

When Participation Becomes Noise

On scale, attention, work, and the pressure to remain visible

Devashish Pawar

Version 1.0 · September 2026

[DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22950392](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22950392)

There was a time when a government job in India was widely associated with stability. Banking carried its own kind of prestige; a bank employee stood for security, respectability and a certain middle-class comfort. Then the private sector expanded, and corporate employment became the newer aspiration: better salaries, professional offices, multinational companies, faster growth.

Today, all three worlds feel very different from what they once promised.

Many government departments operate under growing administrative demand. Bank employees find themselves caught between customer expectations, targets, audits, compliance and management pressure. Private-sector employees face deadlines, performance systems, restructuring, constant communication and the expectation of responsiveness.

It would be too simple to say these jobs were once easy and are now difficult. Different institutions and departments have always varied enormously. But I wonder whether something broader has happened.

The systems grew. The number of people participating in them increased, and with it the demands placed on them and the amount of communication required to keep them functioning. Their capacity to comfortably absorb all that growth may not have grown at the same rate.

Perhaps that is the point at which growth begins to resemble congestion.

Growth Is Not Capacity

We generally treat growth as a sign of success. More customers, more employees, more users, more transactions, more participation. Often it is. A larger institution serves more people; a larger company builds more things; a larger platform connects more voices; a larger bank processes more economic activity.

But growth and capacity are not the same thing.

A system can attract more participants without becoming better at organizing them. It can process more work while increasing the strain on the people doing the processing. It can open more channels for communication while making communication harder to navigate. It can give more people the ability to speak while making it harder for any individual voice to be heard.

Consider a small organization. When twenty people work together, communication can remain informal; responsibilities are visible, decisions travel quickly, and everyone knows roughly who is doing what. At twenty thousand people, the organization needs something entirely different: reporting structures, policies, dashboards, approvals, escalations, meetings, performance systems, internal platforms and management layers.

Much of this is necessary. Large organizations could not function otherwise.

But something happens along the way. The organization begins spending an increasing share of its energy simply managing its own complexity. Work produces coordination, coordination produces processes, processes produce reporting, and reporting produces more coordination. Eventually part of the work exists only because so much other work exists around it.

Research on information overload has described a related problem for decades. Overload is not simply the presence of a large amount of information. It emerges from the relationship between the information arriving, the task being performed, the time available and the capacity of the person expected to process it. A thousand messages are not inherently a problem. They become a problem when someone is expected to read, interpret, prioritize and respond to them faster than the system allows.

The problem is not merely quantity.

It is the relationship between demand and capacity.

Participation-Capacity Imbalance

I have started thinking of this as a participation-capacity imbalance.

The idea is simple. A system remains manageable while its ability to organize participation grows alongside the participation entering it. Trouble begins when demand, communication or activity grows faster than the mechanisms available to absorb and organize it.

This does not condemn scale. Well-designed systems can scale remarkably well. Technology adds capacity, automation removes repetitive work, institutions hire, processes improve, platforms build better filters.

But when complexity enters a system faster than the system can reduce or organize it, the excess has to go somewhere.

Very often, it goes into people.

The Human Being Becomes the Buffer

Systems do not usually stop functioning when they exceed comfortable capacity. They adapt. Queues lengthen. Employees work faster. Targets rise. Another dashboard appears, another channel is opened, another layer of reporting is added.

The system continues, and from the outside that continuity can look like health.

The bank still opens tomorrow morning. The company still ships. The government office still processes applications. The quarterly numbers still get reported.

But operational continuity can hide what is happening underneath. Someone still has to read the additional messages, handle the additional customers, reconcile the additional reports, manage the exceptions and deal with the frustration of the person waiting on the other side of the system.

The human being gradually becomes the buffer between what the system is being asked to do and what it can comfortably handle.

Sometimes this produces overwork. Sometimes burnout. Sometimes cynicism. Sometimes, eventually, disengagement.

Imagine working through a hundred pending files today while knowing another hundred will arrive tomorrow. You can work harder, become more efficient, stay longer. But if the queue never meaningfully shrinks, effort begins to lose its relationship with completion.

The question can slowly change from:

How can I solve this?

to:

What do I need to do to get through today?

That distinction matters.

We often treat overwork and disengagement as opposites: one person trying too hard, another stopping caring. But in some situations they may be different psychological responses to the same experience:

effort no longer feels proportional to outcome.

One person pushes harder. Another begins withdrawing. Neither reaction tells the whole story unless we also look at the system surrounding the person.

Then I Started Noticing the Same Tension Online

What made the idea more interesting to me was noticing something structurally similar in an entirely different environment: social media.

There was a time when posting online felt much closer to simple expression. You had a photograph, so you shared it. You discovered something interesting, so you wrote about it. You had an opinion, so you expressed it.

The logic was roughly:

I have something to say, therefore I will say it.

That still happens. But another logic now exists alongside it.

People post because remaining visible has value. Professionals maintain profiles, creators maintain audiences, founders maintain presence, companies maintain brands, writers maintain readership.

A person may genuinely want to express something, but the expression now takes place inside an environment where visibility can carry professional, economic or social value.

