Attitudes toward signing avatars vary depending on hearing status, age of signed language exposure, and avatar type

Lorna C. Quandt^{1*}, Athena S. Willis¹, Melody Schwenk¹, Kaitlyn Weeks¹, Ruth Ferster¹

¹Educational Neuroscience, Gallaudet University, United States

Submitted to Journal:
Frontiers in Psychology

Specialty Section:
Language Sciences

Article type:
Original Research Article

Manuscript ID:
730917

Received on:
25 Jun 2021

Revised on:
03 Nov 2021

Journal website link:
www.frontiersin.org

Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest

Author contribution statement

LCQ conceptualized and supervised the study, conducted formal analysis and visualization, acquired funding, drafted and wrote the work. ASW contributed to conceptualization, methodology, investigation, and review/editing of the work. MS contributed to conceptualization, methodology, data curation, and review/editing of the work. KW contributed to methodology, investigation, and review/editing of the work. RF contributed to investigation and review/editing of the work.

Keywords

sign language, Avatars, Signing avatars, Deaf, virtual humans

Abstract

Word count: 341

The use of virtual humans (i.e., avatars) holds the potential for interactive, automated interaction in domains such as remote communication, customer service, or public announcements. For signed language users, signing avatars could potentially provide accessible content by sharing information in the signer's preferred or native language. As the development of signing avatars has gained traction in recent years, researchers have come up with many different methods of creating signing avatars. The resulting avatars vary widely in their appearance, the naturalness of their movements, and facial expressions—all of which may potentially impact users' acceptance of the avatars. We designed a study to test the effects of these intrinsic properties of different signing avatars while also examining the extent to which people's own language experiences change their responses to signing avatars. We created video stimuli showing individual signs produced by 1) a live human signer (Human), 2) an avatar made using computer-synthesized animation (CS Avatar), and 3) an avatar made using high-fidelity motion capture (Mocap avatar). We surveyed 191 American Sign Language users, including Deaf ($N = 83$), Hard-of-Hearing ($N = 34$), and Hearing ($N = 67$) groups. Participants rated the three signers on multiple dimensions, which were then combined to form ratings of Attitudes, Impressions, Comprehension, and Naturalness. Analyses demonstrated that the Mocap avatar was rated significantly more positively than the CS avatar on all primary variables. Correlations revealed that signers who acquire sign language later in life are more accepting and likely to have positive impressions of signing avatars. Finally, those who learned ASL earlier were more likely to give lower, more negative ratings to the CS avatar, but we did not see this association for the Mocap avatar or the Human signer. Together, these findings suggest that movement quality and appearance significantly impact users' ratings of signing avatars and show that signed language users with earlier age of ASL acquisition are the most sensitive to movement quality issues seen in computer-generated avatars. We suggest that future efforts to develop signing avatars consider retaining the fluid movement qualities integral to signed languages.

Contribution to the field

Signing virtual humans (aka avatars) are becoming more refined and receiving large financial investments aimed towards commercial and other uses. In the work presented here, we found that movement quality and appearance significantly impact users' ratings of signing avatars. We also show that ASL users with earlier age of ASL exposure (and more fluency) are the most sensitive to the movement quality issues seen in avatars based on computer-synthesized motions. We suggest that developers of signing avatars must retain the fluid movements which are integral to signed languages. Since people who learn ASL earlier are more likely to rely on it as a primary language, interference of computer-generated movements into signed content is unlikely to be met with acceptance by the users for whom signing avatars may be the most useful. This paper provides a data-backed view of how possible end-users view these virtual humans, with important implications for their future development.

Funding statement

We recognize support from National Science Foundation grant #1839379 and Gallaudet University's VL2 Center.

Ethics statements

Studies involving animal subjects

Generated Statement: No animal studies are presented in this manuscript.

Studies involving human subjects

Generated Statement: The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by Gallaudet University Institutional Review Board. The patients/participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

Inclusion of identifiable human data

Generated Statement: No potentially identifiable human images or data is presented in this study.

In review

Data availability statement

Generated Statement: The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

In review

Attitudes toward signing avatars vary depending on hearing status, age of signed language acquisition, and avatar type

Lorna C. Quandt*, Athena Willis, Melody Schwenk, Kaitlyn Weeks, & Ruthie Ferster

Educational Neuroscience, Gallaudet University, Washington, DC, USA

* Correspondence:

Lorna Quandt

lorna.quandt@gallaudet.edu

Keywords: sign language, avatars, signing avatars, deaf, virtual humans

Abstract

The use of virtual humans (i.e., avatars) holds the potential for interactive, automated interaction in domains such as remote communication, customer service, or public announcements. For signed language users, signing avatars could potentially provide accessible content by sharing information in the signer's preferred or native language. As the development of signing avatars has gained traction in recent years, researchers have come up with many different methods of creating signing avatars. The resulting avatars vary widely in their appearance, the naturalness of their movements, and facial expressions—all of which may potentially impact users' acceptance of the avatars. We designed a study to test the effects of these intrinsic properties of different signing avatars while also examining the extent to which people's own language experiences change their responses to signing avatars. We created video stimuli showing individual signs produced by 1) a live human signer (Human), 2) an avatar made using computer-synthesized animation (CS Avatar), and 3) an avatar made using high-fidelity motion capture (Mocap avatar). We surveyed 191 American Sign Language users, including Deaf ($N = 83$), Hard-of-Hearing ($N = 34$), and Hearing ($N = 67$) groups. Participants rated the three signers on multiple dimensions, which were then combined to form ratings of Attitudes, Impressions, Comprehension, and Naturalness. Analyses demonstrated that the Mocap avatar was rated significantly more positively than the CS avatar on all primary variables. Correlations revealed that signers who acquire sign language later in life are more accepting and likely to have positive impressions of signing avatars. Finally, those who learned ASL earlier were more likely to give lower, more negative ratings to the CS avatar, but we did not see this association for the Mocap avatar or the Human signer. Together, these findings suggest that movement quality and appearance significantly impact users' ratings of signing avatars and show that signed language users with earlier age of ASL acquisition are the most sensitive to movement quality issues seen in computer-generated avatars. We suggest that future efforts to develop signing avatars consider retaining the fluid movement qualities integral to signed languages.

