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INTRODUCTION: AN EXPANDING LITERACY

The ACRL 2021 Environmental Scan named privacy literacy (PL) an expanding literacy, empowering library workers to address key critical thinking skills about information and the role it plays in individuals’ lives and within society. Recent LIS literature on PL focuses largely on practical personal data protection, instruction case studies, frameworks, critiques, and ethical patron data management by libraries and vendors. This paper extends insights from co-authors’ survey study, while contributing to extant literature by exploring instruction librarians’ attitudes, practices, and vision of PL.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with twenty academic teaching librarians engaged in PL instruction. Participants discussed how PL relates to information literacy (IL), their rationales for and philosophies of PL, the barriers they encounter and strategies for overcoming them, student responses, and reflections on how PL is evolving. Each interview was transcribed and coded using elemental and affective methods to categorize and identify themes. The study was reviewed and exempted by Penn State University’s IRB.

Participants were recruited through purposive, expert sampling of teaching librarians, and expanded through snowball sampling. Study participants represented a diverse range of experiences, identities, institution types and locations, and student populations. Some interviewees shared the significance of their cultural, gender, or ethnic/racial identities to their PL practice. Participants discussed the importance of PL for their students, including unique relevance to populations such as students of color, women, LGBTQ+ students, immigrants and DREAMers, economically disadvantaged students, and international students.

| Institution Type | Community college | Public & private liberal arts colleges | Public research universities | Private research universities | Satellite campuses |
|------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Count            | 2                 | 4                                    | 12                          | 2                           | 2                 |
| Region           | Northwest         | West                                 | Midwest                     | Southwest                   | Northeast         | Mid-Atlantic      | Southeast        |
| Count            | 3                 | 2                                    | 1                           | 3                           | 2                 | 4                 | 5                |
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Though findings are non-generalizable, analysis of these in-depth interviews contributes a record of the practical application of this emergent literacy in academic libraries and how librarianship is addressing this professional value at a time of rising social relevance.

“LITTLE PATHS IN”: MODALITIES & PEDAGOGY

Participants demonstrated a variety of teaching modalities. Forty-five thematic codes and subcodes, along with six in vivo codes related to teaching modality were applied across all twenty interviews. Forty instances of the primary code ‘pedagogical approach’ were assigned to ten interviews. As seen in Table 2, academic librarians are integrating PL through several approaches including credit-bearing instruction, PL focused workshops, peer-facing PL, traditional one-shot instructional models, and other low-barrier instructional methods. Co-investigators determined the hierarchy of learning experiences based upon the level of professional autonomy exerted over each modality – with credit-bearing instruction enabling the most control, free-standing privacy workshops allowing similar independence but less depth and breadth of coverage, and one-shot instructional models and low-barrier instructional methods permitting the least freedom.

Half of participants engaged in PL work within the constraints of the traditional one-shot instructional model. These often manifested through low-barrier instructional methods like the use of privacy related search examples and integrating PL concepts into existing IL content, such as privacy implications of web searching or privacy policies of library databases. As one participant observed, “I always try to look for little paths in.” While teaching librarians of all modalities engaged in low-barrier instructional methods, it seems these approaches are entry points for librarians seeking to integrate PL concepts into their teaching practice.

Outside of the one-shot instructional context, low-barrier methods also included informal learning experiences and passive programming. Examples of informal PL included reference consultations, where librarians addressed privacy concepts with individual students, as well as campus outreach events like pop-up tabling. Passive programming encompassed library displays and research guides, which often connected with larger initiatives such as Cybersecurity Awareness Month and ALA’s Choose Privacy Everyday.

With the added autonomy of free-standing privacy workshops and credit-bearing instruction, participants implemented more sophisticated pedagogical approaches. Several librarians engaging in this level of teaching cited privacy theory and the ACRL’s Framework as guiding principles to their pedagogy. Both modalities support class discussions and active learning. Predictably, credit-bearing instruction permitted even more time and space for in-depth exploration of PL concepts including project based, service, and experiential learning, as well as integrated class readings on both case studies and privacy theory.

