Abstract

Almost all research output includes tables, diagrams, photographs and even sketches, and papers within HCI typically take advantage of including these figures in their files. However the space given to non-diagrammatical or tabular figures is often small, even in papers that primarily concern themselves with visual output. The reason for this might be the publishing models employed in most proceedings and journals: Despite moving to a digital format which is unhindered by page count or physical cost, there remains a somewhat arbitrary limitation on page count. Recent moves by ACM SIGCHI and others to remove references from the maximum page count suggest that there is movement on this, however images remain firmly within the limits of the text. We propose that images should be celebrated – not penalised – and call for not only the adoption of the Pictorials format in CHI, but for images to be removed from page counts in order to encourage greater transparency of process in HCI research.
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ONCE UPON A TIME IN THE LAND OF HCI...

Ah, CHI References, looks like you are all up to date with your page taxes since 2016 [18]. You are free to go ...

PUBLIC HEARINGS

NEXT!!!

Ah Sketch, unpaid Existence Taxes, you take up too much space. You are hereby fined 250 Words.

Ah Mr Table...

Images are penalised out of hand! We can't live by the rules of Words [9]. Something has to change!

You aren't worth the paper you're drawn on. Pay up and leave!

NEXT! Ah Mr Table...

PUBLIC NOTICES

COURTHOUSE

Images are viable forms of research, and not just for documentary! In fact, they are indispensible to UCD [2], and HCI itself!

That's crazy! Why don't References have to pay?

That's crazy! Why don't References have to pay?

No More Bias
OI! STOP!
You're defacing Academic Property with an unsolicited submission!

STOP! In the name of Interdisciplinary practice ...

There's a special place in hell for useless little sketches like you, think you have a valid contribution, do you?
SOME TIME LATER...

Who... what? You saved me? But why the secrecy?

We are the Pictorials [2]. My name is Eli, and these are my associates, Sabrina, Will and Nicolai. We work toward the recognition of imagery as a valid contribution in Serious Research. We are small in number at present, but our clan grows every year. HCI is an Interdisciplinary field [4,20], and must make allowances for a variety of submission types.

So why don’t they? Won’t the Town Hall listen? I... could have been CUT?!

Come, little Sketch. Take a walk with me, I have something to show you...

We are the Pictorials [2]. My name is Eli, and these are my associates, Sabrina, Will and Nicolai. We work toward the recognition of imagery as a valid contribution in Serious Research. We are small in number at present, but our clan grows every year. HCI is an Interdisciplinary field [4,20], and must make allowances for a variety of submission types.
We've been watching them for years... waiting... analysing... these are our paper archives [17]...

...there were some victories, like with DIS conference [7]...

...we used sketches to analyse data, as pioneered by our allies, Lee et al. [11]...
Papers analysed by percentage space given to each type of output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Equations</th>
<th>Diagrams</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Conference, CHI, 1990
| Conference, CHI, 1994
| Conference, CHI, 2008
| Conference, CHI, 2011
| Conference, CHI, 2014
| Conference, CHI, 2015
| Conference, RecSys, 2015
| Conference, RecSys, 2016
| Conference, Mindtrek, 2011

**SIGCHI**

10 Most Downloaded (last 6 weeks)

Range: 1990–2017

...we’ll get there – but the Publishers... well, that’s another story...

...which means researchers strive toward rigour and accessible work. We cannot lay the blame with them however! We hold workshops [12], courses [13], even release comics [1,8,15,19]...

...sure they like us when they need us, to fill a gap, or if there's a Design paper [6], but there are calls for HCI to be a type of science [4]...

...we’ll get there – but the Publishers... well, that’s another story...

There are some great powers at work, little one. The References are seen as adding great value to research culture...

But didn’t the References win the right to exist tax free [18]? What’s to stop us having the same?
I've even seen sketching papers that don't have pictures in them! [10,14]

The change from print publishing to the digital model has not trickled down to longer paper length. This is unfair but what can we do?

We've tried subtle, maybe we should be more BOLD? Take some action?

The time has come to take a stand! We deserve RECOGNITION, and the SPACE TO EXIST!

Just maybe...

I've heard tell that Mayor CHI is under the influence of the Publishers, they drain its resources, make longer submissions unviable. If we destroy the Publisher King we can free CHI and put our case forward...

I'll call for Design Fiction backup [19]! They are open minded!

We should also ask some journals, they have longer page limits [5]...

Down with arbitrary limits! Interdisciplinaries assemble!

Cano you hear the people sing! Singing the songs of angry pens!!!

TO CHI!!!
I hear people coming, should we go and see what they want? I can't eat any more grapes!

Hush now... Nothing you need to concern yourself with, let Publishing take care of it all... you just concentrate on making money... yessss... all the money... for usssss...

You fools! You think you can make a difference? If I go another will take my place and the cycle will continue!

We represent those who believe image inclusion in research is important. We have a proposition for you.

Mayor CHI? Are you ok? Did the Publisher hurt you?

UHHH
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