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ABSTRACT
This paper reports a study of the use of activity theory in human–computer interaction (HCI) research. We analyse activity theory in HCI since its first appearance about 25 years ago. Through an analysis and meta-synthesis of 109 selected HCI activity theory papers, we created a taxonomy of 5 different ways of using activity theory: (1) analysing unique features, principles, and problematic aspects of the theory; (2) identifying domain-specific requirements for new theoretical tools; (3) developing new conceptual accounts of issues in the field of HCI; (4) guiding and supporting empirical analyses of HCI phenomena; and (5) providing new design illustrations, claims, and guidelines. We conclude that HCI researchers are not only users of imported theory, but also theory-makers who adapt and develop theory for different purposes.
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1. Introduction
One way to analyse the role and current status of theory in HCI is to examine how researchers have questioned, critiqued, used, and developed theory. This paper seeks to understand how HCI theory in general, and one theory in particular, activity theory, have been employed in HCI research.

Our premise is that the role of theory in HCI remains an open issue. On the one hand, theory is apparently central to HCI as a research field. The very emergence of HCI was, to a large extent, the result of the application of a particular theoretical approach, information processing psychology, to the analysis and design of interactive systems (Card, Moran, and Newell 1983; Clemmensen 2006). Some of the most influential HCI works have been attempts to bring new theoretical insights to the field (e.g. Bødker 1991; Carroll 1991; Dourish 2001; Nardi 1996; Winograd and Flores 1986). Recent years have brought conceptually oriented review papers that advocate clarifying what we know in subareas of HCI such as User Experience and Participatory Design (Bargas-Avila and Hornbaek 2011; Halskov and Hansen 2015).

However, these efforts have not ensured the development of a solid and widely accepted theoretical foundation for HCI. This situation is perhaps similar to that in the related field of Information Systems (IS), which some see as unsuccessful in developing a sustainable and widely used theory (Kjærgaard and Vendelø 2015). In HCI, the usefulness of the original information processing psychology perspective was questioned early in the history of the field (Carroll and Campbell 1996), and this perspective has never realised its promise of being a general theory of HCI (Clemmensen 2006). A number of other approaches known as ‘second-wave theories’ (Bødker 2006; Kaptelinin et al. 2003) or ‘modern theories’ (Rogers 2012), such as the language-action perspective or distributed cognition, were introduced to HCI as alternatives to information processing psychology (Bødker 1991; Carroll 2003; Monk and Gilbert 1995; Nardi 1996; Rogers 2004; Winograd and Flores 1986). These theories have expanded the scope of HCI research, but each has its own challenges. First, the diversity of second-wave theories, which seem to partly overlap, raises questions regarding how to choose between them, or possibly how to combine them. Second, newer developments in HCI, especially the recent emphasis on experience, personal values, and designers’ creative self-expression, present a problem for second-wave theories (Bødker 2006), and suggest that HCI researchers should adopt an eclectic perspective not constrained by traditional distinctions between theory and practice, or laboratory experiments and field studies (see Rogers 2012).

To use theory to ask big questions and produce new knowledge, HCI researchers need to know more about the sociocultural contexts of other researchers’ use of theory, in the same way that designers need to know users’ context of use in order to design systems and products for them.
Knowing the sociocultural context of use of theory is not the same as understanding core topics for HCI, what kind of science HCI is, and how to study HCI. HCI does not have a set of core topics (Kostakos 2015; Liu et al. 2014) or industrial constraints (Newman 1994) that drive the field forward, leaving open the question of the purposes for which we produce theory. HCI theory appears in many new and creative forms, from engineering modelling techniques, solutions, and tools (Card, Moran, and Newell 1983), to philosophically grounded discussions of categories of human–technology relations (Fallman 2011). But in which contexts are which forms of HCI theory most useful? Some argue that HCI should be studied in practice (Kuutti and Bannon 2014), but what are researchers’ reflections on the usefulness of the theory in their contexts?

In this paper, we present an in-depth study of the use of activity theory as one theory that has been used extensively in HCI. We examine the purposes of using activity theory, the forms of activity theory researchers have used, ‘classic’ texts and concepts, and authors’ reflections on the usefulness of the theory. We hope to give a sense of the empirical and theoretical landscape of activity theory in HCI, including what researchers have said about how it informed their practice.

2. About activity theory in HCI

This section provides a general outline of activity theory and a brief account of how it became a theoretical framework in HCI. The section does not intend to present a comprehensive exposition of the conceptual structure, historical developments, and current debates in activity theory. Detailed discussions of these issues can be found, for instance, in Leontiev (Leontyev) (1978), Engeström (1987), Nardi (1996), Engeström, Miettinen, and Punamäki (1999), and Kaptelinin and Nardi (2006, 2012).

Activity theory, originally proposed by the Russian psychologist Alexey Leontiev (Leontyev) (1978, 1981) has its roots in the Russian psychology of the early twentieth century. Two main ideas, comprising the foundation of activity theory, the social nature of human mind, and unity and inseparability of human mind and activity, were formulated and elaborated by, respectively, Vygotsky (1978) and Rubinstein (1946), mostly in the 1920s and 1930s. Vygotsky’s cultural-historical psychology (1978) considered culture and society as generative forces behind the very production of human mind, rather than external factors or conditions of its development. This general view was elaborated by Vygotsky into a number of more specific concepts, such as ‘the universal law of human development’, according to which an individual’s mental functions appear as distributed between the person and other people (i.e. as ‘inter-psychological’) before they become appropriated by the individual (i.e. become ‘intra-psychological’). Rubinstein (1946) argued that human mental processes (the internal) and human acting in the world (the external) are closely related and mutually determine one another.

Leontiev’s activity theory builds on Vygotsky’s cultural-historical psychology; it also adopts, and somewhat adapts, Rubinstein’s principle of unity and inseparability of human mind and activity. The foundational concept of Leontiev’s theory is ‘activity’, understood as a purposeful, social, mediated, multilevel, and developing interaction between actors (‘subjects’) and the objective world (‘objects’). A central claim of the approach is that it is activity that places the subject in objective reality and transforms the reality into a form of subjectivity (Leontiev (Leontyev) 1978). The human mind emerges, exists, and develops within the context of human activity as a whole, and therefore analysis of object-oriented activities should be considered a necessary prerequisite for understanding the human mind. An extensive programme of theoretical and empirical research conducted by Leontiev and his colleagues explored the co-development of activity and mind at different levels of analysis: from biological and social evolution to child development to the development of perceptual and motor skills (Leontiev (Leontyev) 1978, 1981; Wertsch 1981).