“COMMODIFICATION OF THAT DIGITAL SELF”: PL TOPICS

Across all twenty interviews, two hundred twenty-three thematic codes and subcodes, along with forty-one in vivo codes about PL topics were applied. As a sweeping concept of increasing societal importance, it’s unsurprising that librarians address an enormous variety of privacy topics in their instruction. Many situate their PL work within digital and data literacies, as well as information ethics. Despite the breadth of topics, major themes emerged among interviewees, which align with results from co-authors’ survey study.²
Nearly all participants tackled digital platforms in some capacity; the most prevalent were social media, educational technology, library subscriptions / systems, and search engines. Discussions surrounding these platforms were connected to personal data collection, reputation management, privacy settings and policies, targeted advertising, and hidden surveillance architectures of everyday technologies.

Additionally, privacy-enhancing technologies were widely examined; specific technologies detailed by participants included DuckDuckGo, VPNs, two-factor authentication, password managers, ad blockers, privacy browsers, and incognito mode. While some librarians engaged in nuanced discussions of these technologies and their limitations, most utilized them as tangible solutions and “takeaways” to potential privacy concerns and violations.

Beyond specific technologies, librarians sought to examine larger systemic issues such as surveillance capitalism and the “commodification of that digital self” with students. Exploration of these issues often led to discussions of convenience and the tradeoffs which individuals are increasingly forced to make in order to participate in various spaces, both virtual and physical.

Participants also explored PL themes of digital wellness, learning analytics, student surveillance, government versus corporate surveillance, the differences between data security and privacy, personalization, persuasive design, and digital citizenship in their teaching.

Generally, those engaged in low-barrier and one-shot instructional models integrated succinct coverage of topics that easily fit into established learning objectives, such as library subscription databases, educational technologies, and web searching. Nuanced discussions of specialized topics and larger systemic issues were addressed and analyzed in credit-bearing instruction and free-standing workshops.

"SO MUCH BIGGER": INSTRUCTIONAL PHILOSOPHIES

Thirty-nine instances of the primary code ‘instructional philosophy’ were applied in seventeen out of twenty interviews; twenty-nine instances of the primary code ‘need for PL’ were assigned in eleven interviews. Overwhelmingly, participants felt there was a deep need for PL in their work as academic teaching librarians. Their instructional philosophies were profoundly guided by their belief in its significance to students’ lives and society. As one librarian described, “what we’re teaching is just so much bigger than ‘how do I get through this next term paper.’”

Participants viewed PL as “immediately applicable” and of universal relevance, with one librarian explaining, “it’s essential for any human being to know that when you’re using the internet...that there are certain ways in which your privacy is no longer what you think it is.” Some additional motivations for PL in the academic context were intellectual privacy, doxing, digital literacy initiatives, and lifelong learning. As one interviewee stated, “we do it because we don’t want there to be a chilling effect on what people are researching, people’s ability to speak freely or engage freely with the world.”

With increasing integration of artificial intelligence into all spheres of society and growing concerns related to job security, intellectual property, academic integrity, and human dignity, PL is of rising significance. It was highly important to participants that their PL instruction was student-driven with real-world application. Despite the consensus among interviewees that PL holds universal value, many acknowledged that there are no easy answers to satisfy everyone’s preferences or values; the goal of instruction was knowledge and empowerment, not judgment. As one librarian explained, “I’m not here to tell anyone what they should or shouldn’t do.” Several instructional philosophies, including care ethics, harm reduction, and critical pedagogy were explicated as approaches to address these complexities. Another theme surrounding PL instructional philosophies was a concern for professional self-efficacy and a subsequent need for humility as librarians “are learning as we go.”

A common large-scale motivation was surveillance capitalism’s disparate impact on marginalized communities and algorithmic bias. Relatedly, several librarians connected their PL work to civic responsibility, social justice, activism, and coalition building.

“I hear all the time that privacy is dead. It doesn’t exist. What’s the point? And that’s, like, totally legit cause I think so much of it is kind of hard to resist. But I think we also wanted to show students that there are ways that you can mitigate that.”
There was some dissonance surrounding teaching librarians’ overall goals in PL instruction with many interested in a "shock and awe" approach, and others interested in positivity and advocacy. For example, some librarians made statements like, “I think leaving students feeling a little creepy, a little creeped out, is in their best interest” and “I want them to leave a little worried.”

While there is merit to provoking a healthy level of concern in students, this can lead to a common sentiment with PL work: hopelessness and digital resignation. In response to this condition, several interviewees expressed a desire to imbue their students with optimism when possible. As interviewees explained, “I try to inculcate them with hope” and “I want to give them the tools that they can use to move forward.”

