

10. Privacy from a Communication Science Perspective

Sandra Petronio

10.1 Introduction

Privacy has emerged as a prominent topic of inquiry and has made individuals evermore mindful of its presence in everyday life. Privacy is a value in many cultures, contexts, academic disciplines, and within legal domains. Yet, privacy is often difficult to unpack. In each sphere, there are often a multiplicity of ways to think about privacy as is represented in the chapters found in this volume. This chapter discusses privacy from a communication science perspective focused on a theoretical understanding of privacy through the lens of Communication Privacy Management theory (CPM) (Petronio 1991, 2002, 2016; Petronio and Durham 2008). Communication privacy management research ascribes to using social science methodologies in juxtaposition to the historic disciplinary base of rhetoric and public speaking that reflects early developments of the communication discipline in the United States (National Communication Association 2018). Communication science typically uses both quantitative and qualitative methods rather than rhetorical or humanistic inquiry. However, the scope of communication studies in the United States sits side by side with the historic approaches focused on the power of communicating through public speaking in everyday life.

Communication between and among individuals spans many conditions and situations. Understanding the nature of human communication requires such issues as knowledge about societal issues, psychological conditions, message generation, the nature of conflict, the way groups function, organizational issues, persuasion, and communication that surrounds political issues.

The importance of having a broad-based understanding of how human communication functions allows for a deeper grasp of the complexities inherent in communication interactions. This approach provides a more complete way of understanding the nature of human communication. National and regional communication studies organizations in the United States, such as the National Communication Associations, encompass many areas of expertise and theoretical approaches. As an outcome, the discipline of communication, in which communication science resides, has many

different emphases and theories. For example, foci such as planning theory (Berger 1997) that is devoted to understanding issues of goal attainment through communicative action and the theory of imagined interaction that focuses on such issues as rumination (Honeycutt 2003). By contrast, Communication Privacy Management theory emphasizes the communicative importance of understanding the *management* of private information. The development of Communication Privacy Management theory exemplifies the utility of incorporating a broad spectrum of knowledge to understand communicative issues such as privacy management.

10.2 Meaning and function of privacy management

Unpacking the paradoxical sense of privacy management seems an increasingly difficult task. People worry about their private information and are often not sure how to deal with decisions to tell or protect their information. With the Internet introducing endless examples of privacy breakdowns, it is often unclear whether privacy is still possible. Decisions to disclose or conceal private information can be tricky. For example, when an individual makes a choice to disclose a secret and that friend posts the information without asking the individual's permission, there is a relational price to pay. Communication Privacy Management theory and research offer a more informed understanding of the place privacy management has in today's world. The predictive nature of CPM allows individuals to recognize the behaviours of individuals when granting or denying access to their information. CPM identifies ways to learn how privacy management functions and ways individuals can effectively take charge of their private information.

Rather than focusing on typologies or assuming the definition of private information is the same for all people, CPM theory places an emphasis on information that individuals 'themselves' define as private. In addition, CPM theory focuses on how individuals make decisions to reveal or conceal, disclose or protect, and grant or deny access to their information when others are involved. Correspondingly, CPM theory takes into account decisions that recipients make regarding how they will or should care for the owner's information once told. While there are many other ways to consider privacy, CPM theory offers a targeted approach factoring in relationships with others through communicative actions. The way individuals manage and regulate these social and communicative encounters is the nucleus of CPM theory.

Communication privacy management theory, therefore, provides a road-map that furthers the understanding of judgments made by both information

owners and recipients of the owners' information in regulating disclosure and protection of private information with others (Petronio 2002). CPM theory is evidence-based, meaning that the theoretical concepts have been tested for viability and validity. In the years since the initial publication of CPM in 2002, researchers have used this theory in multiple contexts. For example, these contexts include applications in healthcare (e.g. Broekema and Weber 2017), in social networking (e.g. Child, Petronio, Agyeman-Budu, and Westermann 2011), exploring organizational domains (e.g. Gordon 2011) in family studies (e.g. Petronio 2010), within the context of personal and interpersonal relationships (e.g. Ngcongco 2016), conducting LGBT studies (e.g. McKenna-Buchanan 2015), in exploring educational issues (e.g. Sideliger, Nyeste, Madlock, Pollak, and Wilkinson 2015), social work issues (e.g. Cohen, Leichtentritt, and Volpin 2012), group interactions (e.g. Petronio, Jones, and Morr 2003), and in finance (e.g. Allen 2008).

In addition, researchers are using CPM theory and research in a number of countries, for example, Malaysia (Badrul, Williams, and Lundqvist 2016), Hong Kong (Hawk 2017), South Africa (Ngcongco 2016) Latvia (Peterson and Khalimzoda 2016), Kenya (Miller and Rubin 2007), Scandinavia (Heikkinen, Wickstrom, and Leino-Kilpi 2007), United States (Scharp and Steuber 2014), and Belgium (De Wolf, Willaert, and Pierson 2014).

While there is more to achieve, these data show interest in, if not promise of, continued expansion and applications of ideas about privacy management from a CPM perspective. In doing so, the volume and nature of CPM-based research has the potential to develop systematic ways to isolate communalities and differences across contexts and countries.

The next segment illustrates the fundamentals of Communication Privacy Management theory. Two main areas characterize the tenets of CPM theory. First, the underlying foundation of Communication Privacy Management theory is presented. Next, the operational system of CPM theory is explained.

10.2.1 Understanding the underlying foundation of communication privacy management theory

Communication Privacy Management theory is based on three major assumptions framing the CPM theoretical system of managing private information, they include: (1) dialectics, (2) centrality of others, (3) meaning of private information (Petronio 2002).

