Technological Waitance: Unraveling Passive and Active Actions in the Digital Age

Nasim Boustani[1]*

[1]*Department of English, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran*

Abstract In the fast-paced era of digital communication, technology-mediated communication (TMC) has created remarkable changes in users' behaviors. Unraveling passive and active behaviors of TMC users, this study investigated the psychological patterns that emerge when individuals rely on technology for outcomes. Adopting Pishghadam's (2024) "waitance" model, the research explored the TMC users' psychological patterns during waiting behavior and addresses the complicated involvement of emotional-cognitive processes during the waiting period, especially when one expects others to complete tasks. The paradoxical nature of waitance and technology was delineated, first by describing the waitance period, which encompasses the underlying senses of physical stillness and psychological involvement, and then by discussing the dual nature of technology, which simultaneously facilitates and exacerbates communication. Some discussions of technology users' passive behaviors emphasized the importance of active involvement. Understanding waitance psychological patterns can inform technology users about their behavior and encourage them to mitigate prolonged periods of waitance.

Keywords: Digital communication, Waitance, Technology, Technology-mediated communication, User behavior

***Corresponding Author:**
Nasim Boustani
nboustani@mail.um.ac.ir

1. Introduction

Technology is a deep and broad concept integrated into every aspect of life, and restricting it to a definition may not effectively describe the inherent notion. Technology commonly refers to the employment of conceptual and abstract knowledge to practical one to attain practical objectives (Skolnikoff, 1994). Technological advances have engendered significant alterations in society and life. Evolutionary and revolutionary changes from stone tools to digital media have undeniably had positive and negative effects on behaviors. One of the evolving technology tools is technology-mediated communication (TMC). It refers to the application of digital platforms and tools to exchange messages between individuals or groups of users (Veltsos & Veltsos, 2010). TMC is about the formation of messages, the transmission process, and the reception of information in text,

audio, and/or visual modes from senders to receivers (Gattiker & Stollemmaier, 1992). TMC covers various communication channels enabled by technological advancements and the internet. Some examples of TMC are social media, email, video conferencing (Siitonen & Aira, 2019), and platforms like Uber, UPS, Humanyze, etc. (Cram & Wiener, 2020). Research in the TMC area investigates message flows to audiences. TMC enables interaction regardless of physical barriers. Depending on the synchronicity or asynchronicity of communication modes, there may be a time lag in interaction. The pause in the continuity of communication causes a waiting period.

Waiting is a universal, ubiquitous, and inescapable experience in daily life, referring to the absence of activity or a "pause between present and future" (Mathews & Ali, 2022, p. 2). Essentially, the pause is beyond empty time and is the manifestation of a stationary yet dynamic phenomenon of uncertainty (Irvin, 2001). This paradoxical experience unites the underlying senses of stillness and involvement during the expectation and anticipation of a specific event (Irvin, 2001; Pfeifer & Wittmann, 2020). Indeed, the waiting period is the presentation of expectations and uncertainties concerning the possible upshots of the engaging event (Gove, 1986). The uncertainty about the ending dominates people's emotional and mental experiences. Some researchers (e.g., Hill et al., 2018; Maister, 1985) have associated the bitter taste of waiting with anger, frustration, and depression.

But a key question is, "How long are people ready to wait?". The expectation is a determinant factor that can significantly shape individuals' emotional experiences and modulate their readiness to endure waiting (Mathews & Ali, 2022). This implies an interplay between expectations and emotions. In essence, people's anticipation of the outcomes influences their emotional experiences and shapes their behaviors (Norman, 2008; Tamir & Bigman, 2018).

Considering the mesh between waiting and expectation, Pishghadam (2024) proposed the waitance model. Waitance (wait + expectance) is a psychological phenomenon referring to an unspecified time during which waiting people tend to defer action or wait and expect a positive or negative outcome. Waitance reveals individuals' tendency to procrastinate their direct involvement and rely on external forces to take courses of action (Pishghadam, 2024). In the course of waitance, they stop acting and suspend active engagement with an impermanent pause. During the pause, despite the suspension of an active engagement, people actively expect and anticipate outcomes. In other words, their minds actively assess and reassess the likelihood of various scenarios. This is in reference to the paradoxical nature of waiting and the stillness-movement state (Irvin, 2001).

