However, despite given the undeniable relevance of NUIs and their ongoing research towards modern technology, it can’t also be undeniably stated that their design philosophy has been sufficiently explored. An opinion that was summarised by Don Norman \cite{NormanNUI}\cite{NormanGIS} and has since been repeatedly cited, in regards to what he and others felt was the place NUIs currently held during the onset of its surge. He claims that Natural Interfaces are useful, but that they may currently be a misnomer. The discussion further equates their development to the early developments of the GUI, where a lot of actions would be explained through use of metaphors. For the GUI, the popular metaphor that still survives today in vernacular, was that of a work desktop with papers and filing folders strewn about, and a hand to drag and work on them. However, the metaphor was merely a learning aid, and it doesn't directly resemble the actions intended when handling a GUI. For the Natural Interface which purports to better leverage the usage of metaphors, this was not necessarily encountered.\\

The more remarkable example of a metaphor successfully working as a NUI, but then failing the user expectations was found with a bowling game for the Nintendo Wii system. The Wii Controller is a gestural form of input with buttons on either side allowing users to mimic the motion of grabbing and swinging a bowling ball. Users are supposed to apply pressure on the buttons, and then perform a swinging motion releasing the buttons at its end, analogous to that of using a bowling ball in a real-world environment. However, when players got invested and immersed in the game, occasionally it would be verified that they would also release the controller itself at the end of the swing, throwing the controlled most likely in the direction of the game display. This would take users out of the experience, and they'd then make their plays with more careful and inhibited, yet far less natural, impetus.\\

The reasons given for the labelled failure of Natural Interfaces is due to them not conforming to the rules, or heuristics, of interaction design that apply beyond the scope of any particular technology\cite{Shneiderman:1997}\cite{Nielsen:1990}. Specifically, existing NUIs have issues with the visibility of signifiers and thus also with discoverability of new commands. With the freedom, reliability, feedback and, as seen above, error prevention, leading to users to perform commands they’re not even conscious of, and being unaware of how to quickly correct the program after issuing an erroneous change\cite{NormanGIS}\cite{malizia2012}. This is the lead up to a lot of scenarios where users either must be taught how to perform certain commands and are told to perform mimicry of analogue movements, or conversely, of a command that represents a non-kinesthetic concept. This proves to be confusing, and then regularly users find themselves complaining, after extended periods of use, about options that they had no way of knowing existed, of commands not making particular intuitive sense for the application, or even ones that don’t seem to work in new contexts with no discernible visible cue to explain the difference. A great deal of concern is given to the need of standards, and exploring the right approach that would actually feel seamless in the hands of users, and also to the difficulty that the behavioural distinctiveness of users presents to either goal.\\

One the tenants in HCI as a science for its usability concerns, we are told that users should not have to ‘radically change to fit in’, but rather that ‘systems should be designed to match their requirements’\cite{Preece1993}. So, one of the solutions presented tried to face the issue regarding ambiguity of input and user spontaneity, was through adaptability. If a technology wishes to allow users to interact with it as they are used to interact with the real world in everyday life, this technology must be malleable enough to each user, and the framing by which it should handle their involuntary suppositions would be their Culture. Culture is rich in gestures and expressions that hold special meaning. Even for concepts that have no physical equivalent and thus can’t be simply produced through mimicry of the concept, the depth is such that non-verbal communication is possible. Culture aware systems could provide an answer on not just what is a valid definition of Natural for one user, but separate answers for every group of every ethnicity and upbringing.\\

As such, there’s a need to produce research on this potential of leveraging user culture. Should a methodology prove itself to be feasible, new standards of interaction may be built for it among niches fulfilled by NUI based systems, providing users with more inclusive and immersive experiences, and opening new fields of research. The Shamanic Interface is one among ideas for introducing cultural awareness into systems, focusing on the separation of concerns between gestures classifications and virtual instructions.