Activity theory emerged as an approach in Russian psychology, but eventually it transcended both geographical and disciplinary borders. In the last decades, especially since 1980s, Vygotsky’s cultural-historical psychology and activity theory (sometimes collectively labelled as ‘CHAT’, that is, ‘cultural-historical activity theory’) became increasingly known in the West,1 in particular, owing to the work of Michael Cole and James Wertsch (1986; see also Wertsch 1981). In addition, activity theory became an interdisciplinary framework, employed not only in psychology but also in education, organisational learning, and HCI.

The extension of activity theory beyond geographical and disciplinary borders resulted in a major advancement of the theory itself. A well-known and influential version of activity theory that extends the notion of activity to provide an account of collective activities and organisational practices was proposed by Engeström (1987, 1999). Engeström introduced the concept of the activity system model, which adds a third component, community, to Leontiev’s ‘subject–object’ interaction. The model discusses different means of mediating three-way interaction between ‘subject’, ‘object’, and ‘community’: tools/instruments, rules, and division of labour. The activity system model, as well as representations of activity system model networks, was extensively used in studies of various real-life work practices, in which special attention was
paid to contradictions in (and between) activity systems as driving the development of practices (e.g. related to the adoption of new technologies).

Activity theory was introduced to HCI in the late 1980s to early 1990s, during a transition of the field from first-wave HCI, which was dominated by information processing psychology, to second-wave HCI, which recognised the importance of human agency and motivation, and the social context of technology use. To the best of our knowledge, the first attempt to systematically apply activity theory in HCI was made by Bødker (1989, 1991), who employed the theory to argue that in the analysis and design of computing technology, it is critically important to take into account that people act through technology, rather than interact with it. More recently, the theory has been used as a conceptual framework in a wide range of HCI studies (e.g. Kaptelinin and Nardi 2006; Nardi 1996) and has established itself as one of the most influential theories in HCI (Rogers 2012). As shown in the analysis in this paper, activity theory has been used in a wide range of HCI studies, for various purposes and in various roles.

3. Qualitative analysis and synthesis

We conducted a qualitative analysis and meta-synthesis of the use of activity theory in a set of 109 HCI activity theory papers dating from the first introduction of activity theory to HCI in the late 1980s (Bødker 1989). In contrast to quantitative meta-analysis which first selects a set of papers and then applies a predefined analysis framework to do a statistical analysis, a qualitative meta-synthesis iteratively develops a template for the analysis and synthesis of the content of the selected papers, given what is learned from reading the papers in each step, until it reaches a final version, which is then applied systematically on all papers (King 2012; Stewart et al. 2012). The development of the evaluation criteria had four steps, beginning with a simple keyword approach to give a sense of the landscape of possible activity theory papers by using search engines and citation databases, and then in the later steps, taking steps of focusing on top-level journals and conferences in HCI, and ending up with five themes for analysis (see Figure 1).

3.1. Step 1 – searching for ‘activity theory’ across disciplines

To identify HCI activity theory papers, we began with the simple idea that an activity theory HCI paper was any paper that used the term ‘activity theory’. Not all relevant research outlets could be found in a single database. For example, at the time of our search, ACM DL did not include Computers in Human Behaviour, Interacting with Computers, and the INTERACT Conference. The results suggested varied numbers of potential activity theory papers: 45,600 (Google Scholar), 2524 (Scopus), 1331 (WoS), and 868 (ACM DL) for 1989–2014.

3.2. Step 2 – searching for ‘activity theory’ in HCI outlets

Having gained a feeling for the overall size of the search space across disciplines, we then excluded all publications that were not in English, not peer-reviewed scientific publications, and not explicitly HCI relevant. We excluded books and other types of publications that were not journals or conference proceedings. We did not exclude conferences as these are primary outlets for research in computer science. Journal and conference outlets with a focus other than HCI were excluded; for example, journal and conference proceedings such as Mind, Culture, and Activity; Cognition, Technology and Work; Ergonomics; Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems; and conference proceedings from conferences in related fields such as IS. We then did the search again, this time only in selected HCI outlets, for the period from the beginning of the outlets’ publication and, until and including 2014 (see Table 1.) At this point we had 416 papers.

3.3. Step 3 – regular full journal/conference papers

We then excluded panel descriptions, posters, introductions to special issues or invited discussion papers, extended abstracts, and short papers. A total of 96 papers...
were excluded in this step (Table 1). Now we had 320 full papers.

3.4. Step 4 – substantial use of theory: forming the final set of papers for meta-analysis and synthesis

We then selected the papers that had a ‘substantial use of activity theory’, in the sense that they cited at least one classic HCI activity theory text or a set of activity theory references; used activity theory to analyse a design, user activity, or concept (such as affordances) or reflected on the use of activity theory in HCI (see Table 2). After having gone through the 320 full papers, we excluded 211 papers that did not show a substantial use of activity theory.

We then analysed and synthesised a final set of 109 papers (Table 3 and the appendix).

At the same time as we narrowed down the set of papers, we developed our understanding of what to look for in an activity theory paper. In step four, we ended up with five themes for analysis and synthesis. Our first and primary theme for the synthesis was the purpose of using activity theory. The use of theory in HCI research is context specific, depending on its purpose, and who uses the theory, and how and why. Identifying the main purposes of using activity theory was our way to take the papers’ research purposes into account. The second theme was a paper’s reference to classic activity theory texts; that is, did the paper cite reference activity theory texts? In bibliometry, a classic text is one that has not become obsolete after decades of popularity (Walstrom and Leonard 2000). The Psychology of Human–Computer Interaction by Card, Moran, and Newell (1983), for example, is a classic HCI text. A classic text can be cited in many ways, for example, for authority or for specific arguments, all of which may tell us something about how researchers appropriate classic activity theory knowledge in a paper.

The third theme was the specific activity theory concepts the paper used; that is, which activity theoretical concepts such as mediation, internalisation, and development did the paper use? This theme would provide insight as to whether a paper had used the theory as a gestalt, or used a few key concepts from the theory.

The fourth theme was whether the paper employed activity theory alone or in combination with other theories. What role did activity theory play and how was it integrated with other theories?

---

Table 1. Search results for ‘activity theory’ in selected HCI outlets (until 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source title</th>
<th>Publications using the term ‘activity theory’</th>
<th>Excluded in step 2 (editorials, short papers, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHI conference (1982–2014)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with Computers (IwC) (1995–2014)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Computer Interaction (HCI) (1985–2014)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour &amp; Information Technology (BIT) (1996–2014)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM TOCHI journal (1994–2014)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS TOHCI journal (2009–2014)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Search performed June 2015, in each outlet.