Once visibility has value, silence begins to acquire a cost.

Noise Does Not Require Bad Information

We often think of social-media noise as a problem of quality: spam, engagement bait, repetitive opinions, shallow commentary. All of that contributes.

But I think there is another kind of noise, and it is more interesting.

Noise can emerge even when the individual signals are good.

Imagine five people speaking in a room. You can probably listen.

Now imagine five thousand people speaking at once, and suppose every one of them is saying something intelligent.

The result is still noise.

Nothing happened to the quality of the speakers. What changed was the relationship between the number of signals and the listener's ability to process them.

That distinction feels increasingly important online. The technological capacity to produce information has expanded enormously; the human capacity to attend to it has not. We still have one mind, one stream of attention, one day at a time. Reading takes time, listening takes time, understanding takes time, thinking takes time.

Herbert Simon observed more than half a century ago that a wealth of information creates a poverty of attention.

It feels almost obvious now.

Content can multiply almost indefinitely. Attention cannot.

So perhaps the defining scarcity of the digital age is not information but attention. And once too many legitimate signals compete for the same limited attention, even good information begins to feel like noise.

Expression Becomes Maintenance

Scarce attention changes behaviour.

Creators are encouraged to post consistently, professionals to build personal brands, founders to build in public, businesses to remain active, writers to grow audiences. People study hooks, formats, posting times, engagement, impressions and follower growth.

The sequence begins to shift.

I have something to say

can gradually become:

I need something to say.

That difference looks small.

I think it is enormous.

The first begins with meaning.

The second begins with the need to remain present.

Once presence has professional or social value, expression acquires a maintenance function. You are not only communicating; you are maintaining visibility.

This does not require an algorithm to explicitly punish silence. The perception that visibility depends on continued participation can be enough. If other people keep posting while you stop, they keep appearing and you do not.

Silence can begin to feel less like rest and more like disappearance.

The Quantification of Recognition

None of the underlying psychology is new.

Human beings have always cared about recognition. We want to be heard, acknowledged, our work to matter. We care about reputation, status and belonging.

Social media did not invent any of this.

It gave these things counters.

Followers. Likes. Views. Impressions. Comments. Reposts. Subscribers.

Recognition became measurable, and once something is measurable it becomes comparable. Someone has 500 followers, someone else 50,000. One post receives twenty reactions, another twenty thousand.

The metrics are not meaningless. A writer may genuinely need to know whether anyone is reading; a business needs to know whether communication reaches customers; a creator may depend economically on audience size.

The interesting part begins when the measurement starts influencing the behaviour being measured.

You publish something. The platform measures the response. You see the response. You adjust what you do next.

Research suggests this feedback loop is real. Studies have found that social rewards such as likes can influence subsequent posting behaviour, and that emotional reactions to likes and comments can affect both how often people post and what they choose to share.

This does not mean people are mechanically controlled by metrics.

It means the numbers are not passive records of behaviour. They become part of the environment producing future behaviour.

The platform does not merely measure expression.

Its measurements can begin shaping expression.

When Visibility Acquires a Price

Once attention becomes scarce, visibility becomes valuable, and wherever something becomes valuable, economic activity gathers around it.

Major social platforms now increasingly offer subscription tiers and premium features: verification, advanced analytics, creator tools, professional features, support, customization and, in some cases, preferential positioning within parts of a platform.

Charging for software is unremarkable. Platforms cost money to build and operate, and paid features can provide genuine value.

But the broader structure is interesting.

First a platform becomes an important environment for social or professional visibility. Then users compete for attention inside it. As participation grows, attention becomes scarcer. Around that scarcity develops an economy of tools, status, analytics and positioning.

expression → participation → competition for attention → scarcity of visibility → economic value around visibility

I would stop short of saying platforms simply sell attention, or that every subscription buys reach. That would be too crude.

The more interesting point is that they increasingly sell products inside environments where visibility has already become valuable.

The platform is no longer merely somewhere speech occurs. It organizes the conditions under which speech is discovered, ranked, measured and rewarded.

And that organizational power becomes more valuable precisely because everyone cannot be heard equally.

No One Has to Intend the Noise

Perhaps the most interesting part is that nobody needs to consciously design this outcome.

A professional sees other professionals building audiences. A founder sees competitors publishing constantly. A creator sees one post perform well and another disappear. A company watches analytics. A writer notices which ideas travel.

Each person adjusts.

And each adjustment may be perfectly rational.

If visibility produces opportunity, why not remain visible? If customers expect faster responses, why respond slower? If competitors produce more, why voluntarily produce less?

The problem is that individually rational behaviour can produce a collectively exhausting environment.

Everyone speaks because being heard has value.

Because everyone speaks, being heard becomes harder.

Because being heard becomes harder, people speak more frequently, optimize more aggressively and devote more effort to visibility.

Which creates still more speech.

more participation → greater competition for attention → greater pressure to participate → still more participation

Noise does not have to be anyone's intention.

It can simply be an emergent property of the incentives.

These Are Not the Same Systems

There is an obvious danger here.