The concept of waiting lies in the future, and the act of waiting shines a light on expectations and anticipations. Despite the universality of waiting, the experience of waiting is personal (Foster, 2019), signifying the diversity of experiences with regard to length, intensity, and valence (Mathews & Ali, 2022; Pishghadam, 2024). In fact, the experience of waiting is ubiquitous and can vary across people and contexts for significant or insignificant events. Waiting can be for a webpage to load or for the consequential results of a crucial event. Although waiting is omnipresent in daily life, it has not fully developed as a subject of inquiry in connection with a theoretical framework. To fill the gap, the focus of the present study is on this concept, along with the theory of waitance. Specifically, it aims to address the issue of technology, which is another widespread concern. Although studies have examined human-technology relationships (e.g., Cascio & Montealegre, 2016; Shaw et al., 2018), many behaviors, like waiting, expectation, and anticipation, are poorly defined. This may be due to the absence of a comprehensive theoretical framework. To fill the gap, the waitance theory is presented alongside a description of human-technology behavior. The study discusses the potential impact of various aspects of TMC in different contexts in association with their effects on human behaviors. Regardless of the positive and negative impacts of these tools, the aim was to explore how their use might impact the tendency to wait and expect something to happen without taking sufficient action or responsibility. To delineate the waitance model and its manifestations in the context of technology use, the focus was specifically on five contexts: email response time, social media engagement, project collaboration tools, video conferencing participation, and online customer support. The logic behind selecting these platforms was based on several reasons. First, they are prevalent and widely used platforms in both personal and professional contexts; therefore, the issue addresses a broad range of audiences. Second, the diversity of these platforms embraces both asynchronous (e.g., email, social media, and customer

support) and synchronous (e.g., video conferencing) modes at an individual (e.g., email and social media) and collaborative (e.g., project tools and video conferencing) levels. Moreover, they encompass the diversity of formality levels from casual communication (e.g., social media) to formal and structured collaboration (e.g., project tools and video conferencing). Finally, efficient metrics can be provided by response times and engagement levels to explain the waitance model. Thus, several comprehensive scenarios across the waitance model types and levels were covered, aiming to provide insights into the effects of TMC on waitance behavior. Correspondingly, the significance of the study lies in examining the psychological patterns of active and passive behaviors in the use of technology. Signifying the waitance model as the theoretical framework of this study, I have focused on the active and passive behaviors that users may present when interacting with technology. Active behavior involves the users' proactive approach and direct involvement, whereas passive behavior refers to the users' indirect involvement while waiting for the actions of others. Hence, this study is significant as it sheds light on the paradoxical nature of technology in view of this novel theory. Moreover, the contexts exemplified offer valuable discussions and implications for improving digital communication strategies.

2. Waitance

Waiting is a universal experience and an inevitable part of life, highlighted by the dominancy of passive mood over the active one (Mathews & Ali, 2022). Waiting refers to "a stationary, yet dynamic, and unspecified time-frame phenomenon in which manifestations of uncertainty regarding personal outcomes remain in suspension for a limited time, but for the definite purpose of something expected" (Irvin, 2001, p. 135). Waiting is driven by the belief that external forces (e.g., others or luck) will carry out actions (Basgall & Snyder, 1988). In effect, an inherent feature in people makes them psycho-logically wait for and expect favorable or unfavorable outcomes.

The waiting period aligns with a multitude of emotions, and they color individuals' experiences during the waiting period (Tamir & Bigman, 2018). One of the principal determinants of emotional experiences is a lack of certainty about the upshots of events (Norman, 2008). The level of emotional experiences is heavily influenced by expectations over time (Mathews & Ali, 2022; Norman, 2008; Tamir & Bigman, 2018). This marks a difference between the physical and psychological properties of time. Norman states that physical time is accurately measured by physicists, but psychological time varies across people according to the context. Psychologically, time is an irreplaceable resource, so quantitative measures fail to capture the nature of waiting (Mathews & Ali, 2022). Since waiting is profoundly influenced by emotional and mental processes.

Considering the complexity of mental and emotional processes during waiting periods, Pishghadam (2024) proposed a concept called waitance. Waitance is the psychological process of passive waiting and expecting others' performance. The reluctance to take any substantial action differentiates waitance from "temporal discounting", as the latter prioritizes actions over non-actions (Pishghadam, 2024). Accordingly, "waitants" observe events without actively working to unfold problems and have a tendency to be reactive rather than proactive (Pishghadam, 2024).