---

Table 2. Evaluation criteria for an HCI paper with substantial use of activity theory.

1. A clear example of an activity theory paper, it tells the reader in the title, abstract, and keyword that this is about activity theory; it cites the reference HCI activity theory texts; it uses theory deeply and in a substantial way; and it reflects core HCI activity theory concerns. For example, the paper can be summarised as: ‘… the model below was developed, inspired by activity theory …’

2. The paper is about activity theory, it does cite reference activity theory texts, and it uses theory in a reasonable way, although not too deep. For example, the paper draws on concepts taken from activity theory, such as ‘activity awareness’ derived from Badger, 1996; Bardram, 1998; or ‘activity-based’ or ‘activity-centric’ concepts

3. The paper is about activity theory per se, up to a point, and cites some, but not all relevant activity theory and activity theory texts. The use of activity theory may still be limited

4. The paper is not an activity theory paper per se, but it is about core concerns for activity theory, and it does cite activity theory literature. For example, a paper analysing the concept of ‘context’, or papers that discuss activity theory, even if this is not the main aim of the paper, is a paper with substantial use of activity theory

5. The paper is not activity theory oriented in a deep way, but only cites some activity theory literature, and the paper is much more focused on some other, non-AT, concept. Though the paper may mention activity theory several times, it does not really use activity theory (e.g. the paper may cite Badker, but does not say anything about activity theory)

6. Not much on activity theory per se. The paper does not have much on HCI activity theory per se; that is, the only use of activity theory is a reference in one sentence to an activity theory paper. For example, the term ‘activity’ may be mentioned in the paper, but activity theory is not discussed, except for a single citation, such as ‘it has been long known that the context of use is an important factor in human–computer interaction (e.g. Suchman, 1987; Nardi, 1995)”
Table 3. The 109 HCI papers that engage activity theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCI (10)</td>
<td>Badker 1989;</td>
<td>Badker, 1996;</td>
<td>Badker, 1998;</td>
<td>Benyon and Imaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIT (8)</td>
<td>Carroll, 1996;</td>
<td>Arestova, Babanim, and Voiskounsky, 1999; Hermann et al., 2004; Convertino et al., 2007; Chauvin, Morel, and Tirilly, 2010; Ang, Zaphiris, and Wilson, 2011; Lundvoll Nilsen, 2011; Korpelainen and Kira, 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009; Halverson, 2009; Barr, Noble, and Biddle 2007; Noros, Linsanuo, and Hutton, 2011; Sjölie, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHCS (10)</td>
<td>Erskine, Carter-Tod, and Burton, 1997; McCarthy et al., 1997; Decortis, Noirfalise, and Saudelli, 2000; Macaulay, Benyon, and Cerar, 2000; Wright, Dearden, and Fields, 2000; Carroll et al., 2003; Norros and Nuutinen, 2005; Paulson, Cummings, and Hammond, 2011; Law and Sun, 2012; Belkadi et al., 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011; Bødker and Klokmose, 2011; Korpelainen and Kira, 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWc (12)</td>
<td>Gobbin, 1998;</td>
<td>Turner and Turner, 2001; Decortis, Rizzo, and Saudelli, 2003; Folcher, 2003; Pargman, 2003; Pargman and Waerm, 2003; Rabardel and Bourmaud, 2003; Meira and Peres, 2004; Carroll et al., 2006; Barr, Noble, and Biddle 2007; Noros, Linsanuo, and Hutton, 2011; Sjölie, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006; Fjeld et al., 2002; Halverson, 2002; Korpela, Mursu, and Sorivay, 2002; Miettinen and Hasu, 2002; Nardi, Whittaker, and Schwarz, 2002; Spasser, 2002; Zager, 2002; Carmien et al., 2004; Schmidt and Wagner, 2004; Lauche, 2005; Nardi, 2005; Badker and Petersen, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCW (18)</td>
<td>Engeström 1999; Westerberg, 1999; Bardram, 2000; Barthelmess and Anderson, 2002; Clases and Wehner, 2002; Collins, Shukla, and Redmiles, 2002; Fjeld et al., 2002; Halverson, 2002; Korpela, Mursu, and Sorivay, 2002; Miettinen and Hasu, 2002; Nardi, Whittaker, and Schwarz, 2002; Spasser, 2002; Zager, 2002; Carmien et al., 2004; Schmidt and Wagner, 2004; Lauche, 2005; Nardi, 2005; Badker and Petersen, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009; Bødker and Klokmose, 2011; Korpelainen and Kira, 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHCI (9)</td>
<td>Honold, 2000;</td>
<td>Bedny and Karwowski, 2003; Mühlfelder and Luzczak, 2003; Chaiklin, 2007; Bedny, Karwowski, and Sengupta, 2008; Mohamedally and Zaphiris, 2009; Bedny, Karwowski, and Bedny, 2010; Mahatody, Sagar, and Kolksi, 2010; Bedny, Karwowski, and Bedny, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001; Korpelainen and Kira, 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHB (10)</td>
<td>Owen, 2001;</td>
<td>Raven, 2006; Ruda and Thomas, 2006; Liaw, Huang, and Chen, 2007; Young, 2008; Chan, 2009; Hannan, 2011; Zitter et al., 2009; Denmen, 2014; Peña-Ayala, Sossa, and Méndez, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005; Law and Sun, 2012; Belkadi et al., 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOCHI (6)</td>
<td>Petersen, Madsen, and Kjaer, 2002; Bardram, 2009; Benbunan-Fich, Adler, and Mavlanova, 2011; Convertino et al., 2011; Oviet et al, 2012; Tomlinson et al., 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006; Bødker and Klokmose, 2013; Klokmose and Bertelsen, 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THCI (1)</td>
<td>Luse et al., 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conferences

| INTERACT (3) | 2001; Norris, Wong, and Rashid, 1999; Mwanza, 2001; Badker and Klokmose, 2013; Klokmose and Bertelsen, 2013 |

Note: See the Appendix for a complete list of references to the 109 papers.

The fifth theme was the authors’ comments and reflections on their uses of activity theory. What did the authors think worked and did not work in their papers? Insights from the use of theory in psychology (Greenwald et al. 1986) have indicated that too fixed a view on theory may obstruct research. Thus, we could learn in what sense researchers expected activity theory to be useful, and whether social, cultural, organisational, technical, or political issues were associated with the use of activity theory.