1. *Dialectical Tensions.* For CPM theory, the concept of dialectics is fundamental to the theory and overall privacy management system (Altman 1975; Altman, Vinsel, and Brown 1981; Petronio 2002). In other words, a

dialectical tension underpins choice making about revealing and concealing private information. These choices are typically between wanting to connect interpersonally through disclosing to others and at the same time being mindful about retaining a sense of autonomy to protecting the individual's private information. For example, Jane is recently diagnosed with breast cancer. She is new in town and she feels uncomfortable about talking to people she does not know well about this diagnosis. Because she needs some support, she takes a chance and confides in her neighbour. Nevertheless, she feels a sense of caution because she is not sure whether her neighbour will keep the information to herself. This example illustrates a push and pull of needing or wanting to disclose and at the same time worrying about whether the private information could be compromised. This type of tension prevails in most privacy situations to greater or lesser degrees. In this regard, the tensions become mindful when individuals have to make decisions about disclosing or protecting an individual's private information. Both protection and access of information enter the calculus reflective of managing private information.

2. *Centrality of Others.* Others play a significant role in understanding the mission of communication privacy management theory. Only when others are involved is there a need to *manage* private information. CPM theory considers communicative interactions among and between individuals and groups where private information is concerned. The way individuals make choices about how and to whom they communicate private information represents one half of the structure by which privacy management occurs. How recipients of private information handle the revealed private information is the second half of the equation. There are varying reasons individuals construct ways to control choice making about revealing and concealing, disclosure and protection, and granting or denying access to owners' private information. CPM theory and research provide tools to investigate what people do when faced with these issues (e.g. Kennedy-Lightsey, and Frisby 2016; Petronio 1991, 2002, 2010, 2013).
3. *Meaning of Private Information.* Over the years, many different ways of defining privacy have emerged, each portraying privacy and private information somewhat differently. After a considerable number of observations, CPM theory and research advocate that there is likely not one consistently held definition of private information. Individuals tend to define something as private information when there is a reason to do so, with the possibility that the nature of that information will change once the need for defining the information as private dissipates. These shifts in defining information as private can be held for a short time or a long time depending on the need

to have the information defined as private. Variations in what constitutes private information likely occur across the lifespan with changing privacy needs. Often, what is considered private information to one person differs for others. The character of private information for individuals also shifts when circumstances change. For example, the nature of private information that adolescents hold may dramatically change as the adolescent moves into adulthood (Petronio 2002).

Because there is a changeability in how individuals define information as private, CPM theory argues there is a likelihood that privacy indicators can be detected through actions taken in communicative encounters (both verbal and non-verbal). For example, when a friend discloses information and states, 'don't tell anyone about this', the act of making this statement signals the information is likely to be private and expectations can be discerned regarding how the owner wants the recipient to treat the information (Petronio and Bantz 1991). Many types of behavioural enactments give rise to identifying a person's information as private. Obviously, more consideration is needed to work out these issues.

While there is a variability in how individuals define information as private, the underlying factor of vulnerability is, likely, inherent in the nature of the information deemed as private. In the cyber world, privacy risks play an important role because they highlight a level of presumed vulnerability (Ezhei and Ladani 2017). Although the notion of vulnerability is not a definition per se, there is a sensitivity to experiencing degrees of vulnerability. When that occurs, this state can trigger the need for exercising levels of ownership and control over information considered private by the owner. Degrees of vulnerability can range from high to low. When the vulnerability is high, there can be more intense management processes working to protect information perceived as private to the individual. This state suggests that privacy boundaries will likely be more impenetrable. When the sense of vulnerability is low, individuals are likely less concerned about sharing private information. The privacy boundaries surrounding the information are likely more permeable (Golden 2014; Millham and Atkin 2016).

10.2.2 Operations of communication privacy management

CPM theory proposes an operational structure that captures the scope of how this privacy management system functions (Petronio 2002, 2010, 2012, 2013). These highlight the component parts of the CPM private information management system that work in conjunction with each other forming a

way to grasp how people make decisions about their private information and the underlying issues that drive the management process. Five aspects are discussed in more detail below, namely: (1) issues of private information ownership and privacy boundaries, (2) privacy rules and privacy control, (3) coordination operations when others are involved, (4) collective privacy boundaries reflecting multiple privacy relationships, (5) *privacy turbulence in privacy relationships*.

10.2.2.1 Private information ownership and privacy boundaries

Individuals believe they own their private information and it belongs to them individually. Individuals thus create a metaphoric 'boundary' to represent where individuals house this information. Individuals consider themselves rightful owners of their information. When information owners grant access to others, thereby sharing the information, the recipients become 'authorized co-owners' (e.g. Petronio and Durham 2008). Intended access by the owner transforms the privacy boundary from personal to collective thereby creating a 'privacy relationships' between the information owner and authorized co-owner or co-owners.

When individuals disclose or reveal their private information to selected others, the 'information owner' presumes the recipient understands the 'fiduciary' responsibilities for the information. Thus, the act of sharing prompts expectations regarding assumptions about how recipients should care for the owner's private information. The expectations that 'information owners' have about recipient responsibilities stem from a clear sense that they own and should have the right to control how the authorized co-owners handle their information. These expectations remain even after individuals reveal their private information. Thus, individuals believe they own rights to their private information and they feel justified in believing they should be the ones controlling their privacy, regardless of the fact others are privy to the information.

The notion of privacy boundaries also play a part in identifying the level of information access owners grant 'authorized co-owners' through identifying permeability levels of the privacy boundary walls. Thus, privacy boundary walls can be thick and at times impermeable when the information is restricted, such as secrets, and thin when the information is fluid or permeable where owners tend towards allowing more openness. Thick and thin walls reflect the anchor points on a continuum regarding access to private information. In addition, privacy boundaries are often layered. For example, families tend to have boundaries that regulate a family's collectively held information to others outside the family. These mark what

members can or cannot discuss with people outside of the family (Petronio 2002). Families also have internal privacy boundaries that focus on how the family members are expected to treat the privacy regulation within the family (Petronio 2002).

10.2.2.2 *Privacy rules and privacy control*

Individuals control their private information by using ‘privacy rules’ (Petronio 2002). Privacy rules represent the engine of this privacy management system where choices about access, protection, and how authorized co-ownership is managed with others. Privacy rules are often constructed and reconstructed depending on the needs of the owner and the extent to which authorized co-owners adhere to the owner’s expectations (see privacy turbulence). Once others are involved, successful and continued control post-access is accomplished through *coordinating and negotiating privacy rules* with authorized co-owners regarding third party access (Petronio 2002).