“TOTALLY DISEMPOWERED”: STUDENT RESPONSES

Thirty-one instances of the primary code ‘student response’ were recorded in nine out of twenty interviews, with nineteen associated in vivo codes. Student reactions to PL ranged from blind trust in digital platforms to apathy, skepticism, and total surprise. Overall, interviewees felt that students were engaged and highly interested in the content. Participants used words like “shock”, “awe”, “freaked out”, “creepy”, and “horrified” to describe students’ reactions to PL instruction. This suggests that despite growing up alongside these technologies, students are not entirely cognizant of the surveillance architectures embedded in their world. Librarians noted that many students experienced digital resignation and felt “totally disempowered” while investigating data privacy.

It was evident to interviewees that the majority of students cared deeply about privacy. While many articulated frustrations with the lack of control over their data, they were keen to seek solutions. Students exhibited technosolutionist mindsets, concerned primarily with privacy-enhancing technologies that could offer safeguards against ubiquitous surveillance. This preoccupation with quick fixes to complex, systemic privacy issues can lead to digital resignation for both librarians and students, as one interviewee illustrated, “I do think it’s frustrating because we never come up with a solution, right? It’s just like a long conversation.”

Beyond technosolutionist mentalities, some librarians witnessed openness to behavioral changes. A combination of techniques were embraced by students including threat modeling, informed decision-making, along with mindful integration of privacy-enhancing technologies.

“FIGHTING AGAINST THE TIDE”: BARRIERS

Barriers to PL programming was a highly salient topic; seventeen of twenty participants mentioned macroenvironmental and local factors that hindered PL efforts, and investigators applied 109 instances of the primary thematic code ‘barriers’ along with eighteen related in vivo codes across these interviews.

Characteristics of privacy culture in the US create macroenvironmental barriers. Participants describe a “cultural logic” of ubiquitous surveillance, pointing to hidden surveillance architectures permeating everyday technologies, observing that we are “exposing ourselves to [a] large surveillance infrastructure” that is “explicitly built with a disregard for privacy.” In the higher education context, students lack meaningful privacy choices; one participant observed, “I think ethically we’re asking them to use things that they can’t actually opt out of,” describing conditions of systemic coercion of digital participation. Librarians and participants alike feel powerless to enact their privacy values and like they are, in the words of one interviewee, “fighting against the tide.” Participants wondered how to convey that privacy matters in a macroenvironment where “[students] just feel like they don’t have any control and they’re ambivalent.” One participant was frustrated that they “can raise the concern, but I don’t know how to be part of the solution,” and another disclosed that they find PL work “exhausting.”

Additional macroenvironmental factors include perceived lack of public awareness and prevailing privacy illiteracy, cultural differences, stigma, and technosolutionist desires for quick fixes. Multiple participants shared the concern that PL is stigmatized as “an activist thing,” or as the purview of conspiracy theorists. Finally, as interviews occurred during summer 2020, many participants pointed to the COVID-19 pandemic and transition to remote teaching and learning as a disruption in their PL work. Participants also observed that student privacy was further deemphasized as institutions prioritized online learning and worked to bridge the digital divide for students.
Participants spoke to a number of factors specific to their institutions, libraries, and roles that pose barriers to PL work. Time is the most frequently-mentioned barrier that library instructors face: instruction time, as well as time to develop PL content and acquire PL knowledge. This is consistent with findings from co-authors’ previous study.9 Many participants identified the one-shot instructional model as a temporal impediment to PL. One interviewee observed that “many librarians are stuck in an instructional model that does not support them being able to teach about privacy,” and another observed that securing faculty buy-in to allot instruction time to PL was challenging. Time to develop instructional materials is also scarce. Librarians pointed to a lack of PL standards and resource sharing, with one participant observing that most effort is invested in digital literacy and digital citizenship. Participants also had insufficient time for PL knowledge-building, contributing to a lack of self-efficacy.

Related to time pressure is a broader institutional culture that deprioritizes PL work. Many librarians experience a lack of support to “make privacy an issue across the board.” Participants observed that PL work is often incongruent with higher education practices regarding student data collection, and that recognition of PL as an expanding literacy is delayed because “academia is slow to change.”