For the synthesis, all three authors analysed the same set of 12 randomly selected papers, and discussed and adjusted the analysis. We then read and reread the 109 papers, systematically looking for relations between the ‘purpose of using AT’ and the other four categories in the final evaluation criteria.

4. Findings

In this section, we discuss the variety of ways in which activity theory was used in the corpus of selected papers. The analysis is structured around the first of the five themes, identified in the previous section; that is, the papers are divided into five groups according to the main purpose of using the theory. The remaining four themes are then used to analyse each of the five groups of papers, one at a time. The decision to adopt this structure was based on the assumption that the use of theory in HCI research is context specific. The way a theory is cited, the specific concepts that are found relevant, the place of the theory in the paper, and the perceived strengths and weaknesses of a theory all depend on the particular research context in which the theory is being employed for some meaningful purpose. Identifying the main purposes of using activity theory was a way for us to take the research contexts into account.

The five-group division was produced in three steps. First, we differentiated between papers predominantly employing the theory as (a) an object of analysis, that is, focusing on activity theory per se (e.g. making the case for the theory as an HCI framework or comparing it to other theories) or (b) a conceptual tool, that is, applying activity theory to support analysis and/or design. The first group has five papers, while the overwhelming majority of papers belongs to the second group. At the second step, the 104 papers in the conceptual tool group were divided into two subgroups depending on whether activity theory was used to support analysis (87 papers) or design (17 papers). Finally, the analysis papers were further divided into three subgroups: (a) meta-tool, that is, activity theory as a theoretical influence for developing a new analytical tool proposed in the paper (16 papers); (b) tool for conceptual analysis, that is, activity theory used as an analytical tool in a predominantly conceptual analysis of HCI (30 papers); and (c) tool for empirical analysis, that is, activity theory used as an analytical tool in a predominantly empirical analysis of HCI (41 papers). Figure 2 schematically shows the divisions.
Assigning papers to certain groups was often a non-trivial task. Many papers used theory for several purposes; for instance, an empirical study could be followed by a discussion of implications for design. Grouping problems were addressed by discussions among the three authors; the final version of the group division is a result of a series of adjustments and modifications stemming from the discussions.

4.1. Activity theory as an object of analysis

In the five papers comprising this group, the main purpose of using the theory was to analyse and further develop activity theory. In these papers, Nardi (1996), Engeström (1987), and Bødker (1991) were used as early and authoritative source texts that present activity theory as providing a common vocabulary and rich framework for studying context in HCI.

The papers argued that activity theory provides a number of useful concepts that support the understanding of technology, including context, tool mediation, contradiction, object, and the hierarchical structure of activity. Bødker (1989), Halverson (2002), Decortis et al. (2003), and Baumer and Tomlinson (2011) discussed the concept of context as a defining feature of activity theory. The emphasis on context suggests that activity theory can be a conceptual framework to describe technology in a particular setting ‘... situated within the broader organizational context’ (Halverson 2002). Baumer and Tomlinson (2011) engaged with the activity theory concept of object in a comparison to distributed cognition. Decortis et al. (2000) discussed the similarities and differences between the notions of ‘goals’ in distributed cognition and ‘object’ in activity theory. Bedny and Karwowski (2003) noted that activity theory is useful for HCI because it ‘has precise units of analysis and carefully elaborated concepts and terminology’. The concept of tool mediation was discussed by Decortis et al. (2000) and Halverson (2002). Halverson observed: ‘Naming a category “mediating artifacts” focuses the analyst’s attention around those objects used by the subjects of the activity system. Naming helps communicate to others – particularly when they do not understand the particular domain’. Decortis et al. (2000) noted that, ‘Contradictions within the activity and with social forces are then seen as the origin of any change’. Bedny and Karwowski (2003) studied inventory processes for a manufacturing firm and found the notion of hierarchy in activity theory useful: ‘[T]his process is organized into a hierarchy of recursive subsystems directed to achieve goals of various operations and actions … Hence, cognition should be studied as a continuous processing system and as a system of cognitive actions and operations’.

Some authors mentioned difficulty learning activity theory concepts, and that comparative analysis with activity theory may be difficult due to the existence of multiple meanings of the key activity theory concepts. Baumer and Tomlinson (2011) remarked that activity theory may be difficult to learn in that there are multiple meanings of the concept of object (2011). At the same time, Halverson (2002) said that ‘Despite early calls that it was too difficult to learn [activity theory] … the range of practitioners here – academics, members of large and small companies, as well as researchers – attest to its growing converts’.

4.2. Activity theory as a theoretical influence in the development of a new analytical tool

In this group of 17 papers, activity theory was used for developing new analytical tools, either as a sole basis for developing a tool, or by combining it with another theory (or theories) to propose a new framework for analysis and evaluation, intended for a specific work or learning domain. For this purpose, tool mediation was an important concept. The ways activity theory can be applied appear to depend on multiple concerns: the type of domain, whether it is used by a whole community or an individual researcher, what variant of the theory is used, and with which ontological perspective it is applied. Nardi (1996), Engeström (1987), and Bødker (1991) were cited as introductions to activity theory’s history, key concepts, and how to apply the theory. The concept of tool mediation was the most important concept in this group of papers. Ang et al. (2011) devised a tool to guide the design of computer-based artefacts as a support for constructionist learning systems. Belkadi et al. (2013) used activity theory to build a generic

The concept of context was engaged to describe specific domains (Bardram, 1998; Rabardel and Bourmaud, 2003; Spasser, 2002; Young, 2008; Jaferian et al., 2014). Kuutti and Bannon (1993) used the concept of the hierarchy of activity to develop a model of the process of enlarging the domain of HCI research. When reflecting on their use of activity theory, authors noted not only certain benefits, but also problems to wrestle with. Mühlfelder and Luczak described problems analysing dynamics over time (2003). Ang et al. discussed difficulties modelling interactions between activity systems (2011). They argued that activity theory emphasises cognitive aspects of human activity, and may sometimes overlook organisational aspects as Engeström (1999) discussed. For certain types of human–human interaction analyses, some authors argued that activity theory needs to be supplemented with other theories to make it possible to develop more specific tools. For example, Meira and Peres needed specific linguistic tools for their analysis (2004). Due to an elaborate theoretical vocabulary, activity theory may lead to analytical tools that are cumbersome or time consuming to use (Bardram and Doryab, 2011), which may also be the case for the new analytical tools derived from activity theory (Belkadi et al., 2013).

In sum, the main advantage of activity theory identified in this group of papers was that activity theory works with different ontological perspectives and helps avoid reductionism. Because it has a rich theoretical vocabulary and is open and expandable, activity theory can be used for the analysis of a variety of human work domains, by both whole research communities and individual researchers. However, the papers also mentioned that activity theory has some shortcomings when analysing dynamics over time and interaction between activity systems, and it may overemphasise the analysis of cognition.

4.3. Activity theory as a theoretical frame for conceptual analyses

In this group of 30 papers, researchers applied activity theory to conceptualise various kinds of computer supported work and communication activities, with a focus on interfaces and development of IT systems. Classic texts were cited as explanations of different philosophical and psychological approaches to HCI, for example, as an alternative to the information processing model (Barr, Noble, and Biddle 2007), for activity theory’s philosophical foundations (Benyon and Imaz 1999), and as a specific instance of a general sociocultural approach (Kaptelinin and Nardi 2012). Classic texts were also cited for defining key activity theory concepts, for example, defining levels of activity (Bødker and Andersen 2005) or Engeström’s approach to extending the concept of conflict (Bødker, 1996). An early paper by Kuutti and Arvonen (1992) cited Engeström (1987) for presenting a structural model of ‘… a “fundamental type” of context, which is called activity’.

Nearly all of the 30 papers used the concept of object to establish the objectives of activities and to identify specific things transformed in activity. Chaiklin (2007), for example, established the object of his inquiry as obligatory mass schooling for all children to satisfy a societal need. Bødker and Andersen (2005) identified concrete objects in activities, for example, carpenters hit ‘nail objects’, ship officers move ‘engine control objects’ from workstation to workstation at the ship’s bridge, and maritime pilots identify ‘foreign ships objects’. Barr, Noble, and Biddle (2007) noted that video games researchers study how ‘avatar objects’ are transformed in game activities. Hannan (2011) observed that software development use cases can be ‘business objects’. Arestova et al. (1999) talked about computer-mediated communication as ‘new external tools (both sign systems and material objects)’. Kuutti and Bannon (2014) talked about the ‘object of [HCI] research’.

Some researchers studied the concept of object itself, such as proposing pseudo-collective objects (Zager, 2002), and discussing definitions of the concept of object (Greenberg, 2001). Other concepts included the hierarchy of activity, mediation, contradiction, and development. For example, the concept of development was used to conceptualise historical development in mediators and the division of labour in Bødker and Andersen (2005) and Sjölje (2012), and for personal development in Carroll et al. (2006). Affordance was given an AT interpretation in Kaptelinin and Nardi (2012), who analysed affordances as instrumental within activity. Other authors noted that key activity theory concepts, such as mediators and objects, could be further conceptually developed, for example, into ‘co-occurring mediators’ and ‘immediate and ultimate objects’ (Bødker and Andersen 2005). Processes of development can be extended to concepts such as ‘instrumental genesis’ that transform artefacts (Rabardel and Bourmaud,
Mohamedally and Zaphiris used the concept of mediation to capture processes in diagramming design activities (2009).

Authors remarked that it is possible to integrate activity theory with other theories in a more comprehensive framework to analyse new situations. Some authors felt that activity theory by itself was not sufficient to conceptualise what goes on in work settings (Hannan, 2011). Kaptelinin and Bannon (2012) argued that activity theory needs to be further developed to deal with sets of interrelated activities that use shared pools of resources. Korpela et al. (2002) commented that activity theory by itself was not enough for the development of standard sets of data to compare across countries.

4.4. Activity theory as a conceptual tool for empirical analyses

In this group of 41 papers, HCI researchers used activity theory as a theoretical framework for empirical analysis to formulate specific questions for their studies. The papers focused on activity in diverse contexts, including:

- healthcare (Engeström, Engeström and Saarelma, 1988; Nardi et al., 1993; Bardram 1998, 2000; Lundvoll Nilsen, 2011; Nardi et al., 1993; Park and Chen, 2012) and elder care (Westerberg, 1999);
- education (Carroll et al., 2003; Law and Sun, 2012; Liaw et al., 2007; Pargman, 2003; Pargman and Wærn, 2003; Raven, 2006; Turner and Turner, 2001);
- corporate and industrial work (Barthelmess and Anderson, 2002; Bødker and Petersen, 2007; Chauvin et al., 2010; Collins et al., 2002; Folcher, 2003; Lauche, 2005; Wright et al., 2000; Miettinen and Hasu, 2002; Nardi et al., 2002; Norros and Nuutinen, 2005; Owen, 2001; Schmidt and Wagner, 2004);
- office work (Voida and Mynatt, 2009);
- household product usage (Honold, 2000; Petersen et al., 2002);
- social media use (Nardi et al., 2004; Yardi and Bruckman, 2011; Dennen, 2014; Hautasaari, 2013);
- technology use in urban slums (Sambasivan et al., 2010); and
- technology use in controlled experimental settings (Norris et al., 1999; Bedny et al., 2008; Chan, 2009; Paulson et al., 2001; Oviatt et al., 2012).

The papers in this group cited the classic texts as a general theoretical framework for empirical analysis. The classics were often cited together as a cluster that formed a uniform theoretical gestalt or a concrete analytical framework to interpret empirical evidence. For example, Korpelainen and Kira (2013) cited Engeström (1987) and Nardi (1996) for presenting general activity theory.

The activity theory concepts most widely used in the papers were tool mediation to help understand artefacts; context to discuss meaningful human activity; and contradictions, tensions, and breakdowns to help understand the development of activity systems. Thirteen papers had a strong focus on tool mediation. For example, Bodker and Petersen (2007) studied a configuration of artefacts used in media production, Pargman and Wærn (2008) studied collaborative writing tools, Bardram (1998) studied surgical tools, and Oviatt et al. (2012) studied user interfaces for higher learning activities. Twelve papers focused on context. For example, Barthelmess and Anderson (2002) produced a rich contextual description of software development as a collaborative activity, and Owen (2001) analysed the organisational context of workplace learning. Nine papers used the concept of contradiction, as well as the related (but not synonymous) notion of breakdown. For example, Miettinen and Hasu (2002) analysed contradictions in a network of activity systems involved in innovation, Law and Sun (2012) examined breakdowns in video gaming, and Hautasaari (2013) used the concept of hierarchy to analyse and design support for Wikipedia article translation.