Pishghadam (2024) adds that waitance can be influenced by individual differences and environmental circumstances. Cultural traits, personality characteristics, and educational background can be some of the particular instances of the former, while social norms as an element in the environmental context can have an effect on waitance. Remarkably, waitants' waitance level can be contextually different. In other words, a person's waitance in social contexts may be high; however, he may experience a low level of waitance in political situations (Pishghadam & Ebrahimi, 2024). Global waitance indicates the average level of a waitant's waitance level across various contexts. Pishghadam and Ebrahimi (2024) distinguish an individual waitance level from a societal waitance level by differentiating waitance from Waitance. In this respect, in contrast to societies with low levels of Waitance, Pishghadam and Ebrahimi (2024) described high-Waitance societies as having a lot of patience, often accomplishing tasks with delays. The high-Waitance societies consider long-lasting results, have less planning, respect customs and traditions, believe in chance and luck, are more idealistic and collectivistic, and accept hierarchies and power distances.

To delineate the psychology of waitance, Pishghadam (2024) mentions that waitance takes on four forms regarding different waiting periods and expectation levels. He introduces long and short waiting periods, besides low and high expectations, to provide deep insights into individuals' tendencies (Figure 1).

Figure 1
Waitance in Terms of Expectation and Waiting

Note. Reprinted with permission from "Emotional-Cognitive Dynamics of "Waitance": Unraveling its Relationship with Teaching Burnout", by R. Pishghadam, 2024, *Journal of Cognition, Emotion and Education*, *2*(1), p. 68 (https://doi.org/10.22034/cee.2024.189873).

Based on the figure, waitance encompasses four dimensions: prolonged waitance with high anticipation, intense waitance with high anticipation, prolonged waitance with low anticipation, and intense waitance with low anticipation. Indeed, individuals who have a high level of waitance accept the unknown for a more prolonged period in comparison to those with a low level of waitance (Pishghadam, 2024). The following paragraphs will offer descriptions and instances of waitance types. To align with the study's aim, the forthcoming examples specifically pertain to technology and TMC. In particular, TMC users' waitance behavior across these contexts was demonstrated: email response time, social media engagement, project collaboration tools, video conferencing participation, and online customer support.

- Prolonged Waitance with High Anticipation (PWHA):

Description: PWHA manifests a psychological state where a person experiences a "prolonged and high anticipation" for results (Pishghadam, 2024). In this state, the person has patiently stayed for a long time, expecting some positive or negative outcomes.

Example: A professional employee working on a project sends an email to a busy colleague requesting crucial information and guidance. Though he knows his colleague may not respond to him instantly, he waits for a prolonged period and maintains a positive outlook. He eagerly anticipates his colleague's reply but passively waits for external forces to provide information and advance his project.

- Intense Waitance with High Anticipation (IWHA):

Description: IWHA displays a "short and high anticipation" prior to the occurrence of a positive or negative result (Pishghadam, 2024). This psychological condition is associated with very high expectations for the forthcoming event, along with intense emotional moods.

Example: Imagine a social media influencer who is eagerly anticipating the release of her video on various social media platforms. She experiences intense waitance and high anticipation for its success and a significant increase in views, likes, comments, and shares. Her subsequent emotional responses (i.e., intense satisfaction or dissatisfaction) depend on the feedback she will receive.

- • Prolonged Waitance with Low Anticipation (PWLA):

Description: PWLA represents the "long and suppressed anticipation" of positive or negative outcomes (Pishghadam, 2024). Waitants take a low expectancy view towards intervention with prolonged waitance.

Example: A project manager uses a specific project collaboration tool to arrange tasks; however, he faces challenges and limitations with the tool, realizing the need for a new one to enhance productivity. Despite recognizing this requirement, the manager remains passive for extended periods and suppresses his high anticipation and expectation for a positive change. These attitudes and behaviors prevent the manager from actively participating.

- • Intense Waitance with Low Anticipation (IWLA):

Description: IWLA describes a "mild and short-lived anticipation" before a positive or negative result (Pishghadam, 2024). Waitants are passive for long periods and adopt low expectancy and anticipation towards interferences; hence, they take little responsibility for finding solutions.

Example: A listener planned to participate in a video conference session; however, she does not anticipate any significant changes will occur as a result of this conference. Thus, during the conference, she takes a passive approach and does not participate in the discussions as she has little hope for external intervention.

In addition to the four mentioned types of waitance, Pishghadam (2024) accentuates the emotional side of it and mentions that the experience of uncertainty during the waiting period can affect people's emotions. On the one hand, the persistent sense of doubt may cause anxiety; on the other hand, the feeling of hope and optimism can counterbalance this negative emotion and create a positive mood during the waiting period. Therefore, Pishghadam considers positive and negative sides in terms of valence with low and high intensities (Figure 2).