Individuals use two types of criteria to determine privacy rule selection, ‘*core criteria*’ and ‘*catalyst criteria*’ (Hammonds 2015; Petronio 2013).

1. *Core criteria* tend to remain stable and often work in the background when determining privacy rule usage. For example, ‘*privacy orientations*’ as developed by CPM theory illustrates that groups, such as families, socialize members to use certain types of privacy rules consistent with the expectations of the family as a whole (Morr Serewicz, and Canary 2008; Petronio 2002). Core criteria include the notion of *cultural expectations* reflecting values of privacy anchored in cultural tendencies. Thus, all aspects of culture, including societal, ethnic, and regional, influence an individual’s expectations about the nature of privacy and impacts choices of management (Yep 2000). In addition, a person may have *gendered tendencies* toward the kind of information that is held private. Gendered tendencies evolve out of the gender identity one adopts and the socialization one experiences (Manning 2015). In addition, *privacy orientations* to privacy management emerge when individuals are socialized to regulate their private information in a particular way, thereby becoming routinized in their decision-making about private information (Petronio 2013).
2. *Catalyst criteria* tend to be triggered when there is a needed change in the established privacy rules a person uses. Three examples can be provided:
 - a. When ‘*motivational goals*’ shift and change, privacy rules may need altering to accommodate a desired outcome. The goal of knowing more about someone a person finds attractive can for example

trigger a change in a person's privacy rules. The person may disclose more about him or herself than is typical, thereby modifying the privacy rules to accommodate the *motivational goals*. In unfamiliar circumstances, the individuals tend to weigh '*risks against benefits*' of granting access or concealing their private information. These cases trigger the need for new or different privacy rules.

- b. '*Situational conditions*' also act as a catalyst for privacy rule changes. As the context or situation calls for different rule structures, it propels the need for modifications or alterations of the current set of rules typically used for privacy management. For example, divorced couples necessarily need to change the privacy rules they have established in their marriage (Miller 2009).
- c. '*Emotional needs*' often change the privacy rules a person might typically use. For example, when a partner is uncharacteristically critical of a loved one, catching that person off-guard, the result may lead the loved one to unwillingly disclose hidden feelings that otherwise would not be discussed (e.g. Hesse and Raunscher 2013; McLaren and Steuber 2013).

As these circumstances show, there are catalysts that trigger the need for change in the privacy rules people use to make decisions about revealing or concealing private information where others are concerned.

10.2.2.3 *Coordination operations when others are involved.*

CPM research illustrates that when the information owner wishes to grant access to their private information, three types of operation work to coordinate privacy rules so that a smooth co-management of the owner's private information occurs (Petronio 2002). These operations include decisions about privacy boundary *linkages* reflecting the owners' selection of individuals as co-owners of their private information. Coordination regarding privacy boundary *permeability* determines how much the owner tells the recipient and how much the 'authorized co-owner' is able to tell others (see Liu and Fan 2015). Thus, the information owner sets parameters for the authorized co-owners regarding such issues as to who they may tell, if they can tell, and how much they are permitted to tell others. The third operation includes privacy boundary *judgments about co-ownership control*. This operation reflects the level of propriety rights the authorized co-owner is granted concerning independent rights to make judgments about the control over how the owner's private information is handled.

10.2.2.4 *Collective privacy boundaries reflecting multiple privacy relationships.*

CPM theory argues that authorized co-ownership status can include multiple people leading to jointly held and operated collective privacy boundaries (Petronio 2002). Within these co-constructed boundaries, all members are considered co-owners; however, there are different forms of coordination processes that determine privacy rules for access and protection. CPM argues at least three types of privacy boundary coordination that take place with collectively held privacy boundaries. First, these are situations where one or more of the members appropriate control over the collective information held in the privacy boundary. These are defined as *power privacy relationships*. For example, in sexual child abuse situations, the perpetrator manipulates control over the child to keep the incidents secret. CPM also argues that there are collective privacy boundaries that reflect *equitable privacy relationships*. In these cases, all parties in the collective share responsibility for the ownership and control over the private information through negotiating the privacy rules that are used in the group. Finally, there are collective privacy boundaries where there is a unified agreement among the co-owners where everyone understands that the information within the privacy boundary is co-owned by all members of the group. This type of coordination is defined as representing a *participative privacy relationship*. For example, joining Alcohol Anonymous, a self-help group for alcohol dependency, illustrates this type of privacy boundary coordination where the information the members share are well-kept secrets outside the group. Recently, this type of unified boundary coordination has been insightfully applied to issues found in social networking (De Wolf and Pierson 2014).

10.2.2.5 *Privacy turbulence in privacy relationships*

CPM theory argues that efforts to coordinate privacy rules can be problematic. Because individuals do not live in a perfect world, breakdowns in privacy management will likely occur. CPM theory identifies the notion of 'privacy turbulence' to reflect the assumption of change in privacy management that has the potential to ultimately sustain the privacy management system. There are two categories of privacy turbulence, 'privacy miscalculations' and 'privacy transgressions'. 'Privacy miscalculations' reflect unintentional mishaps that occur in privacy management. For example, information owner's privacy rule choices are left unsaid at times. In so doing, the co-owner is in the dark about what privacy rules the owner wants him or her to use. Consequently, the authorized co-owner may second-guess which rules seem acceptable triggering a potential for miscalculating the privacy

rules the owner expects (Hewes and Graham 1989). When the choice of privacy rules is problematic, there is a potential for awkward interactions and possible challenges to the privacy relationship in the future. Regardless of how the authorized co-owner deals with these ambiguities, the lack of 'privacy rule coordination' can lead to mistakes and misunderstandings for both the recipient and the information owner.

