

FACTORS OF STRESS IN THE TECHNOLOGICAL AND INFORMATION SOCIETY

Mihai GOLU¹

Abstract: *As a rule it is admitted that the progress of technology and of knowledge has a major benefit for man and for improvement of the quality of life. But an objective analysis shows us, that this generates also serious negative consequences. One of them, which appear, at the individual psychological level, is the growing of the stress of adaptation and re-adaptation. The changes produced till now have led already to the alarming rise of the cases of inadaptation and neurotic troubles.*

In the future it is expected, that simultaneously with the new technological and informatic progress will raise in complexity and difficulty the neuropsychic tasks, making more high the level of individuals who couldn't cope with them. As main factors, which will contribute to such phenomenon in this paper are considered the follow: 1) the rapidity of changes in the professional structures; 2) the rapidity of changes in the structure and volume of scientific information; 3) the acceleration of pace of performing mental and motor operations; 4) the rise of the instability of work places; 5) the deterioration of interpersonal relations; 6) the compromising of equality of chances; 7) the growth of distances and differences between socio-economical structures, including the rise of frustration.

It is concluded, that for becoming really benefic the technological and scientific progress must integrate even in its logical structure an ethical dimension: „No science without conscience”

Despite the great discoveries and creations, despite the accumulation of a big amount of data about nature and man, at the end of first half of the XX-th century, the scientific knowledge was confronted with a serious inner crisis in its essence methodological. This crisis was caused by the limits of atomic descriptive and rigid partitioning paradigm on which the science has founded and developed its attempts.

Two main constations were made in the given context, namely:

1. The methodological fabliness and general negative consequence of hermetically closed of particular disciplines in they self and of fragmental isolation, which attained a such level, that as N. Wiener said, we couldn't more call „mathematician”, „physicist” or „biologist” etc. without supplementary specifications; although occupied neighbouring offices, a specialist in algebra did not communicate with a specialist in geometry, they being not interested in what is doing each other; so between the disciplines such separated remained big of nobody territories;

¹ Ph.D. univ. prof., titular member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists