# Re-framing HCI through Local and Indigenous Perspectives

José Abdelnour-Nocera, Masaaki Kurosu, Torkil Clemmensen, Nic Bidwell, Ravi Vatrapu, Heike Winschiers-Theophilus, Vanessa Evers, Rüdiger Heimgärtner, Alvin Yeo

## HAL Id: hal-01596946
### https://inria.hal.science/hal-01596946

# Re-framing HCI through local and indigenous perspectives

Jose Abdelnour-Nocera[1], Masaaki Kurosu[2], Torkil Clemmensen[3], Nic Bidwell[4],
Ravi Vatrapu[3], Heike Winschiers-Theophilus[5], Vanessa Evers[6], Rüdiger Heimgärtner[7],
Alvin Yeo[8]

[1]University of West London, [2] The Open University of Japan, [3]Copenhagen Business
School, [4]CSIR-Meraka & Nelson Mandella Metropoliton University, [5]Polytechnic of
Namibia,[6]University of Amsterdam, [7]Intercultural User Interface Consulting Germany,
[8]Universiti Malaysia Sarawak
Jose.Abdelnour-Nocera@uwl.ac.uk, masaakikurosu@spa.nifty.com, tc.inf@cbs.dk,
nic.bidwell@gmail.com, rv.caict@cbs.dk, heikew@polytechnic.edu.na, evers@uva.nl,
ruediger.heimgaertner@iuic.de, awyeo@acm.org

**Abstract.** This one-day workshop aims to present different local and
indigenous perspectives from all over the world in order to lead into an
international dialogue on re-framing concepts and models in HCI/Interaction
Design. The target audience is HCI researchers and practitioners who have
experience with working with culture and HCI. The expected outcome of the
workshop is a) network building among the participants, b) a shortlist of papers
that can be basis for a proposal for a special issue of the UAIS journal, and c)
identify opportunities to develop a funded network or research proposal.

**Keywords:** Indigenous HCI, HCI theory and methodology, localization,
globalization, cultural usability.

## 1   Objective and theme

One of the current challenges for HCI as a discipline is addressing the tensions
created between local cultures and the assumptions, priorities and values embedded in
the HCI as a discipline. The objective of this workshop is to further our understanding
of these issues and lead to practical recommendations for people researching and
implementing HCI from an explicit indigenous perspective. Translating local
knowledge into valid and useful HCI tools is not a simple problem, but one that
requires re-defining and re-negotiating disciplinary boundaries (and connections) and
the subject and object of the interaction design. Focusing on local or indigenous
awareness and practices in design pushes the envelope in a very exciting way. For
instance, the democratic values of equal participation driving user-centred design are
not necessarily shared by local communities which prioritize respecting the views of
their leaders.  Addressing these gaps requires a fresh look at how diverse disciplines
and professions explore and conceptualize the relation between users, designers and
other stakeholders. While the global HCI community has well-defined conceptual and
methodological frameworks, there is little research about how local HCI professionals

experience, adapt and implement this knowledge, nor how to locate HCI so that it is locally accountable [1]. To progress this research we must start by better understanding relationships between HCI concepts and methods and their meanings to local and indigenous groups. Universal perspectives on HCI like ethnology and ethnography, e.g., technomethodology [2], and national culture models [3] and activity theory [4] have all had an impact in the design of interactive systems for culturally different users, but the potential contribution of explicitly local or indigenous perspectives, approaches and experiences with HCI, see e.g., [5], have not become so clear and uniform. Furthermore, the idea of what constitutes a useful and usable system in different cultural contexts remains partially explored at the very least. In addition, a simple localization, i.e. the adaptation of products and systems developed in advanced countries to developing countries, may take the form of cultural invasion or sometimes a technological colonization. Thus, we need to support those who are interested in improving the Quality of Life (QOL) of people in developing countries by co-operating the user research and designing something new that will contribute to the QOL of people living there, as well as conducting the conventional localization.

## 2. Workshop organization and duration, target audience, and expected outcomes

This one-day workshop will address the goals above through three activities: (a) workshop participants will together compile a list of examples of indigenous HCI problems, (b) participants will present short papers on their own current research; (c) group discussion will address specific issues. The target audience is HCI researchers and practitioners who have experience with working with culture and HCI, e.g., participants in IWIPS, ICIC, IFIP TC 13 SIG on Interaction Design and International Development, and more. The expected outcome of the workshop is a) network building among the participants, b) a shortlist of papers that can be basis for a proposal for a special issue of the UAIS journal, and c) identify opportunities to develop a funded network or research proposal.

## References

1. Suchman, L. (2002). Located accountabilities in technology production. Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems, 14(2), 7.
2. Button, G., & Dourish, P. (1996). Technomethodology: paradoxes and possibilities CHI1996 (pp. 19-26): ACM.
3. Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations: Sage Publications.
4. Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. (2006). Acting with technology: Activity theory and interaction design: MIT Press Cambridge, MA.
5. Kurosu, M., Kobayashi, T., Yoshitake, R., Takahashi, H., Urokohara, H., & Sato, D. (2004). Trend in Usability Research and Activities in Japan. International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 17(1), 103-124.