While 'privacy miscalculations' have challenges, CPM theory also points out that there are incidents of 'privacy transgressions' that erupt (Petronio 2002). These violations are more serious in nature. Instances of 'privacy transgressions' further increase the complexity of managing private information. For example, the notion of betrayal reflects a circumstance where the actions taken are deliberate and are frequently complex. President Clinton's affair with Monica Lewinsky illustrates situations where privacy transgressions took place. A newspaper account indicated that one of Lewinsky's friends, Linda Tripp, betrayed her confidence and revealed damaging information (Petronio 2002). Betrayals such as this are often a surprise to the aggrieved individual. 'Trust credit points' are lost and are difficult to regain. Consequently, the privacy relationships are significantly compromised and thorny to overcome.

CPM theory points out that the *ramifications* for the information owners in these turbulent incidences is often perplexing and problematic. However, the authorized co-owners can also experience turbulence when they encounter situations that become difficult.

There is a wide berth of reactions to receiving someone's private information. Among them are incidents where confidants are reluctant to accept the burden of knowing a person's private information. The notion of a 'reluctant confidant', as identified in CPM theory, speaks to the need for better understanding the role of authorized co-owners (Petronio 2002; Petronio and Reiersen 2009). Receiving unwanted private information, whether the information owner is a relative, friend, or stranger can negatively affect a privacy relationship. Being asked to keep confidences when an individual knows others might benefit from having the information or encountering situations where knowing creates a dilemma because the confidant finds out information that could negatively affect a relative can be difficult to manage (McBride and Bergen 2008; Petronio 1991, 2013).

As these issues illustrate, privacy turbulence disrupts the privacy management system. However, these disruptions call into question the viability of the privacy rules used in these circumstances. Discovering that the current privacy rules do not address the needs of the owner or compromise co-ownership brings about the impetus to make changes in the management

system. The recognition of the need for recalibrating privacy rules allows the privacy management system to sustain itself and provides a viable way to sustain control and ownership of private information (Child and Petronio 2015; Child and Petronio 2011; Child, Petronio, Agyeman-Budu, and Westermann 2011).

As this discussion points out, the framework of CPM has many facets as indicated in this segment of the chapter. The foundation of the theory gives depth and breadth of understanding to the assumptions and the platform upon which this theory stands. The operations of CPM theory identify core apparatus with which individuals gain insight into this type of communicative actions. Overall, these fundamentals of CPM guide us toward a more comprehensive understanding of how privacy management works in everyday life.

10.3 Classic texts and authors

The evolution of CPM theory development started with testing the viability of concepts and working to validate the ideas about managing private information. While CPM theory is primarily grounded in the discipline of communication, several lines of inquiry in communication science and other social science disciplines made a significant contribution to understanding issues of privacy management. Namely, authors in the discipline of psychology have influenced the development of many ideas in CPM theory. The history starts with Jourard (1958) introducing the concept of self-disclosure and a few years later publishing a book entitled *The Transparent Self* (1964) where he expanded his notion of self-disclosure. Interestingly, his introduction of this concept brought to the forefront the utility of communicating about one's self and significantly informed the nature of decision-making regarding revealing and concealing aspects of one's self to others. As mentioned in the preface of Chelune's (1979) edited book, 'self-disclosure has come a long way in its relatively short history' (p. ix). Although Jourard passed away early in his life, the legacy of his quest to understand self-disclosure has a rich history and continues to grow with many branches expanding the scope of understanding.

A bridge was erected between self-disclosure issues and privacy through the scholarship of Derlega and his colleagues. In particular, Derlega and Chaikin (1977) highlighted the synergy between disclosure and privacy by introducing the concept of dyadic boundaries. Their insights contributed to identifying ways that self-disclosure and privacy are integrated. Derlega,

Metts, Petronio, and Margulies (1993) added to the dialogue in their book on self-disclosure merging several important aspects about the role privacy plays in human interaction.

The seminal work on secrecy by Bok (1982) opened up additional considerations regarding the tension between revealing and concealing information considered secret. Her insights into reasons for secrecy and the way individuals treat secrets helped provide a set of comparisons. The insights Bok offers in her book broadened the scope of understanding the nature of privacy in relation to secrecy.

Privacy issues in communication received early attention from Burgoon (1982). Among other insights, she presents four states of privacy that capture different dimensions of privacy. She suggests that these states include the notion physical privacy such as public territory and home territory. Privacy states also include the notion of social privacy where Burgoon notes 'inasmuch as privacy presupposes the existence of others, a fundamental facet of privacy is the ability to withdraw from social intercourse' (Burgoon, 1982, p. 216). She also includes 'psychological privacy' that 'concerns one's ability to control affective and cognitive inputs and outputs' (Burgoon, 1982, p. 224). Burgoon also includes the state of informational privacy that 'is closely allied to psychological privacy but its legalistic and technological implications coupled its significance beyond the individual to the society as a whole is treated separately' (Burgoon, 1982, p. 228).

In addition to Burgoon's work on privacy, her research on interpersonal and family communication contributed to a better understanding of the way these relationships help contribute to the development of privacy management (e.g. Baxter 1988; Duck 1994; Rawlins 1989).

Although each of these inquiries offer a useful way to understand communicative aspects of privacy management, Altman's foundational work built a platform that has inspired the emergence of new ideas and ways to understand the notion of privacy. Early in his search for understanding privacy, Altman was intrigued to discover that there was 'almost no empirical research' that had been done on privacy (Altman 1975, 6). He further stated, 'that social and behavioral scientists have generally not seen the issue of privacy as central or worthy of their empirically directed energies' (Altman, 1975, 6).

Altman's (1975) work on the environment and social behaviour charts a path to investigating privacy in a broader set of considerations. For example, Altman's inquiries regarding privacy issues incorporate processes that accommodated cultural issues, groupness, and the significance of dialectics. His ideas further explored the interface of disclosure and privacy among other

significant inquiries (Altman 1975; Altman 1987; Altman 1992; Altman 1993a; 1993b; Altman 1977; Altman, Vinsel, and Brown 1981). His seminal books, such as *The Environment and Social Behavior* (Altman 1975) and *Social Penetration: Development of Interpersonal Relationships* (Altman and Taylor 1973) have been the focus of attention for several generations of students and researchers. As these articles and books illustrate, Professor Altman's vision opened the door to a more comprehensive way of considering the notion of privacy.

