Again, looking through Rogers and Preece’s work\cite{preeceBook}, one finds four common evaluation paradigms used in HCI research: \emph{“quick-and-dirty” evaluation, usability testing, field studies and predictive evaluation}. Among them, the one that provide the most interest for the desired findings are field studies (see fig \ref{fig:Figure\_Evaluation\_Paradigms}). Field studies are performed with the aim of better understanding how users behave naturally and how a technology impacts them. The goals of a field study include finding opportunities for innovative technology, determining requirements for designs, facilitating introduction of paradigms and evaluating the natural assimilation of the products.\\

In practice, a field study involves two primary techniques: Observing the user; and asking users their opinions. Testing user performance is also often relevant as an observation, however that is not necessarily a part of the process. Observation should be performed while utilizing support tools and technologies, such as taking notes, recording audio and video, keeping interaction logs of the experiments. The evaluator should not disturb the users during the observation procedure, as a person’s presence may be considered obstructive. As for asking users what they think, it should be done separately from evaluation, and can be done through an interview or a questionnaire.\\

One of the more important tasks for the planning aspect, is to identify what will be the practical issues facing the testing environment and the participants, and plan around them to ensure that every user is faced with the same conditions, and that results obtained pertain to the test’s design and not to other factors. These issues may be: The design of each task, choosing users of interest, preparing and recording the test conditions, and choosing how to run the tests. Establishing requirements and objectives early allows an easier decision of the remainder of the important aspects, such as establishing dates, times and places, gaining contacts, and choosing what recording techniques will be employed based on available equipment. For the testing stage, a couple focus point are prevalently relevant, such as preparing and photographing the controlled environment with minimal distractions, obtaining consent of recording the interaction, writing down observations as they occur and user answers as is without personal flair, and attempting to be as unobtrusive as possible. Analysis should always occur later, but any observations that seem peculiar must be noted down as they happen and clarified with the users after the session is completed, to obtain some insights. It’s also important to perform a pilot observation session (real or not) to get a feel of what to expect and test out any observation sheets.\\

Without having a better feel for what's the expected cultural background of voluntaries, or without having a clear schedule for the environment, the questions of who and how cannot be objectively answered. However, the flow of the sessions can be pre-emptively decided. Due to the need of evaluating the capacity and retention of gestural commands in the system, it makes sense to employ more than a single session per user. As such, the study will be performed in two phases, an initial longer one and a second, shorter one focused more on user performance. Each session will have 5 parts to it: The \emph{Introduction}, wherein the user is welcomed to the controlled environment and recording consent issues are handled; a \emph{Warmup} where users are introduced to the tool and asked about their familiarity with it, and are given some easy instructions that may be required for setup; the \emph{main session}, during which they will perform their tasks with lesser involvement from the overviewing researcher and will have to perform tasks in escalating complexity and difficulty; \emph{Cool Off} period, during which they are interviewed about their experience, their difficulties and some more confusing aspects of the session will be clarified; and finally, a \emph{Closure} in which the recording is stopped and the user is thanked and led out of testing. The second of the two phases will have a much shorter warmup session, and the researcher will have much lesser involvement in the main session, as users should by then be more aware of what is the flow of the program and what tasks they should perform.