Participants experienced lack of support within the library. One interviewee described “a perception that this isn’t the work of libraries necessarily,” and another was “very strongly discouraged” from pursuing PL work. Librarians also observed a lack of formal recognition for PL efforts; one participant shared that “none of us have privacy in our job descriptions” and as a result “it almost kind of feels like we’re doing volunteer work outside of our normal nine to five jobs.” Librarian status (faculty vs. staff), degree of autonomy, job duties, and staffing levels comprise additional barriers. Finally, one participant observed that library-led PL programming is less impactful when disconnected from other campus efforts.

Interviewees also reported that LIS education did not adequately prepare them for PL work, and characterized librarians as “behind the times” with respect to privacy issues external to libraries. One participant explained, “I did not receive enough foundational education about the informational structures that dominate our world today, which is not the library.”

“WE ALL JUST KINDA CAME TOGETHER”: COLLABORATIONS

Forging collaborations is a primary means by which participants overcame barriers to PL work. Forty-two instances of the primary code ‘collaboration’ and seven related in vivo codes were applied in thirteen out of twenty interviews. Collaborations occurred with campus partners, within the library, and with external groups.

The most frequently mentioned collaborations were with campus IT; however, these initiatives tended to focus on data- and cyber-security topics such as anti-phishing campaigns. Programming for Cybersecurity Awareness Month was a common context of IT collaboration. Participants collaborated with other administrative units, such as centers for teaching, scholarly communications, and research data management, as well as institutional governance bodies including curriculum committees and policy development task forces. Student-facing collaborations included joint programming with career services (reputation management), health and wellness centers (digital safety and wellbeing), and student life, including services for international and DACA/DREAMer students (government-corporate surveillance). One participant described their campus collaboration as a serendipitous “informal group”:

“[We were] kind of just going at it alone in a lot of cases, like, we all just kinda came together because we happened to figure out who else on campus or who else in the libraries cared about privacy.”

Librarians also formed collaborations with academic disciplines, particularly in computer and information sciences, the humanities, and social sciences. Table 3 lists the academic programs referenced by participants as PL collaborators across these domains in order of frequency.

Often, these collaborations developed in the context of a liaison librarian role. Participants also pursued collaborations in general education curricula, first-year experience and first-year writing programming, noting that PL has broad application across the curriculum: “Privacy is a part of many different disciplines.”
A smaller subset of interviewees collaborated within their libraries. The most frequent examples were co-teaching or instruction teams. Most PL programming is student-facing, but some library collaborations deliver peer-facing PL continuing education. Other peer collaborations in the library center on knowledge-building, such as reading clubs, discussion groups, and mentoring. Additional library-based collaborations occurred with co-located services or at integrated service points, including writing services and peer research consultants, in which PL practitioners cross-trained service providers on privacy as it relates to patron privacy and library professional ethics.

Some interviewees also discussed external collaborations, including participation in Library Freedom Institute cohorts and the Digital Library Federation’s Privacy and Ethics in Technology Working Group, regional library consortia initiatives, and local public and school library partnerships.

**“WE JUST DECIDED TO DO IT”: ENTREPRENEURIALISM**

Many PL practitioners are entrepreneurial in developing and delivering PL programming. Twenty-five thematic codes and subcodes and thirteen in vivo codes related to entrepreneurialism were assigned to eighteen interviews. Participants exhibited aspects of entrepreneurial mindset, engaged in new venture creation, conducted outreach activities, and enhanced the library’s reputation as an agent of PL. These efforts were often received positively by campus constituencies and contributed to on-campus collaborations.

Participants expressed two primary dimensions of entrepreneurial mindset: self-efficacy—an intrinsic belief in one’s potential for success, and opportunity recognition—the ability to recognize a gap or need in available offerings. PL practitioners’ self-efficacy manifested in strategies to maintain privacy-related current awareness and in leveraging academic freedom to deliver PL learning opportunities. As one participant explained, “And so I’m learning still and I hope to continue to learn as much as I can and use it as much as I can for instruction.”

Interviewees also identified or created opportunities to deliver a range of PL offerings. Many participants observed that PL is not delivered by any other university units, a finding consistent with co-authors’ previous study. As one participant mused, “who else would be educating folks about this?” While librarians recognized that engaging in a new instructional area requires time and effort that can compete with existing priorities, they felt that the work was worthwhile. One participant described it as “a good fight,” continuing, “I think it’s worth really making this an important issue and talking about it, bringing it to the forefront, doing more professional development.”