Clearly, Professor Altman's work has influenced the development of Communication Privacy Management theory as he points out in the foreword to the book introducing this theory (Petronio 2002, xiii-xix). CPM theory benefited from the insightfulness of Professor Altman. In addition, part of the CPM journey included a need to gain a more comprehensive understanding about the relationship between self-disclosure and private information. During the late 1960s and early 1970s, there was a proliferation of very good self-disclosure research (e.g. Jourard 1971). Curiosity was a main reason for working through the way that self-disclosure and private information could be seen as integral. After much thought and work testing this hypothetical relationship, it seemed that the act of disclosure could be understood as a process of revealing and that the information revealed could be identified as an individual's private information. Treating the relationships between disclosure and private information in this manner proved to be important to the framing of CPM theory.

10.4 Traditional debates and dominant schools

The most traditional debate regarding privacy issues occurred between Altman (1975) and Westin (1967). These foundational theories of privacy have both commonalities and differences that lead to challenges. Margulis (2003, 2011) discusses a comparative analysis of the underlying differences and similarities between Westin's focus on privacy and that of Altman's position. Margulis' (2003) assessment, in general, argues that Westin's focus is on how people protect themselves by limiting access to others. Westin states that

privacy is the claim of individuals, groups, or institutions to determine for themselves when, how, and to what extent information about them is communicated to others. Viewed in terms of the relation of the individual to social participation, privacy is the voluntary and temporary withdrawal of a person from the general society through physical or psychological means, either in a state of solitude or small group intimacy of, when among large groups, in a condition of anonymity or reserve. (Westin 1967, 7).

Margulis (2003) points out that the states of privacy, according to Westin's perspective, focus on the 'hows' of privacy that include solitude, intimacy, anonymity, reserve, and the 'whys' of privacy that include personal autonomy, emotional release, self-evaluation, and limited and protected communication.

In the assessment of Altman's perspective on privacy, Margulis (2003) points out that Altman emphasizes the importance of individual and group levels of analysis and ways privacy is regulated. He also brings a dialectical approach to privacy regulation and a commitment to social and environmental psychology where social interaction is the underlying focus of the theory (Margulis 2003). Margulis (2003) argues that Altman's theory has five properties (p. 418). First, that privacy involves a temporal/dynamic of process of interpersonal boundary control. Second, that there is a differentiation of desired and actual levels of privacy. Third, where there can be an optimal desire for privacy or too much privacy. Fourth, privacy is bidirectional involving inputs and outputs. Fifth, Altman advocates that there can be individual and group levels of analysis. Margulis (2003) notes that 'Altman has challenged us to consider a number of important aspects of privacy' (p. 419). For example, Altman contributed the needed apparatus to illustrate how privacy is fundamentally a social process. At the time of Altman's theoretical breakthroughs, he challenged psychologists to recognize that where privacy was concerned, there needed to be an interplay among individuals, the social world in which they live, and account for cultural as well as contexts in which people navigated issues of privacy.

While there are specific differences in the way Altman and Westin envision the notion of privacy as Margulis (2011) points out, there are overlaps in some fundamental ways. However, the importance of these legendary leaders who have carved important paths of understanding cannot be overstated. Certainly, the advances made in the development of Communication Privacy Management theory has significantly benefited from the insightfulness of their work.

10.5 New challenges and topical discussions

In today's world, there are many challenges concerning privacy to consider. Clearly, social media is producing a number of issues that confront the continued efforts of privacy researchers and theorists. These challenges centre most certainly on capabilities to sustain the perceptions of privacy and directly call for more theoretically driven ways to capture behaviours

in everyday life. For example, the relationship between privacy and security will need a new and more effective type of framework.

From a CPM theory vantage point, privacy and security, though sharing fundamental issues, tend to have essential differences. When people talk about their private information, they act on their assumption that they are in charge. People do not stop assuming control even after a disclosure is made. Research shows that people work to sustain their control over what happens to their private information by recalibrating their privacy rules to right the system (e.g. Child, Petronio, Agyeman-Budu, and Westermann 2011).

However, in the context of security, these situations seem to have a different calculus. Security arises as an issue when individuals must provide private information to access services. For example, when someone needs hospitalization in the United States, HIPAA privacy forms must be signed in order to receive healthcare. There appears to be a transfer of control over specific types of private information with the assumption that the information will be considered 'confidential'. To ensure that, people are asked to sign a form that is considered a promissory note to protect the owner's private information.

However, patients know that not signing this form can potentially mean they will not receive healthcare. A HIPAA form is not the only circumstance people are asked to sign a document to insure the parameters of responsibility are identified. Likewise, when people want a loan, private information must be provided to achieve this goal. When someone opens a bank account, banking procedures require disclosure of private information. The nature of security in these situations implicitly assumes that individuals will trade off access to their private information for a particular outcome. As these examples illustrate, at times, relinquishing private information is utilitarian to achieve a specific goal (Pastalan 1974).

In these cases, responsibility for promising protection of the individual's private information falls to the entity caring for the person's information. There are dialectic tensions between the assumed level of privacy protection and the expectation of security. For instance, when there is a data breach at a bank, the patrons hold the bank responsible; they have essentially entered into a 'contract'. Yet, the patrons cannot necessarily dictate how the bank should handle the loss of their private information. Thus, in this example, the notion of 'security' has to do with an entity being responsible for an individual's privacy, but the management of the private information needed for using a bank is limited to what the bank perceives is reasonable. A person can change banks, but still has limited control over the information disclosed. Though this is true, the trade-off is limited for the private information owner;

however, there is likely a judgment of the risk-benefit ratio by the information owner that calculates how much control over privacy management they want to relinquish in order to gain access to services they need or want.

