
Queer in HCI: Supporting LGBTQIA+ Researchers and Research Across Domains

Michael A. DeVito
Ashley Marie Walker
Northwestern University
devitom@u.northwestern.edu
amwalker@u.northwestern.edu

Caitlin Lustig
Amy J. Ko
University of Washington
celustig@uw.edu
ajko@uw.edu

Katta Spiel
KU Leuven & Universität Wien
katta.spiel@kuleuven.be

Alex A. Ahmed
Northeastern University
ahmed.al@husky.neu.edu

Kimberley Allison
Macquarie University
kimberley.allison@hdr.mq.edu.au

Morgan Scheuerman
Brianna Dym
Jed R. Brubaker
University of Colorado
morgan.klaus@colorado.edu
brianna.dym@colorado.edu
jed.brubaker@colorado.edu

Ellen Simpson
Syracuse University
easimpso@syr.edu

Naveen Bagalkot
Srishti Institute of Art,
Design & Technology
naveen@srishti.ac.in

Noopur Raval
University of California Irvine
naraval@uci.edu

Michael Muller
IBM Research
michael_muller@us.ibm.com

Jennifer Rode
University College London
j.rode@ucl.ac.uk

Mary L. Gray
Microsoft Research
mlg@microsoft.com

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the Owner/Author.

CHI'20 Extended Abstracts, April 25–30, 2020, Honolulu, HI, USA
© 2020 Copyright is held by the owner/author(s).
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-6819-3/20/04.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3334480.3381058>

Abstract

As Queer Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) becomes an established part of the larger field, both in terms of research on and with queer populations and in terms of employing queering theories and methods, the role of queer researchers has become a timely topic of discussion. However, these discussions have largely centered around member-researcher status and positionality when working with queer populations. Based on insights gathered at multiple ACM events over the past year, we identified two pressing issues: (1) we need to better support queer people doing HCI research not specific to queer populations, and (2) we need to

identify how to best support member-researchers in leading Queer HCI while including collaborators beyond the queer community. This Special Interest Group (SIG) aims to directly address these challenges by convening a broad community of queer researchers and allies, working not only on explicitly-queer topics but across a broad range of HCI topics.

Author Keywords

Queer HCI; sexual and gender minorities

CSS Concepts

• **Social and professional topics~Gender** • **Social and professional topics~Sexual orientation**

Introduction

Queer HCI has recently become prominent within HCI, especially as it lends a unique perspective to crucial issues such as identity management [6, 9, 11], online communities [7, 10] and the negative consequences of AI classification technology [16]. By examining technical problems from the point of view of the LGBTQIA+ community – a multifaceted and often marginalized group of people – we have been able to explicate broader issues which impact all users. We have also shed light on how the LGBTQIA+ community, which heavily depends on social technologies [12, 13, 19], is deeply impacted by digital systems. This previous work has been valuable to both the queer and general HCI communities, but only represents a narrow segment of what “Queer HCI” can and should be. This SIG aims to create a space to discuss broadening our conception of Queer HCI and establish best practices for supporting the entire Queer HCI community in SIGCHI events and publication venues, based on needs

identified over the past year and the interests of attendees as elicited at the beginning of the SIG.

In a series of CHI and CSCW events held over the last year, most prominently the well-attended CHI 2019 “Queer(ing) HCI” SIG [18], participants made clear that we need to do more to support queer researchers working outside explicitly queer contexts and facing challenges related to their identity [3]. In discussions at the Qualitative Methods [8] and Social Technologies for Digital Wellbeing Among Marginalized Communities [5] workshops at CSCW 2019, it also became clear that queer researchers often experience a pressure to do explicitly queer work due to their positionality, alongside a pressure to disclose one’s queer identity before one may be ready to do so, or in circumstances where stigmatization is still likely. Both of these findings point to a need to better define Queer HCI to serve the entire SIGCHI queer community, moving from a definition that focuses on queer work and methods to one that inclusively highlights the community itself and the people within it.

Towards a Redefinition of Queer HCI

As a starting point for furthering discussion on the topics above, we propose to redefine **Queer HCI** as *research in HCI by, for, or substantially shaped by the queer community itself and/or queering methods and theory, regardless of application subdomain*. In turn, we advocate that **supporting Queer HCI** center around not just funding and publishing work on queer populations, but also funding and supporting queer researchers and their perspectives across domain areas and ensuring that our allied researcher partners develop the appropriate sensitivity and background

knowledge to approach queer topics productively and respectfully.

These redefinitions are essential for two reasons. First, queer researchers face significant pressures and barriers not experienced by all HCI researchers [2, 14, 17], and might desire or need support even if they are not working on queer topics. As noted above, the CHI 2019 SIG drew over 60 attendees in addition to the organizers, most of whom identify as LGBTQIA+ but do not do work on explicitly queer topics. Despite the fact that the explicit focus of the 2019 SIG was furthering research on queer populations and using queer/queering methods, the overall message from the attendees was clear: Queer HCI as a project must attend to all queer researchers regardless of application domain. As such, both this redefinition and this SIG directly answer a large community need within HCI.

Second, queer researchers have a right to do the research they wish to do, and should not face undue pressure to perform explicitly queer research simply due to their identity. However, there is also much ground to be covered in terms of research on queer populations, particularly in the area of intersectionally-interwoven experiences of marginalization [4, 15]. To have the capacity to do this research without tokenizing or epistemically exploiting [1] queer researchers, we will need to create space for and support allies in doing queer research sensitively, appropriately, and in a way that keeps queer perspectives, theories, and methods centered. We must also do the same internally in terms of recognizing, accounting for, and respecting differences within the queer community while working across subcommunities, e.g. cisgender queer researchers doing work with transgender populations.

By starting this SIG from the point of the new definitions proposed above, we can focus on enacting the definitions to address these two problems.

CHI 2020 will likely be attended by many queer researchers from varying subcommunities and at varying levels of identity development and outness, who represent both academia and industry in multiple countries and cultures, working across a range of research domains. As such, a SIG at CHI 2020, represents an ideal and safe opportunity to draw from their varied experience and expertise in exploring and establishing potential ways forward. Using an unconference model based on last year's highly successful Queer(ing) HCI SIG, we aim to create concrete recommendations for better supporting both queer researchers and researchers working with queer topics and theories.

References

- [1] Nora Berenstain. 2016. Epistemic Exploitation. *Ergo*, 3, 22.
- [2] Diana Bilimoria and Abigail Stewart. 2009. "Don't ask, don't tell": The academic climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty in science and engineering. *NWSA Journal*, 21, 2: 85-103.
- [3] Emeline Brulé and Katta Spiel. 2019. Negotiating gender and disability identities in participatory design. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Communities & Technologies - Transforming Communities*, 218-227.
- [4] Kimberle Crenshaw. 1990. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stan. L. Rev.*, 43, 1241.
- [5] Michael A Devito, Ashley Marie Walker, Jeremy Birnholtz, Kathryn Ringland, Kathryn Macapagal, Ashley Kraus, Sean Munson, Calvin Liang, and

- Herman Saksono. 2019. Social Technologies for Digital Wellbeing Among Marginalized Communities. *Conference Companion of the 2019 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, 449-454.
- [6] Michael A. DeVito, Ashley M. Walker, and Jeremy Birnholtz. 2018. "Too Gay for Facebook:" Presenting LGBTQ+ Identity Throughout the Personal Social Media Ecosystem. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 2, CSCW: 44.
- [7] Brianna Dym, Jed R Brubaker, Casey Fiesler, and Bryan Semaan. 2019. "Coming Out Okay": Community Narratives for LGBTQ Recovery Work. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 3, CSCW: 154.
- [8] Casey Fiesler, Jed R Brubaker, Andrea Forte, Shion Guha, Nora McDonald, and Michael Muller. 2019. Qualitative Methods for CSCW: Challenges and Opportunities. *Conference Companion of the 2019 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, 455-460.
- [9] Mary L Gray. 2009. Negotiating identities/queering desires: Coming out online and the remediation of the coming-out story. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, 4: 1162-1189.
- [10] Mary L Gray. 2009. *Out in the country: Youth, media, and queer visibility in rural America*. NYU Press, New York, NY.
- [11] Oliver Haimson. 2018. Social media as social transition machinery. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 2, CSCW: 63.
- [12] Benjamin Hanckel, Son Vivienne, Paul Byron, Brady Robards, and Brendan Churchill. 2019. 'That's not necessarily for them': LGBTIQ+ young people, social media platform affordances and identity curation. *Media, Culture & Society*.
- [13] Gary W Harper, Pedro A Serrano, Douglas Bruce, and Jose A Bauermeister. 2016. The internet's multiple roles in facilitating the sexual orientation identity development of gay and bisexual male adolescents. *American journal of men's health*, 10, 5: 359-376.
- [14] Michael C LaSala, David A Jenkins, Darrell P Wheeler, and Karen I Fredriksen-Goldsen. 2008. LGBT faculty, research, and researchers: Risks and rewards. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, 20, 3: 253-267.
- [15] Yolanda Rankin and Jakita Thomas. 2019. Straighten up and fly right: rethinking intersectionality in HCI research. *interactions*, 26, 6: 64-68.
- [16] Morgan Klaus Scheuerman, Stacy M Branham, and Foad Hamidi. 2018. Safe spaces and safe places: Unpacking technology-mediated experiences of safety and harm with transgender people. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 2, CSCW: 155.
- [17] Katta Spiel, Os Keyes, and Pinar Barlas. 2019. Patching Gender: Non-binary Utopias in HCI. *Extended Abstracts of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, alt.CHI 05.
- [18] Katta Spiel, Os Keyes, Ashley Marie Walker, Michael A DeVito, Jeremy Birnholtz, Emeline Brulé, Ann Light, Pinar Barlas, Jean Hardy, and Alex Ahmed. 2019. Queer (ing) HCI: Moving Forward in Theory and Practice. *Extended Abstracts of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, SIG11.
- [19] Michele L. Ybarra, Kimberly J. Mitchell, Neal A. Palmer, and Sari L. Reisner. 2015. Online social support as a buffer against online and offline peer and sexual victimization among US LGBT and non-LGBT youth. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 39, 123-136.