Figure 2
Waitance in Terms of Intensity and Valence

	Valence	
	Positive	**Negative**
High	Miraculous	Disastrous
Low	Rewarding	Punishing

Note. Reprinted with permission from "Emotional-Cognitive Dynamics of "Waitance": Unraveling its Relationship with Teaching Burnout", by R. Pishghadam, 2024, *Journal of Cognition, Emotion and Education*, *2*(1), p. 69 (https://doi.org/10.22034/cee.2024.189873).

Figure 2 illustrates the emotional platform of waitance, which consists of positive and negative valences classified into high and low intensity. The valence-intensity combination characterizes four conditions: miraculous, disastrous, rewarding, and punishing. Generally, passing the oscillation between positive and negative emotions, a sense of relief or frustration may be followed by favorable or unfavorable outcomes, respectively (Pishghadam, 2024). The following paragraphs will exemplify the waitance concept in terms of valence and intensity. Additionally, to be aligned with the study's aim, the examples will illustrate waitance in connection with technology and TMC.

- Miraculous Waitance:

Description: Waitants wait with hopes for positive outcomes with high intensity and have high or low anticipation (Pishghadam, 2024).

Example: Imagine a small business owner who has just sent a proposal to a large potential client. The businessman frequently checks his email with hope and high anticipation for a positive response. The owner adopts a passive approach and hopes significant changes will be provided if the client provides a positive reply.

- Disastrous Waitance:

Description: This psychological condition reveals a pessimistic waiting period with high intensity (Pishghadam, 2024). Waitants have negative expectations with a high or low anticipation.

Example: A customer who is not satisfied with a product sends a message to the online customer support service. The customer anticipates the outcome of his complaint may remain unresolved. The customer experiences more anxiety for a long time, which can be exacerbated by a lack of immediate feedback from the company's support team.

- Rewarding Waitance:

The psychological state of rewarding waitance describes waitants' optimistic expectations with low intensity (Pishghadam, 2024).

Example: A digital marketing specialist who has recently conducted a new campaign with different social media platforms anticipates users' interactions. The specialist has positive expectations and actively controls engagement metrics such as likes, shares, and comments. He expects that this active anticipation will lead to a successful campaign.

- Punishing Waitance:

It characterizes a psychological condition in which people experience negative expectations for unfavorable outcomes (Pishghadam, 2024). Punishing waitance involves a negative emotional state where waitants anticipate that something undesirable will happen.

Example: In the context of project collaboration tools, team members submit a project proposal and then wait for feedback. If they have a high anticipation of rejection, they may pass the time with dread of rejection.

Overall, considering the psychological concept of waitance, a paradoxical feature can be attributed to its nature. The inactive approach of waitance is associated with the contradictory experience of mental and emotional activities (Pishghadam, 2024). On the surface, waitants are physically stable, but psychologically, their mental and emotional processes are active. Since waiting is a universal experience, the decision was made to specifically address it in the context of technology. The underlying reason is that the productive services of technology are also pervasive and universal, affecting every aspect of human life, such as communication, education, health, etc. However, given the broadness of technology, the specific focus was placed on TMC. In the following parts, the discussion will focus on TMC and its features, followed by its relation to waitance.

3. Technology-Mediated Communication

In today's fast-paced world, technology has woven itself into the core of society. Technology generally refers to the employment of scientific knowledge to modify and manipulate the human environment (Britannica, 2024). Accomplishing these targets is possible via the employment of tangible tools or intangible software. The ever-changing role of technology is undeniable, creating alterations in individuals' lives. From fascinating advances in artificial intelligence to ever-evolving TMC, technology has impelled humanity into an era of infinite possibilities.

In the technological journey, humans are at the forefront of the digital revolution. The journey makes people shape and reshape their behaviors and facilitates communication. Using technological tools and platforms to assist communication is called TMC, which provides the means to strengthen interactions (O'Connor, 2016). TMC involves formation, transmission, and reception processes targeting to make communication easy through a multitude of technology tools and applications, such as social media platforms, email, video conferencing, project collaboration tools, and more (Gattiker & Stollemmaier, 1992; Suraj, 2023). The tools and applications encompass various modes of communication, including text, audio, video, or a combination of them (Gattiker & Stollemmaier, 1992).