In reflecting on their applications of activity theory, many authors commented that the breadth of activity theory helped position their research within a wider purview. Owen (2001) noted that, ‘The strength of activity theory is that it draws attention to history and change, and the influence of contradictory structures in mediating everyday work activity’. Bardram (2000) said, ‘Activity Theory informs – in the original sense of the word as giving form or character to – the task of analysing cooperative work settings and devising mediating artifacts’. Korpelainen and Kira (2013) not only pointed out that the ‘strength of the activity system model lies in its being systemic and holistic’, but also noted that it could be ‘challenging to categorize the problems that were identified unequivocally into the categories between different elements’. In general, the reflections suggested that activity theory offers a rich framework that covers a wide range of HCI-relevant issues and factors including the historical, social, and organisational context. The authors observed that empirical analyses informed by activity theory do not deliver specific predictions about the nature of work and its computer support.

4.5. Activity theory as a framework for design

In this group of 17 papers, HCI researchers used activity theory to support design reflexivity, provide a general
Six papers reported the design of concrete systems: a tabletop-based groupware system (Fjeld et al., 2002), an interactive learning environment supporting children’s narrative activities (Decortis et al., 2003), a desktop system for knowledge workers (Houben et al., 2014), a personal project management system (Kapteijn, 2003), and a hospital system for communication and information (Bardram, 2009). The last two systems implemented different versions of the activity-centric computing framework.

Six papers dealt with design methodology. Several approaches to structuring and guiding the design process, informed by activity theory, were proposed: a methodology for designing corporate network security visualisations (Luse et al., 2011); a conceptual model for the design of interactive systems (Döweling et al., 2012); guidelines for designing electronic whiteboards (Klokmo and Bertelsen, 2013); a computer system design methodology based on Engeström’s activity system model (Mwanza, 2001); a framework for analysis, design, and evaluation of peripheral displays (Matthews et al., 2007); a methodology for modelling the development of groupware (Herrmann et al., 2004); and dialogical techniques for the design of websites (Erskine et al., 1997).

The remaining five papers addressed a variety of other topics, such as the relationship between ethnography and theory in design (Macauley et al., 2000); designing socio-technical support for people with cognitive disabilities (Carmien et al., 2004); conceptualising notions of task (Zitter et al., 2009) and anticipation (Peña-Ayala et al., 2014) intended to support the design of learning environments; and common ground and awareness in emergency management planning (Convertino et al., 2011).

The papers cited activity theory classics as providing guidance for design activities. For example, Houben et al. (2014) cited a classic text as their theoretical basis: ‘…we ground our design in Activity Theory (AT) (Engeström 1987), and ’to make activity theory more concrete in context of the three problems of the contemporary desktop interface, we present three guidelines …’

Activity theory concepts used were context to inform design and describe use situations, tool mediation to understand the role of technology in changes in work practices, and object to define the task to be supported by the design. For example, Mathews et al. said, ‘Activity Theory provides a framework for describing user context … and consequently … a framework for describing how people and peripheral displays interact in various situations’ (2007). Klokmo and Bertelsen (2013) analysed how information on a whiteboard was remediated to and from the whiteboard, and how designing artificial limitations on an electronic whiteboard could help maintain a key quality of a whiteboard – that when content is erased, it is gone. Peña-Ayala et al. (2014) defined objects in the learning environment and how they were taken into account to support educational activities.

When activity theory was the central theory, it was used to provide general insights into the nature of design. New conceptual tools were illustrated with concrete designs and details of implementation, and presentations of new systems were framed in activity theory discussions from which general claims were made. Klokmo and Bertelsen (2013), for example, conceptualised the use of whiteboards with concepts derived from activity theory, and suggested how new designs could be based on the analysis. When activity theory played a secondary role, it was used to supplement insights from other frameworks, or used for comparison with the main design framework.

Some authors noted that activity theory helped them maintain critical distance so they could analyse their settings more productively. Macauley et al. (2000) said,

The explicit use of theoretical frameworks, at least those such as [activity theory] which are particularly suited to design issues, discourages the tendency for ethnographers to see themselves as ‘proxy users’ by encouraging greater reflexivity about the researcher’s role in constructing the object of study.

The main advantages of activity theory mentioned in the design papers were providing a structure for analysis and design explorations, understanding the role of artefacts in everyday contexts, and supporting reflexivity.

The papers mentioned certain limitations of activity theory. Mathews et al. (2007) observed that activity theory did not obviate the need for time-consuming design processes:

The major limitation of our Activity Theory framework is that it does not alleviate the difficulties of applying design and evaluation methods. It guides the design and evaluation processes, but design and evaluation methods remain challenging and time-consuming to employ.

As in other uses of activity theory, many authors found it advantageous to complement activity theory with other approaches. Luse et al. (2011) observed: ‘[A] marriage between concepts and techniques used by activity theorists and researchers applying design science would … be fruitful’.
4.6. Activity theory in use with other theories

In many cases, authors used activity theory in conjunction with other theories. This finding is perhaps not surprising given that activity theory is a broad conceptual approach centered on concepts generically descriptive of human activity. Other theories were deployed for precision in specific domains or topical areas. For example, Spassler used activity theory with a realist ontology to develop an evaluation framework for digital library use (2002). Mühlfelder and Luczak used activity theory and conceptualisations of mental models to develop a new method for evaluating groupware (2003). Meira and Peres paired activity theory with conversation analysis to evaluate educational software (2004). Convertino et al. combined activity theory with a theory of small groups in a study of intergenerational groups (2007). Young used activity theory, cognitive load theory, and flow experience theory to develop an integrated framework for Internet-mediated experiences for children (2008). Norros et al. used activity theory and cognitive ergonomics requirements engineering in a simulation of first responder services (2011). Barr, Noble, and Biddle (2007) used activity theory with value theory and semiotics to analyse emotions in videogames. Kuutti and Bannon clustered activity theory with other social theories to discuss a turn to practise studies in HCI (2014). Tomlinson et al. (2013) applied activity theory in the development of a theory for collapse informatics, in particular to extend the notion of time to take into account the future. Activity theory has been combined with a wide range of other approaches including philosophical theories, social psychology, cognitive psychology, ethnomethodology, and systems development theory to create new analytical tools in varied domains.

Some papers used activity theory in a limited way to buttress other approaches. Quinones (2014) used activity theory to develop a coding scheme for analysing interviews. Carroll et al. (2003) used the concept of activity in formulating their own concept of ‘activity awareness’. Chan (2009) employed Engeström’s notion of activity system to formulate specific questions to be addressed in a study of decision support systems. In some papers, activity theory was referred to briefly in making general claims about its usefulness, conceptual validity, or relevance. For instance, Wright et al. (2000) suggested using activity theory to explore function allocation in human–computer systems, and both Pargman (2003) and Chauvin et al. (2010) noted that there are similarities between the approach they employ, instrumental genesis, and activity theory.

All of that said, most papers used activity theory as the sole theory to conceptualise the research.

4.7. Summary

Our qualitative analysis of the use of activity theory in a carefully derived set of HCI activity theory papers indicated that HCI researchers used activity theory for five different purposes. When synthesising and summarising these findings, we found five different roles for HCI researchers making AT work:

1. Meta-theoreticians considered AT itself as an object of analysis. They identified unique features and principles, as well as problematic aspects, of the theory and compared it to other ‘contextual’ theories in HCI and related areas. For instance, Halvorson (2002) presented a systematic comparative analysis of AT and Hutchins’ distributed cognition theory as conceptual frameworks for Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW) research.

2. Theory-tool-makers used activity theory as a theoretical influence in the development of a new analytical tool. They identified needs and requirements for new theoretical tools and employed activity theory, sometimes in combination with other theories, to inform and guide the development of such tools. An example is Young (2008) who used activity theory in combination with cognitive load theory and flow experience theory to develop an integrated framework for analysing Internet-mediated experiences in children’s activity.

3. Construct-developers employed activity theory as a tool for conceptual analysis and development. They applied the theory to address central issues and challenges in HCI, often in response to the emergence of new technologies. By doing so they also developed new sub-concepts of existing concepts, or expanded the application scope of existing concepts. An example is the paper by Bodker and Andersen (2005) that conceptualises the historical development of mediators.

4. Data interpreters used activity theory as a tool for empirical analysis. They used key theoretical constructs of the theory to identify and categorise specific empirical phenomena. For example, Bardram (1998, 2000) analysed healthcare cooperative work settings and devised new artefacts.

5. Design-oriented researchers used activity theory as a framework for design. The theory guided the iterative design process, or helped develop claims about the nature of the design process. These researchers provided new design illustrations, claims, and guidelines. An example is Mwanza (2001) who offered a design methodology based on Engeström’s activity system model.
Table 4 summarises the findings of the previous sections.

5. Discussion

5.1. The roles of theory in HCI

By focusing on activity theory, and conducting an analysis and meta-synthesis of 109 selected HCI activity theory papers, we created an empirically based taxonomy of five purposes of using activity theory, and used this to identify five roles for HCI researchers making HCI theory work.

Rogers (2012), in an overview of HCI theory, found that activity theory has been very popular in HCI as an explanatory framework that can ‘be mapped onto features of complex, real-world contexts’. While our analysis of a set of activity theory HCI papers confirms the use of activity theory for empirical analysis of real-world contexts, our findings further identified four other uses of activity theory in HCI, as we have discussed. In addition, a number of broader issues of theory in HCI, regarding its relevance and patterns of use, emerged in our analyses and are discussed below.

5.2. Theory use vs. theory making

Should HCI researchers be considered theory-makers or theory users? Kjærgaard and Vendelo (2015) found that IS researchers studying sensemaking theory often used it without explaining it or providing substantial theoretical background or discussion. They concluded that IS research is mainly concerned with empirical phenomena, pays little attention to theory construction and development, and that therefore IS is less likely to gain recognition as a reference discipline for other disciplines.

In contrast, there are reasons to believe that HCI is in a better situation when it comes to providing theoretical influence on other disciplines. There are indications that HCI acts as a reference discipline; for example, the classic activity theory HCI text Context and Consciousness (Nardi 1996) has been widely cited outside HCI. Instead of theory use as passive consumption of a theory ‘product’, we found numerous cases of theory development. These papers would, for example, alert the reader in the title, abstract, and keywords that the paper is about activity theory; cite the reference HCI activity theory texts; use activity theory deeply and in a substantial way; and reflect core HCI activity theory concerns. We believe that HCI researchers can be described as not only ‘theory users’, but also as ‘theory-makers’.

However, not all HCI researchers are (or should be) either theory-makers or theory users. Many HCI papers may better be characterised as experience reports (Newman 1994), or as challenging and provocative texts to jog our imaginations (Blackwell 2015) with little or no trace of theory. We found more than 200 full papers (outside of the 109 in our corpus) that mentioned activity theory, but did not report substantial theory use or theory making.

5.3. Practical relevance of HCI theory

The results of our qualitative meta-synthesis suggest that HCI has not fallen prey to Kuutti’s (2010) concern that HCI research focuses only on practical usefulness to the exclusion of explanatory analysis. We found that the use of activity theory in design resulted in the development of concepts intended to be used by industry. We found that the papers we analysed were concerned about topics of practical interest in varied domains of work, play, and learning. There are indications that, historically, explicit use of theory in industry by HCI professionals tends to happen mostly in R&D contexts, or in consultancy work (Clemmensen 2003). However, even the broad concept of usability, which hardly qualifies as theory, has been shown to be difficult to legitimise in industry and large organisations without first overcoming considerable organisational obstacles (Cajander, Janols, and Eriksson 2014). One possibility is that there is a misfit between the kind of HCI theory potentially useful for the global IT companies which can afford to have strong R&D usability communities and which are top sponsors and contributors to HCI research (Bartneck and Hu 2009), and the needs of other companies for more organisationally adapted and commercially oriented HCI theory. We believe that our proposed taxonomy can help HCI researchers become more aware of the purposes for which a theory is applied, and the outcomes of theory making and use that can be expected.

5.4. Various interpretations of theory in HCI research

Our analysis shows that the meaning of theory itself varies from paper to paper; it is not fixed and immutable. In this respect, our study goes against the view that a given theory always has a particular form (Gregor 2006; Newman 1994). The diversity of interpretations of a theory in different contexts is determined by a number of factors.