To avail themselves of these opportunities, interviewees implemented new PL learning experiences—a form of venture creation. Many participants characterized their work as not having any formal recognition or support. One librarian explained, “we have not been sanctioned or anything or, you know, given the blessing of administration, we just decided to do it,” and another described how they “forged ahead” with programming.

Participants engaged in numerous outreach strategies to cultivate interest in their PL offerings. Disciplinary faculty were the most sought-after audience for both delivering program- or course-integrated PL or incentivizing student participation in co-curricular workshops. One interviewee included PL offerings in their library’s instruction request form for faculty: “I’ve been trying to...let them know I do more than just show how to use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Programs with PL Collaborations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer and Information Sciences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital literacy (certificate program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybersecurity (minor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a database.” Another explained how PL outreach to disciplinary faculty enhanced the library’s reputation and helped colleagues realize that “[librarians] do more than just think about the library.” One participant described how digital researcher safety for doxing prevention provided a peer-facing PL opportunity with faculty. Participants also promoted PL workshops and webinars to campus constituencies. One outreach strategy entailed scheduling PL programming to coincide with broader privacy efforts. Many participants further engaged in professional outreach on PL topics with peers and through professional associations.

Particip ants reported that PL work was received positively on-campus and presented a reputation building opportunity. One interviewee characterized disciplinary faculty’s interest in PL work: “I think it made them stop and go, ‘wait a minute, there’s a little bit more to this library thing than we thought.’” A librarian who shepherded a PL-related credit-bearing course proposal through their campus’ curriculum development process indicated that “people were very positive” about the course. Another participant shared that campus administration believed PL efforts “showed proactivity” on the part of the library. Participants also observed that PL work afforded them “street cred” with students. Interviewees reported that reputation building through PL work also led to new opportunities for campus collaborations: “it’s totally changed the perception of us and we collaborate in all kinds of ways now.”

“UNCOMFORTABLE KIND OF DICHOTOMY”: PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Privacy is a core value of librarianship. The vast majority of participants agreed that librarians had an obligation and responsibility to uphold patron privacy in our practices, with one individual stating, “we should all understand how privacy relates to whatever aspect of librarianship we’re a part of.” Many spoke of long-established patron privacy norms regarding confidentiality of library records, browsing habits, and library systems.

Fifty-one thematic codes and subcodes and twenty-seven in vivo codes were applied to eighteen out of twenty interviews related to professional ethics. A major theme that arose was that of ethical tensions between practical library work and professional ethics, characterized by one librarian as an “uncomfortable kind of dichotomy.” Participants universally expressed a general discontent with the current condition and trajectory of professional privacy ethics; specific practices cited were academic libraries’ participation in learning analytics and other student success and retention initiatives, as well as library subscriptions and vendor contracts. These concerns mirror the library literature’s ethical critiques. The general sense among interviewees was that there was “no application of [privacy] in the work” and that “libraries have been complicit in giving away people’s privacy.”

Several participants expressed unease regarding library subscriptions and the profession’s complicity in surveillance capitalist practices. One interviewee observed,

“[Librarianship is] failing. It’s one of the things where, at a theoretical level, we are supposed to be strong protectors of privacy. It’s part of our values…. Yet when you look at our databases, and the licenses that we sign, and the information that we hand over to these companies, we’re not doing much.”

Some expressed disappointment with librarians’ easy acceptance, “I’m a little frustrated about our absolute lack of negotiation. We just seem to take whatever the publishers want.” Others questioned the profession’s inaction, “I don’t know if it’s because so many of the resources that we have to use are also a drag on our privacy that we feel hypocritical in addressing it?” Participants were also troubled by academic libraries’ perfunctory adoption of learning analytics practices. Some criticized the profession’s lack of ethical reasoning, “I think people get all excited about the data that they have, and don’t recognize the privacy.”