With the continued investigations regarding the use of big data, CPM theory points out that until the collection of private information is personal for individuals, they tend to feel less engaged or bothered about new technologies they do not understand or to which they do not have direct access. The technology seems to be viewed as complicated and often inaccessible, thus out of their control. Only when individuals are directly impacted by a breach do they become more mindful of the potential ramifications.

However, consistent with CPM theory and research, when the use of data from data banks directly affects a person's life, individuals do not necessarily expect they will be negatively affected. For example, the New York Times reported on a case involving the use of targeted advertising by the Target Corporation (Duhigg 2012). The incident concerned a privacy breach discovered by a father. This father was upset that his teenage daughter was receiving a number of coupons that related to pregnancy. He called the local store and asked the manager why his daughter was receiving these coupons. He said, 'she is still in high school, and you are sending her coupons for baby clothes and cribs? Are you trying to encourage her to get pregnant?' The manager apologized and then called a few days later apologizing again. On the phone the father said, 'turns out that there's been some activities in my house I haven't been completely aware of. She's due in August, I owe you an apology' (Duhigg 2012, 2-19). This case illustrates that, in general, individuals give little notice to

Discerning potential similarities and differences in privacy management regarding personal relationships as opposed to corporate or public services offers an intriguing research opportunity. Examining how individuals conceive of the trade-off with their information in order to obtain services, products, or resources and comparing the findings with the research on choices about revealing or concealing private information with others would add to both research areas. Similarly, identifying how individuals treat corporate or public entities when security breaches occur is a useful line of inquiry.

10.6 Conclusion

The nature of privacy has long been a part of the human condition (Veyne 1987). Yet, our attention to this important aspect of life, where individuals need both privacy and the ability to be social with others is in constant

need of new discoveries. A mission of communication privacy management theory is to bring about new insights into this phenomenon. The mission is to push these ideas further and help others to advance their interests in privacy inquiries. The Communication Privacy Management Center (www.cpmcenter.iupui.edu) at Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, has been recently started to provide resources, such as citations of research using this theory. We have harvested over 1000 citations thus far. There are over fifteen countries where researchers have been applying CPM theory, thus enabling cross-cultural research opportunities. There are also many different contexts and methodologies used in CPM research allowing for cross comparisons. Our team is working on teaching tools and devising ways to translate research into meaningful practice to help others.

Learning about privacy is a mission, yet, watching human behaviours unfold is remarkably entertaining and enriching. This volume offers a multitude of voices, opinions, and challenges. I appreciate the opportunity to take part in this mission.

Further reading

- Beck, C., S. Chapman, N. Simmons, K. Tenzek, and S. Ruhl. (2015). *Celebrity Health Narratives and Public Health*. City: McFarland & Company Publishers (ebook).
- Greene, K., V.J. Derlega, G.A. Yep, and S. Petronio. (2003). *Privacy and Disclosure of HIV in Interpersonal Relationships: A Sourcebook for Researchers and Practitioners*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Child, J.T., and S. Petronio. (2015). 'Privacy Management Matters in Digital Family Communication' in C.J. Buess (ed.), *Family Communication in the Age of Digital and Social Media*. New York: Peter Lang, 32-54.

References

- Allen, M.W. (2008). 'Consumer Finance and Parent-Child Communication' in J.J. Xiao (ed.), *Handbook of Consumer Finance Research*. New York: Springer New York, 351-361.
- Altman, I. (1975). *Environment and Social Behavior: Privacy, Personal Space, Territory, and Crowding*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Altman, I. (1977). 'Privacy Regulation: Culturally Universal or Culturally Specific?' *Journal of Social Issues* 33(3), 66-84. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1977.tb01883.x.
- Altman, I. (1987). 'Centripetal and Centrifugal Trends in Psychology'. *American Psychologist* 42(12), 1058-1069. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.42.12.1058.
- Altman, I. (1993a). 'Dialectics, Physical Environments, and Personal Relationships'. *Communications Monographs* 60(1), 26-34. doi:10.1080/03637759309376291

- Altman, I. (1993b). 'Challenges and Opportunities of a Transactional World View: Case Study of Contemporary Mormon Polygynous Families'. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 21(2), 135-163. doi:10.1007/BF00941618.
- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). *Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Altman, I., A. Vinsel, and B.B. Brown (1981). 'Dialectic Conceptions in Social Psychology: an Application to Social Penetration and Privacy Regulation'. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 14, 107-160. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60371-8.
- Badrul, N.A., S.A. Williams, and K.O. Lundqvist. (2016). 'Online Disclosure of Employment Information: Exploring Malaysian Government Employees' Views in Different Contexts'. *Computers and Society* 45(3), 38-44. doi:10.1145/2874239.2874245.
- Berger, C.R. (1997). *LEA's Communication Series. Planning Strategic Interaction: Attaining Goals through Communicative Action*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Baxter, L.A. (1988). 'A Dialectical Perspective on Communication Strategies in Relationship Development'. In S. Duck, D.F. Hay, S.E. Hobfoll, W. Ickes, and B.M. Montgomery (eds.), *Handbook of Personal Relationships: Theory, Research and Interventions*. Oxford: John Wiley, 257-273.
- Baxter, L.A., and B.M. Montgomery. (1996). *Relating: Dialogues and Dialectics*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bok, S. (1989). *Secrets: On the Ethics of Concealment and Revelation*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Broekema, K., and K.M. Weber. (2017). 'Disclosures of Cystic Fibrosis-related Information to Romantic Partners'. *Qualitative Health Research* 27(10), 1575-1585. doi:10.1177/1049732317697675.
- Burgoon, J.K. (1982). 'Privacy and Communication'. *Annals of the International Communication Association* 6(1), 206-249. doi:10.1080/23808985.1982.11678499.
- Chelune, G.J. (1979). *Self-disclosure: Origins, Patterns, and Implications of Openness in Interpersonal Relationships*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Child, J.T., and S. Petronio. (2011). 'Unpacking the Paradoxes of Privacy in CMC Relationships: The Challenges of Blogging and Relational Communication on the Internet' in K.B. Wright and L.M. Webb (eds.), *Computer-mediated Communication in Personal Relationships*. New York: Peter Lang, 257-273.
- Child, J.T., and S. Petronio. (2015). 'Privacy Management Matters in Digital Family Communication' in C.J. Bruess (ed.), *Family Communication in the Age of Digital and Social Media*. New York: Peter Lang, 32-54.
- Child, J.T., S. Petronio, E.A. Agyeman-Budu, and D.A. Westermann. (2011). 'Blog Scrubbing: Exploring Triggers that Change Privacy Rules'. *Computers in Human Behavior* 27(5), 2017-2027. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2011.05.009.
- Cohen, O., R.D. Leichtertritt, and N. Volpin, N. (2014). 'Divorced Mothers' Self-perception of their Divorce-related Communication with their Children'. *Child & Family Social Work* 19(1), 34-43. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2206.2012.00878.x.
- Collins, N.L., & L.C. Miller. (1994). 'Self-disclosure and Liking: a Meta-analytic Review'. *Psychological Bulletin* 116(3), 457-475. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.116.3.457.
- De Wolf, R., and J. Pierson. (2014). 'Who's My Audience Again? Understanding Audience Management Strategies for Designing Privacy Management Technologies'. *Telematics and Informatics* 31(4), 607-616. doi:10.1016/j.tele.2013.11.004.
- De Wolf, R., K. Willaert, and J. Pierson. (2014). 'Managing Privacy Boundaries Together: Exploring Individual and Group Privacy Management Strategies in Facebook'. *Computers in Human Behavior* 35, 444-454. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.03.010.
- Derlega, V.J., and A.L. Chaikin. (1977). 'Privacy and Self-disclosure in Social Relationships'. *Journal of Social Issues* 33(3), 102-115. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1977.tb01885.x.