Communication technology embraces a broad range of mediums, facilitating communication and collaboration. Telephone calls, short message service, and electronic mail are some of the instances of TMC mediums (Salonen, 2017). Other instances are instant messaging platforms and social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter. Tools like Skype and Google Hangouts, under the category of text and video conferencing, in addition to specialized groupware tools, allow for group communication and collaborative work (Salonen, 2017). Generally, the mediums advance the effectiveness of communication and create alterations from modernity to postmodernity (García-Jiménez, 2012).

Moreover, TMC allows people to instantly send messages regardless of the geographical distances and time zones (Wang et al., 2019). A noteworthy feature of TMC is the dynamic exchange of information where participants can both send and receive messages. The interactive nature of TMC mediums provides equal opportunity for users to engage in dialogues (Spitzberg, 2006). Therefore, visual and auditory aids like television and radio are not categorized as TMC mediums since they are one-directional (Salonen, 2017).

The TMC modes of communication can be synchronous or asynchronous (Suraj, 2023). The synchronous system enables the simultaneous occurrence of communication between parties. An example is video conferencing, which allows immediate feedback and simultaneous exchanges of information. However, the message asynchronicity characterizes a time lag between sending and receiving messages. In other words, the absence of concurrence in time prevents communication from happening in real-time. In asynchronous communication, the sender and the receiver are not in synch, like email and text messaging. Essentially, the context of asynchronous communication makes the senders wait for the receivers' responses. This underlines the influence of technology on behavior and produces undeniable effects, like "decreased co-presence" (Silard et al., 2023). Co-presence is a prominent concept in the social psychological domain and refers to the physical co-location of people (Silard et al., 2023). According to Silard and colleagues, co-presence enhances emotional connectedness, while decreased co-presence might lead to the reduction of emotional labor. It can be implied that the decontextualization of communication may amplify the feeling of waiting and expectation. Since people may have their own interpretations of the messages they are waiting for; hence, the absence of connection between the sender's intent and the receiver's perception may exacerbate the waitance matter. Regardless of the advantages and disadvantages of synchronous and asynchronous communication, the focus of the present study is to examine how technology influences behaviors concerning the waitance concept.

4. Waitance and Technology-Mediated Communication

Spending excessive amounts of time on technology tools and applications has brought about significant changes in how we, as individuals, behave. Though few users may assert that technology, in general, and TMC, in particular, take over their lives, all may seriously claim that they have had undeniable effects on their behaviors. They are not only omnipresent but remarkably effective in people's behaviors as well. In this study, the emphasis is on how the employment of TMC affects the tendency to wait and expect something to happen without taking sufficient action or responsibility. By exemplifying email response time, social media engagement, project collaboration tools, video conferencing participation, and online customer support, an endeavor was made to delineate the matter more concretely. The criteria for selecting these instances are the prevalence of these platforms in both personal and professional contexts and the diversity of their modes at synchronous and asynchronous as well as individual and collaborative levels. The other reason is the diversity of formality levels from casual to formal

communication. Moreover, response time and engagement levels pave the way for clarifying the waitance model.

Email Response Time: In the asynchronous context of email communication, people may exhibit waitance in the time lag between sending messages and receiving responses. For instance, in a business setting, an employee might receive an email requesting information needed for a project, but he delays responding because he expects another team member may provide information. Actually, by delaying responses to emails, he may expect that someone else will handle the task or that the issue will resolve itself. This can lead to inefficiencies in communication, delays in decision-making, and disruptions in completing the task (Rennecker & Godwin, 2005). Reliance on others to tackle the matters may cause a "diffusion of responsibility" as a sociopsychological phenomenon (Martin & North, 2015). Diffusion of responsibility indicates decreased responsibility in the presence of others, considering that others will take responsibility for action (Beyer et al., 2017). The problem can be mitigated by being proactive. For instance, prompt replies to emails and active contributions can accelerate communication and substantially lessen waitance.

Social Media Engagement: On social media platforms, individuals may display waitance by passively waiting for engagement on their posts rather than actively promoting or sharing their content. For instance, someone might post a promotional announcement for their business but wait for others to like, share, or comment on the post instead of actively engaging with their audience or promoting the post through other channels. This behavior raises the problems of passivity and dependability. By adopting a proactive approach, the prolonged period of waitance may be shortened, and the achievement of promotional objectives may be facilitated.