First, we found several forms of activity theory being used, ranging from theory as a gestalt or framework for understanding context, to specific emphases on a few key concepts from activity theory such as mediation. Second, depending on the purpose of using activity theory, different concepts and principles were used. For
Table 4. The five purposes of using activity theory (AT) and related thematic findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Use of AT classic texts</th>
<th>Engagement with key AT concepts</th>
<th>The role of AT in a HCI paper</th>
<th>Reflections on the use of AT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object of analysis</td>
<td>Classic texts are cited as early and authoritative, but difficult, source texts</td>
<td>The concept of context is the most important AT concept</td>
<td>AT can be the primary object for analysis, or one theory among other theories in a comparative analysis</td>
<td>AT has some unique features, and it has principles and is precise, and hence possible to analyse per se. Comparative analysis with AT may be difficult due to semantic problems with key concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-tool</td>
<td>Classic texts are cited as introductions to AT’s history, key concepts, and how to apply it</td>
<td>The concept of tool mediation is important. AT concepts are used as either empirical, theoretical, or explanatory concepts. AT concepts may also be interpreted with various domain-specific assumptions</td>
<td>One approach is to focus on the AT framework and on basis of this develop a new analytical tool. Another approach is to mix AT with other theory in a new framework for analysis and evaluation for a specific work or learning domain</td>
<td>AT works with different ontological perspectives, it helps avoid reductionism, and it has a rich theoretical vocabulary, good means for visualisations, and it is open and expandable. Can be used for analysis of a variety of human work domains, and by both whole user communities and individual researchers. However, AT has shortcomings when analysing dynamics over time and interaction between activity systems, and it tends to focus on the analysis of cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual analysis</td>
<td>Classic texts are cited for providing explanations of different philosophical and psychological approaches to HCI, and for defining selected concepts</td>
<td>The concepts of object and transformation are most important. AT concepts can themselves be topics for further conceptualisation, and/or AT concepts can be used to conceptualise activity and describe its specific characteristics</td>
<td>AT or a mix of AT and various other theories can be applied to conceptualise various computer supported work and communication activities, with a focus on interfaces and development of IT systems</td>
<td>AT works well to conceptualise real-world situations for comparison across a variety of national and organisational settings. AT concepts can be further developed, and non-AT concepts can be re-interpreted as AT concepts. However, AT should be more specific and flexible to be really useful for generalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical analysis</td>
<td>Classic texts are cited for providing a general theoretical framework for empirical analysis</td>
<td>The most important concepts are tool mediation, which helps understand the artefacts; context, which helps take into account meaningful human activity; and contradictions, tensions, and breakdowns, which help understand the development of activity systems</td>
<td>AT used alone directs empirical analysis by helping to formulate specific questions for the study. In a secondary role, selected AT concepts may inform parts of the analyses, or support claims for conceptual validity</td>
<td>AT offers a rich framework that covers a wide range of HCI-relevant issues and factors including historical, social, and organisational context. However, empirical analysis with AT does not deliver predications about the nature of work and computer support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Classic texts are cited for supporting design activities</td>
<td>The most important concepts used are context to inform design and describe use situations, tool mediation to understand the role of technology in changes in work practices, and object to define the task to be supported by the design</td>
<td>AT provides general insights into the nature of design. New conceptual tools may be illustrated with concrete designs and details of implementation, and presentations of new systems may be framed in AT discussions from which general claims can be made. When AT plays a secondary role, it may be used to supplement insights from other, more central frameworks, or used for comparison with the main design framework used</td>
<td>AT supports design reflexivity, providing a general structure for analysis and design explorations, and supporting a better understanding of the role of technological artefacts in everyday contexts. However, when using AT, it is hard to give concrete design examples, and practical guidance for design is scant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
instance, as shown in Table 5, the notion of context was the most widely used by in meta-theoretical analyses, while in theory tool-making, the most widely used was the notion of tool mediation.

Third, we found that activity theory was used in combination with other theories for different purposes and in different ways, such as comparing, adapting it to new work domains or to new technologies, or formulating design guidelines. Fourth, classic HCI theory texts were cited in many different ways, namely, as authoritative theory texts, introductions to the theory, or source of definitions, frameworks for empirical analysis, or loose guidelines. This variation in the use of activity theory suggests that it is extremely flexible, avoids the dogmatism associated with some theoretical work, and is always growing and changing. Indeed, activity theory itself always emphasises that it will grow and change as all human artefacts do (Kaptelinin and Nardi 2006).

5.5. Sociocultural implications of using HCI theory

One obvious feature of activity theory is that it explicitly covers historical, social, and organisational contexts to support a better understanding of the role of technological artefacts in these contexts. The authors suggested that activity theory should be developed more fully to account for analysing dynamics over time, interaction between activity systems, and even more deeply engaging social and organisational aspects.

As HCI develops broader, problem-based approaches such as sustainable HCI, ICT for development (ICTD), crisis informatics, collapse informatics, and computing within limits, the need to engage analyses of political economy and global dynamics suggests that activity theory must itself continue to develop. The complex global social arenas underlying broad societal issues cannot be studied in any deep way without considerations of economy and history, little of which we saw in the articles we analysed. At the same time, broad concerns of economy and environment must include a concept of an individual or collective subject with their objectives and concerns. For example, Pargman and Raghavan (2014) argue that sustainability in HCI should examine topics such as a steady-state economy and the ‘limits to growth’ investigated in economic models. Such analytical approaches are essential, but if they do not weave in human subjects with agency and agendas, they cannot inform the discipline of HCI.

6. Concluding remarks

In this paper we analysed how theory, and in particular activity theory, has worked out for HCI researchers. We found frequent and positive uses, and adaptation and development of activity theory in HCI. Our qualitative meta-synthesis indicated five specific purposes for which HCI researchers use and make activity theory. HCI has produced activity theory classics that might approximate the classics of HCI information processing theory. We have discussed how our findings for activity theory may also be valid for other HCI theories.

We expect that the diversity of issues and interests in our field will continue to produce the blooming, buzzing confusion that is HCI, while at the same time, its theories will ensure grounding for continued development, much as information processing theory allowed for the emergence of HCI as a recognised field. HCI theory is accumulating, whether we like it or not.

Concrete future research to follow up on this study would include interviewing HCI researchers from each category of our theory-makers. From a quantitative point of view, it would be interesting to test the initial characterisation of five roles of theory and theory-makers in HCI more formally and systematically by developing a codebook and by using independent raters from various HCI communities in the world. This could also be done for other theories than activity theory.

Finally, the current study could be taken forward by studying the use of activity theory in related fields such as IS which has recently shown an increased interest in activity theory. Chatterjee (2015), discussing design-based research, proposes that activity theory may be used as a bridge between researchers from different fields, especially social science and computer science, in
a holistic manner in order to create design-based theories. We look forward to such cross-disciplinary efforts to strengthen our understanding of information technology and its impact on individuals and society.

Note

1. In this paper, we do not account for the developments that led to AT being accepted in the West, nor do we discuss potential epistemological and ontological issues related to this process. A discussion of these issues can be found, for instance, in Wertsch (1981), Kozulin (1984), Cole and Wertsch (1986), Cole (1996), and Kaptejin and Nardi (2006).
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