs that are poorly coordinated with each other, and the intricacies of working with them are available only to professionals. A gap appears. Another example is a situation when one division of an organization gives one set of instructions, and another one gives different ones, and they are not coordinated, often contradict each other. Then chaos appears. At the owner level, this is chaos in cash flows, chaos in mutual obligations, in the quality and quantity of projects and their structure. The connectivity of different divisions disappears. Then the leader is expected to have such concentration and defocusing of attention that will ensure a high speed of interaction with all divisions and sources of information so that this connectivity is restored.
5. The leader's isolation from the real business situation. This threat arises if the leader chooses to manage "from the office", relying only on information from the immediate environment. The channels of information transfer from one employee to another are severely limited compared to its volume. In such conditions, the transfer of accurate information is a complex and sometimes "creative" action. As a result, the meaning of the information flow can be distorted by unconscious motives and limitations of the information source.

The following points can be attributed to the internal factors that reduce stress resistance:

1. Strong emotional involvement.
2. Tendency to succumb to emotional decisions. Emotional states can transform a mental image and, by increasing the subjective weight of certain parameters, disrupt its subject logic, and therefore transform its meaning. [4;40]
3. Inability to identify the main thing in the flow of information. In modern conditions, this requires strong intellect.
4. Fear of difficult situations, strong susceptibility to stress.
5. Forced dependence: lack of one's own vision of the situation and the associated need to rely on employees in decision-making. In many situations, this is due to the leader's insufficient competence in certain areas of business (e.g. sales, accounting, marketing...).
6. Leader's uncertainty; when discussing a new project, he does not name deadlines and (by default) does not control individual stages; at an unconscious level, he experiences fear of having to take responsibility.
7. Fear of firing people, fear of hiring new employees, fear of punishing and rewarding.
8. Internal motivation of a top manager. A leader can act from the motive of "interest in the business", or from the motive of "defending oneself, one's importance". In the second case, the threats of reducing stress resistance increase, since the leader unconsciously perceives and evaluates himself from the outside. He relies on a distorted vision of himself, and his assessments and conclusions are not accurate, and this always increases the possible difficulties and dangers for the leader.

Considering the factors and threats of stress resistance in this vein, we come to the conclusion that the leader is highly influenced by both external circumstances and internal difficulties. External sources include processes in the company, in the industry, in the economy, in the state, in the world; the volume and scale of information processes. Each new information affects the sense of security of the manager's personality, and the more unfavorable it is, the stronger its influence.

We include difficulties in the emotional, intellectual, sensory and motivational spheres as internal sources. These difficulties create a special background of perception and even often determine the direction of information perception and increase the threats of damage to the stress resistance of the top manager.

In order to significantly increase the stress resistance of the manager and achieve complete invulnerability, he needs to work on both directions in an interconnected manner inseparably from each other with the help of meditation practices.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study highlights the critical role of stress resistance in managerial effectiveness, emphasizing how a leader's ability to manage stress directly influences decision-making, business sustainability, and organizational success. Addressing the knowledge gap on the interplay between external pressures and internal emotional resilience, this research employed a systematic approach to analyze stressors and coping mechanisms among managers. The findings indicate that modern leaders face an unprecedented level of stress due to rapid technological changes, increased information flows, and evolving business complexities, necessitating adaptive strategies. The results underscore the importance of cognitive flexibility, emotional regulation, and meditation techniques in enhancing stress tolerance. These insights have significant implications for leadership training and organizational policies, suggesting the need for structured programs that equip managers with resilience-building skills to sustain high performance in dynamic environments.

REFERENCES

1. Beehr T.A., & Newman J.E. (1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: a facet analysis, model, and literature review. *Personnel Psychology*, 31, 671-674.
2. Gwilt B. (2014). Top 10 signs of stress during change. CDL Insight Consulting.
3. Lupien S.J., McEwen B.S., Gunnar M.R., & Heim, C. (2009). Effects of stress throughout the lifespan on the brain, behaviour and cognition. *Nat Rev Neurosci*, 434–445.
4. Гринберг Дж. Управление стрессом / Дж. Гринберг. – СПб. [и др.]: Питер, Питер принт, 2002. – 495 с.
5. Стёганцев А. Управление стрессом: системный подход // Управление кредитной организацией [журнал]. – М., 2008.
6. Митева И.Ю. Курс управления стрессом / И.Ю. Митева. – М.: MapT, 2005. – 285 с.
7. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer Publishing.
8. Quick, J. C., Nelson, D. L., & Hurrell, J. J. (1997). *Preventive stress management in organizations*. American Psychological Association.
9. Karasek, R., & Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy work: Stress, productivity, and the reconstruction of working life*. Basic Books.
10. Selye, H. (1976). *The stress of life (Rev. ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.