Despite the disenchantment with librarianship’s handling of PL, participants were still committed to advocating for ethical practices. As one librarian stated, “My philosophy is that [privacy] is just part of what we should be doing, period.”
“PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICALITY”: PRIVACY VS. PL

Many participants differentiated privacy from PL. Six thematic codes and subcodes and seven in vivo codes related to the privacy/PL distinction were applied to eight out of twenty interviews. Participants associated PL with privacy values and awareness of sociotechnical systems impacting privacy, while privacy education was characterized as skills-based. Participants also expressed that privacy policymaking was often more concerned with data privacy and security in the service of compliance than with autonomy privacy. One interviewee expressed concern that “privacy literacy is so broad and vague.” Others observed that libraries do not prioritize privacy as a literacy: “Librarians are all about privacy, but we’re not all about privacy literacy.” Another participant reasoned that privacy education and PL are not mutually exclusive: “It’s one of those things where philosophy and practicality kind of have to collide.”

Some participants further differentiated between privacy advocacy and PL advocacy. Fifteen instances of the primary code ‘PL advocacy’ were applied to seven of twenty interviews, and ten instances of the primary code ‘privacy advocacy’ were applied to five interviews. PL advocacy, described as “creating bigger systems of concern,” centered on curriculum development, faculty awareness, ethical librarianship, peer-facing PL, and learner-centered PL instruction practices.

Most PL advocacy efforts focused on PL across the curriculum. Practitioners pursued credit-bearing instruction and advocated with faculty for the implementation of PL as a learning objective related to digital citizenship and civic responsibility. Participants also engaged in PL advocacy with their library peers, by mentoring instructors and centering PL as a component of ethical librarianship, and with colleagues in IT departments. Many interviewees also described learner-centered PL teaching practices and viewed PL instruction as their personal contribution to advancing privacy: “If this is the one little thing that I can do is to help teach undergraduates about it, then maybe that’s my little piece of the puzzle.”

By comparison, privacy advocacy work focused on influencing campus culture around data collection practices. Participants engaged in student privacy advocacy, policymaking, privacy and compliance training, privacy audits and impact assessments, and coalition building, such as with campus diversity action committees. Campus surveillance and the use of CCTV and facial recognition technologies, along with learning analytics, were two common subjects of privacy advocacy. Privacy-related cross-training for employees at integrated service points is another example of privacy advocacy. Coalition building was presented as an essential strategy for making progress toward campus privacy goals since, as one participant notes, “they’re [privacy advocates are] in the minority, for sure.”

CONCLUSION: PARADIGM SHIFT

Librarianship is at an inflection point. The profession must acknowledge the current paradigmatic shift: “[librarians] need to think radically differently about how librarianship is done in an age of information ubiquity where everything is online.” In the current data-driven information economy, it is no longer enough to consider privacy in library-specific contexts. As one participant explained, “we forget that information science is about how information flows.” PL is “an information literacy issue in an age of information abundance” that has become “critically important to understand.” Academic libraries have a real opportunity to be ethical leaders and critical voices, educating about and advocating for PL during this time of pervasive technological advancement.

Study participants were hungry for professional guidance and tangible solutions in the form of PL frameworks and instruction standards, as well as widespread sharing of privacy OERs. Many felt that to advance PL work it had to gain formal recognition in library instruction roles through codifying privacy into practice. How will librarianship answer this call?

In the meantime, “if we wait until all of us librarians are experts on this stuff, we’re never going to get anywhere.” PL is not solely the purview of technologists – there is an absolute need for ethicists to join the conversation. As co-authors’ contend, privacy is about respect for persons, not about protecting data. The hardest part of PL instruction is simply getting started. Hopefully the experiences and reflections of these interviewees help to inspire and motivate a new cohort of PL advocates and educators.
APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How do you view privacy literacy in relationship to information literacy?
2. What are your rationales for teaching privacy literacy?
3. What is your philosophy about privacy literacy instruction? How do you approach it?
4. How do you account for information asymmetries, privacy paradox, control paradox, etc., in your privacy literacy instruction?
5. What barriers do you encounter in delivering privacy literacy? What strategies have been effective in surmounting or circumventing these barriers?
6. What kind of support is there for privacy literacy at your campus?
7. Response from faculty // peer library colleagues // library administration // campus administration // etc.
8. Are other departments on your campus addressing privacy?
9. Do you have any collaborations around privacy literacy?
10. What has been the student response to privacy literacy instruction?
11. What is your sense of librarianship's handling of privacy literacy?
12. Where do you see privacy literacy instruction going next? How is your practice evolving?

NOTES