Project Collaboration Tools: In collaborative work environments that use project management or collaboration tools such as Slack, Trello, or Microsoft Teams, team members may exhibit waitance by delaying updates or contributions to project tasks, expecting that others will handle the workload or that the project will progress without their input. For example, a team member might wait for others to complete their tasks before updating the project status or contributing their part. The delay in updating the status of tasks may contribute to the failure of the collaborative work. In fact, the assumption that others will handle the project may trigger "cascading failure". This failure is typically addressed in Network models, referring to the failure of an overall system as a result of the failure of components (Valdez et al., 2020). By extending the concept to collaborative work environments, it can be inferred that the failure of a member can trigger the failure of others, impacting the overall project. Hence, waitance in the assigned tasks can hinder the effectual quality of the team's ability to meet the settled goals. Active contribution can be a solution to resolve the passive mode of waitance.

Video Conferencing Participation: During virtual meetings or video conferences, participants may exhibit waitance by remaining silent or passive, expecting that others will lead the discussion or address any issues that arise. This can result in unproductive meetings and missed opportunities for collaboration. For instance, a team member might wait for someone else to speak up about a potential problem rather than take theinitiative to address it themselves. The waitance behavior can become problematic in a way that participants remain silent without an active exchange of ideas. Waitance may .undermine active communication, impeding valuable collaboration

Online Customer Support: In customer service interactions conducted through online chat or messaging platforms, customers may exhibit waitance by waiting for a response from a support agent without taking any additional action or seeking alternative solutions. This can lead to frustration and dissatisfaction if response times are slow or if issues are not resolved promptly. For example, a customer might wait for a response to their inquiry about a product or service instead of proactively seeking assistance through other channels. Waitance can contribute to unresolved questions of customers which may correlate to missing out on alternative opportunities. Instead of waiting and relying on the support agents' responses, customers can take a proactive approach to resolve their concerns.

These examples illustrate how TMC can both facilitate and exacerbate tendencies towards waitance, depending on individual behavior and organizational norms. On the one hand, TMC reduces hesitation in sending messages; on the other hand, lack of co-presence may create waitance. Understanding these

dynamics can help businesses and individuals identify opportunities for improvement in communication processes and mitigate the negative impacts of waitance on productivity and effectiveness.

5. Concluding Remarks

Investigating the pervasiveness of waitance aligned with technology has offered a novel point of discussion as both cause changes in human behavior. Waitance refers to a period of time when one's uncertainty of an outcome is temporarily suspended; however, this suspension of uncertainty is done purposefully, expecting that tasks will be completed by others (Pishghadam, 2024). Accordingly, waitance entails the paradoxical experiences of physical stillness and psychological involvement.

Similar to waitance, technology also has a dual role (Rennecker & Godwin, 2005), both intensifying and reducing the desire to wait. Rapid ease of access to information has created "instant gratification" (Samuel, 2017). Instant gratification is the opposite of waiting and refers to the immediate and instant desire to feel satisfaction (Samuel, 2017). Clicking a button technology users can access a huge amount of data. The convenience of accessing information advanced by technology has yielded an instant gratification culture (Kemp & Childers, 2021). In other words, this convenience offers the opportunity to decrease hesitation and take action. For instance, online learning platforms enable people to acquire information without the typical waiting associated with traditional academies. Additionally, advanced systems and automation have shortened the prolonged period of waiting. Artificial intelligence, collaborative project management tools, or advanced scheduling systems are other examples of technology minimizing the time spent in passive waiting.

On the other hand, social media platforms can exacerbate the tendency to wait and expect others' actions. Sending messages, people may find themselves waiting for others to resolve their issues and undertake their responsibilities. In this respect, the platforms further reinforce waitance instead of active involvement (Machado & Braga, 2022; Romero et al., 2011). A reason for passivity can be an individual's reliance on external forces (Romero et al., 2011).

Waitance in TMC may also ensue from the asynchronicity of many platforms. The lag between message delivery and response can lead to a passive approach where people wait for others to do their tasks. A contributing factor to the appearance of waitance in TMC can be the lack of non-verbal and emotional cues in some of the digital communications (Silard et al., 2023). This may create ambiguity and uncertainty about each person's responsibility, leading to diffusion of responsibility (Beyer et al., 2017). In group settings, this may result in the assumption that the tasks will be completed by others. Notably, teams with varying cultural norms may experience waitance differently (Pishghadam & Ebrahimi, 2024).

An implication of the presence of waitance in TMC is reduced productivity during project completion. Mentioning the interplay between productivity and business growth, Kumar (2021) states members' attempts to accomplish work can increase profitability. On the contrary, it could be implied that if members consistently wait and expect others to act, the project may fail. Moreover, the mismanagement of tasks may occur due to the assumption that others will undertake the responsibilities. The crisis is specifically crucial in task dependencies when the project management depends on the efficient management of tasks built on their sequence (Hartshorne, 2023). The other implication might be increased demotivation and frustration among team members who like to progress (Shepherd et al., 2013). A strategy for mitigating waitance is establishing clear communication to clarify expectations and responsibilities. Regular check-ins and progress reports can be useful strategies in minimizing waitance. Mentioning the link between regular check-ins and accountability, Rae (2024) suggests that these strategies enable leaders and members to keep track of progress.