- Derlega, V., S. Metts, S. Petronio, and S. Margulis. (1993). *Self-disclosure*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Duck, S. (1994). 'Stratagems, Spoils, and a Serpent's Tooth: on the Delights and Dilemmas of Personal Relationships' in W.R. Cupach and B. Spitzberg (eds.), *The Dark Side of Interpersonal Communication*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 32-54.
- Duhigg, C. (2012). 'How Companies Learn Your Secrets'. *The New York Times*, February 16. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2012/02/19/magazine/shopping-habits.html.
- Ezhei, M., and B.T. Ladani. (2017). 'Information Sharing vs. Privacy: a Game Theoretic Analysis'. *Expert Systems with Applications* 88, 327-337. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2017.06.042.
- Gordon, M.E. (2011). 'The Dialectics of the Exit Interview: a Fresh Look at Conversations about Organizational Disengagement'. *Management Communication Quarterly* 25(1), 59-86. doi:10.1177/0893318910376914.
- Golden, A.G. (2014). 'Permeability of Public and Private Spaces in Reproductive Healthcare Seeking: Barriers to Uptake of Services among Low-income African American Women in a Smaller Urban Setting'. *Social Science & Medicine* 108, 137-146. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.02.034.
- Hammonds, J.R. (2015). 'A Model of Privacy Control: Examining the Criteria that Predict Emerging Adults' Likelihood to Reveal Private Information to their Parents'. *Western Journal of Communication* 79(5), 591-613. doi:10.1080/10570314.2015.1083117.
- Hawk, S.T. (2017). 'Chinese Adolescents' Reports of Covert Parental Monitoring: Comparisons with Overt Monitoring and Links with Information Management'. *Journal of Adolescence* 55, 24-35. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2016.12.006.
- Heikkinen, A.M., G.J. Wickstrom, and H. Leino-Kilpi. (2007). 'Privacy in Occupational Health Practice: Promoting and Impeding Factors'. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health* 35(2), 116-124. doi:10.1080/14034940600975740.
- Hesse, C., and E.A. Rauscher. (2013). 'Privacy Tendencies and Revealing/concealing: the Moderating Role of Emotional Competence'. *Communication Quarterly* 61(1), 91-112. doi:10.1080/01463373.2012.720344.
- Hewes, D.E., and M.L. Graham. (1989). 'Second-guessing Theory: Review and Extension'. *Annals of the International Communication Association* 12(1), 213-248. doi:10.1080/23808985.1989.11678720.
- Honeycutt, J.M. (2008). 'Imagined Interaction Theory' in L.A. Baxter and D.O. Braithwaite (eds.) *Engaging Theories in Interpersonal Communication: Multiple perspectives*. City: Publisher, pages.
- Imber-Black, E. (1993). *Secrets in Families and Family Therapy: an Overview*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Jourard, S.M. (1958). 'A Study of Self-disclosure'. *Scientific American* 198(5), 77-86.
- Jourard, S.M. (1964). *The Transparent Self: Self-disclosure and Well-being*. New York: Van Nostrand.
- Jourard, S.M. (1971). *Self-disclosure: an Experimental Analysis of the Transparent Self*. New York: Wiley.
- Kennedy-Lightsey, C.D., and B.N. Frisby. (2016). 'Parental Privacy Invasion, Family Communication Patterns, and Perceived Ownership of Private Information'. *Communication Reports* 29(2), 75-86. doi:10.1080/08934215.2015.1048477.
- Liu, Y., and J. Fan. (2015). 'Culturally Specific Privacy Practices on Social Network Sites: Privacy Boundary Permeability Management in Photo Sharing by American and Chinese College-age Users'. *International Journal of Communication* 9, 2141-2060.
- Manning, J. (2015). 'Communicating Sexual Identities: a Typology of Coming Out'. *Sexuality & Culture* 19(1), 122-138. doi:10.1007/s12119-014-9251-4.
- Margulis, S.T. (2003). 'On the Status and Contribution of Westin's and Altman's Theories of Privacy'. *Journal of Social Issues* 59(2), 411-429. doi:10.1111/1540-4560.00071.