A bank employee facing an overcrowded branch and a professional deciding whether to post on LinkedIn are not experiencing the same kind of pressure. One involves employment, organizational authority and economic necessity; the other generally involves softer forces around reputation, opportunity, identity and social visibility.

Government institutions operate differently from private companies, and social platforms operate differently from both. Their mechanisms should not be collapsed into one another.

The argument is narrower than that.

Different systems may encounter a similar structural tension: when demands, participants or signals grow faster than the mechanisms available to organize them, excess complexity has to be absorbed somewhere.

Where it appears depends on the system.

In a workplace, as workload.

In a bureaucracy, as delay and procedural friction.

In banking, as queues, targets and frontline stress.

On social media, as algorithmic filtering, attention competition and content saturation.

The mechanisms differ.

The imbalance may be similar.

Scale Is Not Destiny

None of this means growth inevitably produces dysfunction.

Large systems can be extraordinarily effective. Better organizational design can reduce unnecessary coordination; automation can remove repetitive work; greater staffing can increase service capacity; better interfaces can reduce cognitive burden; better filters can make information navigable.

Companies can protect attention instead of continuously fragmenting it. Platforms can experiment with incentives that reward usefulness rather than merely frequent activity.

Participation-capacity imbalance is not a law of nature.

It is partly a problem of design, and perhaps also of what systems choose to measure.

If a company measures responsiveness but not the cognitive cost of constant interruption, responsiveness stays visible while attention loss stays hidden.

If an institution counts transactions completed but not the strain required to complete them, output stays visible while exhaustion disappears from the dashboard.

If a social platform measures engagement but not whether its users feel overwhelmed, engagement becomes easier to optimize than meaning.

Systems become very good at optimizing what they can see.

The costs they cannot easily measure often end up being absorbed by the individual.

Systems Can Survive While People Inside Them Deteriorate

This may be the part that troubles me most.

We often judge systems by whether they continue to function: the company still operates, the bank still opens, the office still processes applications, the platform still has millions of active users.

Therefore the system appears healthy.

But operational survival and human well-being are not the same thing.

A system can remain productive while its workers become exhausted. It can keep processing transactions while customers and employees grow increasingly frustrated. It can produce more communication while meaningful communication becomes harder. It can generate extraordinary amounts of information while attention becomes increasingly fragmented.

The cost has not disappeared.

It has moved.

Into stress, burnout, queues, disengagement, cynicism, compulsive participation and attention fatigue.

And into the strange feeling that if we stop responding, producing, publishing or appearing, we may begin to disappear.

Perhaps overloaded systems often survive precisely because human beings absorb the overload for them.

Humans are remarkably adaptable. We work harder, improvise, develop shortcuts, create unofficial workarounds, tolerate inefficient systems, lower expectations and sometimes emotionally withdraw.

Our adaptability prevents the system from immediately failing.

But perhaps that is also why the structural problem can continue for so long.

When Participation Stops Feeling Voluntary

This brings me back to the question underneath all of these examples:

What happens when participation becomes something we feel we cannot stop doing?

The employee keeps responding because the work keeps arriving. The company keeps accelerating because competitors keep accelerating. The professional keeps posting because other professionals remain visible. The creator keeps producing because an audience has to be maintained. The individual keeps reacting because the conversation never ends.

Nobody necessarily wants the environment to become exhausting.

Each participant may simply be responding rationally to the incentives immediately around them.

And perhaps that is the paradox.

We have become extraordinarily good at making participation easier: easier to communicate, publish, transact, collaborate, reach people and measure activity.

These are real achievements.

But our ability to produce signals may now be growing far faster than our ability to organize and receive them.

Technology keeps expanding the first.

The second remains stubbornly human.

And whenever the distance between them becomes too large, the nature of participation begins to change.

Communication becomes interruption.
Choice becomes overload.
Work becomes pressure.
Expression becomes performance.
Recognition becomes measurement.
Presence becomes maintenance.

And participation, despite everything it makes possible, can begin to produce the very thing it was supposed to overcome:

noise.

Notes and References

The concept of participation-capacity imbalance as used in this essay is a proposed descriptive framework rather than an established academic term.

Eppler, M. J., & Mengis, J. (2004). The Concept of Information Overload: A Review of Literature from Organization Science, Accounting, Marketing, MIS, and Related Disciplines. *The Information Society*, 20(5), 325-344.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The Job Demands-Resources Model of Burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources Model: State of the Art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.

Simon, H. A. (1971). Designing Organizations for an Information-Rich World. In M. Greenberger (Ed.), *Computers, Communications, and the Public Interest*.

Lindström, B., Bellander, M., Schultner, D. T., Chang, A., Tobler, P. N., & Amodio, D. M. (2021). A Computational Reward Learning Account of Social Media Engagement. *Nature Communications*, 12, 1311.

Stsiampkouskaya, K., Joinson, A., Piwek, L., & Ahlbom, C.-P. (2021). Emotional Responses to Likes and Comments Regulate Posting Frequency and Content Change Behaviour on Social Media. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 124, 106940.

World Health Organization. Burn-out an Occupational Phenomenon: International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11).