All that matters is that technology users should be prevented from passively waiting or engaging in "waitiving" (Pishghadam, 2024). Users are not encouraged to make hasty decisions; instead, they should exhibit genius in time efficiency. Informing and encouraging users towards active participation instead of expectation from others can promote collaboration. Actively engaging in text messaging or using visual communication mode can minimize waitance and maximize the overall users' experiences. Additionally, voice and video modes foster real-time communication. The features of collaboration

tools or collaborative workspaces, like document sharing or raising a hand to speak, enable simultaneous collaboration. In fact, by sharing their thoughts, participants can participate actively, leading to the reduction of the prolonged period of waitance.

Overall, the effect of technology on waitance is two-faceted. While technology can promote opportunities to overcome waitance, it may also reinforce waitance by supporting passivity and reliance on external forces instead of active engagement. To avoid falling into passive waiting and expecting patterns, active and proactive rather than nonactive modes are suggested.

Disclosure Statement

The author claims no conflict of interest.

Funding

References

Basgall, J. A., & Snyder, C. R. (1988). Excuses in waiting: External locus of control and reactions to success-failure feedback. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(4), 656–662. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.4.656

Beyer, F., Sidarus, N., Bonicalzi, S., & Haggard, P. (2017). Beyond self-serving bias: Diffusion of responsibility reduces sense of agency and outcome monitoring. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *12*(1), 138–145. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw160

Britannica, T. (Ed.) (2024, March 13). *Technology*. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/technology/technology

Cascio, W. F., & Montealegre, R. (2016). How technology is changing work and organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *3*, 349–375. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-041015-062352

Cram, W. A., & Wiener, M. (2020). Technology-mediated control: Case examples and research directions for the future of organizational control. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *46*(1), 70–91. https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.04604

Foster, R. (2019). 'Doing the wait': An exploration into the waiting experiences of prisoners' families. *Time and Society*, *28*(2), 459–477. https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X16633235

García-Jiménez, L. (2012). Elements for a social theory of technologically mediated communication: From modernity to postmodernity. *Estudios sobr e el Mensaje Periodístico*, *18*(1), 101–114. https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_ESMP.2012.v18.n1.39357

Gattiker, U. E., & Stollemmaier, R. S. (Eds.). (1992). *Technology-mediated communication* (Vol. 3). Walter de Gruyter.

Gove, P. B. (Ed.). (1986). *Webster's third new international dictionary of the English language* (3rd ed.). Merriam-Webster.

Hartshorne, D. (2023, September 28). *Managing task dependencies in project management*. Monday. https://monday.com/blog/project-management/task-dependencies/

Hill, M., Classen, L., Romay, A., & Diaz, E. (2018). Wait time reality check: The convergence of process, perception, and expectation. *Patient Experience Journal*, *5*(2), 109–115. https://doi.org/10.35680/2372-0247.1284

Irvin, S. K. (2001). Waiting: Concept analysis. *International Journal of Nursing Terminologies and Classifications*, *12*(4), 128–136. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-618X.2001.tb00450.x

Kemp, E., & Childers, C. (2021). Insta-gratification: Examining the influence of social media on emotions and consumption. *The Journal of Social Media in Society*, *10*(2), 306–324.

Kumar, A. (2021, March 31). *The effects of low productivity on business growth*. Saviom. https://www.saviom.com/blog/effects-of-low-productivity-business-growth/

Machado, G. M., & Braga, M. M. (2022). Users' passivity in accessing digested scientific evidence through social media: Cross-sectional insights. *BMC Research Notes*, *15*(1), Article 218. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-022-06089-x

Maister, D. H. (1985). The psychology of waiting lines. In J. Czepiel, M. Solomon, & C. Suprenant (Eds.), *The service encounter* (pp. 113–123). Harvard Business School.