- Margulis, S.T. (2011). 'Three Theories of Privacy: an Overview'. In S. Treppe and L. Reinecke (eds.), *Privacy Online: Perspectives on Privacy and Self-disclosure in the Social Web*. Berlin: Springer Heidelberg, 9-18.
- McBride, C.M., and K.M. Bergen. (2008). 'Becoming a Reluctant Confidant: Communication Privacy Management in Close Friendships'. *Texas Speech Communication Journal* 33(1), 50-61.
- McKenna-Buchanan, T., S. Munz, S., and J. Rudnick. (2015). 'To Be or Not to Be Out in the Classroom: Exploring Communication Privacy Management Strategies of Lesbian, Gay, and Queer College Teachers'. *Communication Education* 64(3), 280-300. doi:10.1080/03634523.2015.1014385.
- McLaren, R.M., and K.R. Steuber. (2013). 'Emotions, Communicative Responses, and Relational Consequences of Boundary Turbulence'. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 30(5), 606-626. doi:10.1177/0265407512463997.
- Miller, A.E. (2009). 'Revealing and Concealing Postmarital Dating Information: Divorced Coparents' Privacy Rule Development and Boundary Coordination Processes'. *Journal of Family Communication* 9(3), 135-149. doi:10.1080/15267430902773287.
- Miller, A.N., and D.L. Rubin. (2007). 'Factors Leading to Self-disclosure of a Positive HIV Diagnosis in Nairobi, Kenya: People Living with HIV/AIDS in the Sub-Sahara'. *Qualitative Health Research* 17(5), 586-598. doi:10.1177/1049732307301498.
- Millham, M.H., and D. Atkin. (2017). 'Managing the Virtual Boundaries: Online Social Networks, Disclosure, and Privacy Behaviors'. *New Media & Society* 20(1), 50-67. doi:10.1177/1461444816654465.
- Morr Serewicz, M.C., and D.J. Canary. (2008). 'Assessments of Disclosure from the In-laws: Links among Disclosure Topics, Family Privacy Orientations, and Relational Quality'. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 25(2), 333-357. doi:10.1177/026540750708796.
- Ngcongco, M. (2016). 'Mobile Communication Privacy Management in Romantic Relationships: a Dialectical Approach'. *Communicatio: South African Journal for Communication Theory & Research*, 42(1), 56-74. doi:10.1080/02500167.2016.1140666.
- National Communication Association. (2018). <https://www.natcom.org/about-nca>.
- Pastalan, L.A. (1974). 'Privacy Preferences among Relocated Institutionalized Elderly'. *Man-environment Interactions: Evaluations and Applications* 2, 73-100.
- Pennebaker, J.W. (1990). *Opening Up: the Healing Power of Confiding in Others*. New York: William Morrow.
- Petersons, A., and I. Khalimzoda, I. (2016). 'Communication Privacy Management of Students in Latvia'. *Problems and Perspectives in Management* 14(2), 222-227. <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/49812>.
- Petronio, S. (1991). 'Communication Boundary Management: a Theoretical Model of Managing Disclosure of Private Information between Marital Couples'. *Communication Theory* 1(4), 311-335. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.1991.tb00023.x.
- Petronio, S. (2002). *Boundaries of Privacy: Dialectics of Disclosure*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Petronio, S. (2010). 'Communication Privacy Management Theory: What Do We Know about Family Privacy Regulation?' *Journal of Family Theory and Review* 2(3), 175-196. doi:10.1111/j.1756-2589.2010.00052.x.
- Petronio, S. (2013). 'Brief Status Report on Communication Privacy Management Theory'. *Journal of Family Communication* 13(1), 6-14. doi:10.1080/15267431.2013.743426.
- Petronio, S. (2016). 'Communication Privacy Management Theory' in K.B. Jensen, R.T. Craig, J.D. Pooley, and E.W. Rothenbuhler (ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 278-286. doi:10.1002/9781118766804.wbiect38.
- Petronio, S., and C. Bantz. (1991). 'Controlling the Ramifications of Disclosure: 'Don't tell anybody but...'. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 10(4), 263-269. doi:10.1177/0261927X91104003.

- Petronio, S., and W. Durham. (2008). 'Understanding and Applying Communication Privacy Management Theory' in L.A. Baxter and D.O. Braithwaite (eds.), *Engaging Theories in Interpersonal Communication: Multiple perspectives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 309-322.
- Petronio, S., and J. Reiersen. (2009). 'Regulating the Privacy of Confidentiality: Grasping the Complexities through Communication Privacy Management Theory'. In T. Afifi, and W. Afifi (eds.), *Uncertainty, Information Management, and Disclosure Decisions: Theories and Applications*. New York: Routledge, 309-322.
- Petronio, S., S.M. Jones, and M.C. Morr. (2003). 'Family Privacy Dilemmas: Managing Communication Boundaries within Family Groups' in L. Frey (ed.), *Group Communication in Context: Studies of Bona Fide Groups* (2nd ed.) (pp. 23-56). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 23-56.
- Rawlins, W.K. (1989). 'A Dialectical Analysis of the Tensions, Functions, and Strategic Challenges of Communication in Young Adult Friendships'. *Annals of the International Communication Association* 12(1), 157-189. doi:10.1080/23808985.1989.11678717.
- Scharp, K.M., and K.R. Steuber. (2014). 'Perceived Information Ownership and Control: Negotiating Communication Preferences in Potential Adoption Reunions'. *Personal Relationships* 21(3), 515-529. doi:10.1111/per.12046.
- Sidelinger, R.J., M.C. Nyeste, P.E. Madlock, J. Pollak, and J. Wilkinson. (2015). 'Instructor Privacy Management in the Classroom: Exploring Instructors' Ineffective Communication and Student Communication Satisfaction'. *Communication Studies* 66(5), 569-589. doi:10.1080/10510974.2015.1034875.
- Yep, G.A. (2000). 'Explaining Illness to Asian and Pacific Islander Americans: Culture, Communication, and Boundary Regulation' in B.B. Whaley (ed.), *Explaining Illness: Research, Theory, and Strategies*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 271-284.
- Westin, A. (1967). *Privacy and Freedom*. New York: Atheneum.