Martin, K. K., & North, A. C. (2015). Diffusion of responsibility on social networking sites. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *44*, 124–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.11.049

Mathews, N., & Ali, C. (2022). "Come on f—er, just load!" Powerlessness, waiting, and life without broadband. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *27*(6), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmac020

Norman, D. A. (2008, November 17). *The psychology of waiting lines*. Jnd. https://jnd.org/the-psychology-of-waiting-lines/

O'Connor, A. (2016). *Supporting discourse using technology-mediated communication: A model for enhancing practice in second level education* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Limerick]. University of Limerick Research Repository. https://hdl.handle.net/10344/5585

Pfeifer, E., & Wittmann, M. (2020). Waiting, thinking, and feeling: Variations in the perception of time during silence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, Article 522217. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00602

Pishghadam, R. (2024). Emotional-cognitive dynamics of "waitance": Unraveling its relationship with teaching burnout. *Journal of Cognition, Emotion and Education*, *2*(1), 66–75. https://doi.org/10.22034/cee.2024.189873

Pishghadam, R., & Ebrahimi, S. (2024). *Zabahang: Rooykardi novin dar barrasi zhenhaye farhangi Iranian* [Cultuling: A novel approach to examining Iranian's cultural memes] (2nd ed.). Lulu Press.

Rae, B. (2024, January 23). *The benefits of regular check-ins: Keep your team moving forward*. Doodle. https://doodle.com/en/the-benefits-of-regular-check-ins-keep-your-team-moving-forward/#:~:text=happier%20work%20environment.-,They%20improve%20accountability,sure%20there%20are%20no%20blockers

Rennecker, J., & Godwin, L. (2005). Delays and interruptions: A self-perpetuating paradox of communication technology use. *Information and Organization*, *15*(3), 247–266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2005.02.004

Romero, D. M., Galuba, W., Asur, S., & Huberman, B. A. (2011, March). Influence and passivity in social media. In S. Sadagopan, K. Ramamritham, A. Kumar, & M. P. Ravindra (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference Companion on World Wide Web* (pp. 113–114). Association for Computing Machinery. http://doi.org/10.1145/1963192.1963250

Salonen, M. (2017). *Conflicts in workplace in technology-mediated communication* [Master's thesis, University of Jyväskylä]. JYX Digital Repository. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/56419

Samuel, A. (2017, February 7). *What's so bad about instant gratification?* JSTOR Daily. https://daily.jstor.org/whats-bad-instant-gratification/

Shaw, H., Ellis, D. A., & Ziegler, F. V. (2018). The technology integration model (TIM). Predicting the continued use of technology. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *83*, 204–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.02.001

Shepherd, D. A., Haynie, J. M., & Patzelt, H. (2013). Project failures arising from corporate entrepreneurship: Impact of multiple project failures on employees' accumulated emotions, learning, and motivation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *30*(5), 880-895. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12035

Siitonen, M., & Olbertz-Siitonen, M. (2023). Mediated communication as an entryway into interculturality. In F. Dervin, & M. Y. Sude (Eds.), *Teaching interculturality 'otherwise'*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003345275-16

Silard, A., Watson-Manheim, M. B., & Lopes, N. J. (2023). The influence of text-based technology-mediated communication on the connection quality of workplace relationships: The mediating role of emotional labor. *Review of Managerial Science*, *17*, 2035–2053. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-022-00586-w

Skolnikoff, E. B. (1994). *The elusive transformation: Science, technology, and the evolution of international politics*. Princeton University Press.

Spitzberg, B. H. (2006). Preliminary development of a model and measure of computer-mediated communication (CMC) competence. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *11*(2), 629-666. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00030.x

Suraj. (2023, October 11). *TMC full form: Technology-mediate communication*. Career Guide. https://www.careerguide.com/career/full-form/tmc-full-form-tmc-on-modern-communication-symbiotic-relationship-virtual-reality-redefining-learning

Tamir, M., & Bigman, Y. E. (2018). Expectations influence how emotions shape behavior. *Emotion*, *18*(1), 15–25. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000351

Valdez, L. D., Shekhtman, L., La Rocca, C. E., Zhang, X., Buldyrev, S. V., Trunfio, P. A., Braunstein, L. A., & Havlin, S. (2020). Cascading failures in complex networks. *Journal of Complex Networks*, *8*(2), Article cnaa013. https://doi.org/10.1093/comnet/cnaa013

Veltsos, J. R., & Veltsos, C. (2010). Teaching responsibly with technology-mediated communication. *Business Communication Quarterly*, *73*(4), 463–467. https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569910385397

Wang, N., Roaché, D. J., & Pusateri, K. B. (2019). Interconnection of multiple communication modes in long-distance dating relationships. *Western Journal of Communication*, *83*(5), 600–623. http://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2018.1552986