1 Introduction

Virtual human avatars who use signed languages could improve digital infrastructure for accessing information, learning signed languages, or other aspects of signed interactions (Naert et al., 2020), especially in situations when face-to-face communication is not possible. Signing avatars could also help disseminate emergency-related information quickly and uniformly throughout a community in the case of evacuations, public health crises, or missing person alerts. While signing avatars are

unlikely ever to match the responsiveness and natural movements of an actual human signer, signing avatars have potential benefits for increasing accessibility and use of signed languages in everyday life. For instance, the flexibility and interactive nature of signing avatars mean that an avatar's signing speed or appearance can be changed, content can be repeated on demand, and simple interactions can be programmed according to user needs. With sufficient development, signing avatars can allow semi-automated interaction, much like the ubiquitous customer service chat-bots which have become common in recent years. In this paper, we describe the results of a sizeable online rating study to examine the determinants of American Sign Language (ASL) users' responses to different types of signing avatars.

With appropriate scaling and development of digital tools, signing avatars could be used across various domains when live signers are unavailable or impossible to use. For instance, signing avatars could be used to translate content on a website automatically (Kennaway et al., 2007), translate educational content alongside a textbook (Adamo-Villani & Anasingaraju, 2016), provide time-sensitive information in public spaces (e.g., flight updates at an airport), or teach signed language lessons in virtual reality (Quandt et al., 2020). In these situations, the benefits of signing avatars over pre-recorded actual human signed videos include the ease of editing and automatic production of new signed information. However, sign language users are likely to have different opinions, or acceptance, of signing avatars in some spaces compared to others, and not all potential uses or engineering approaches of signing avatars will be worth the investment of research, time, and money. Additionally, some uses of signing avatars may be geared toward non-signers, such as using avatars for signed language instruction in virtual or mixed reality (Quandt et al., 2020; Shao et al., 2020), and developers creating avatars for different populations should be mindful of how different groups respond to different avatars. It is critical to note that use of signing avatars may not be feasible, appropriate, or worthwhile in many situations (e.g., formal education, providing interpreting in face-to-face meetings; WFD & WASLI, 2018).

However, it is essential to identify the specific situations in which signing avatars can benefit and provide added value. Gaining a firm understanding of what makes a signing avatar comprehensible and likable will help guide future development in the field. Preliminary work has shown that deaf signers would welcome signing avatars in public locations where information-sharing is vital (e.g., train stations, hospitals (Kennaway et al., 2007). One area that could benefit from signing avatars is some health settings where patients share confidential information with a provider, such as during psychological assessments. Interaction with signing avatars in situations where a person may not want to divulge information to multiple parties would allow a signer to minimize the number of people involved in their care, which may ease discomfort in the presence of interpreters (Barber et al., 2010).

Developers can create signing avatars using several different processing pipelines. One of the significant distinctions between types of virtual human animation depends on whether the movement is based on recorded motion capture from actual human signers or whether the movements are based on computer-synthesized motions, programmed to result in signed language production. In the latter case of computer-synthesized motions, developers can use manual or automatic keyframe animation. Each of these engineering approaches has significant benefits and drawbacks (Gibet, 2018; Naert et al., 2020), and each approach has seen significant progress in recent years. Motion capture recordings tend to provide more realistic human movements (Alexanderson & Beskow, 2015; Quandt et al., 2020) but require costly investments of time to process and clean. Computer synthesized animations are more efficient since they can be programmed but result in a limited and less natural movement of the hands and reduced fluency in meaningful facial expressions. More recent innovations use

machine learning to generate highly realistic signs from estimations of skeletal poses trained on existing video data (Saunders et al., 2020; Stoll et al., 2020). These newer animations are pushing the envelope of how accurate and realistic synthesized signing can look, and as such, it is more important than ever to assess how different factors affect end-users' views of signing avatars.

As signing avatars have continued to gain traction in recent years as a potentially powerful accessibility tool for signed language users, researchers have examined which intrinsic or extrinsic factors may contribute to how users perceive and accept the avatars. Intrinsic factors include characteristics of the avatar itself: appearance, type of movement, or facial expressions. Extrinsic factors that may impact receptivity or comprehension include the user's own fluency with a signed language, their attitudes toward technology, or their language and education history. Prior research has examined many of these factors (Kacorri et al., 2015) and identified specific factors which appear to be most important for predicting the reaction to signing avatars. Several prior studies have examined how signers perceive and rate signing avatars, using self-reported ratings and eye-tracking metrics (Huenerfauth & Kacorri, 2016). Prior work has shown that grammaticality ratings and natural motion can be associated with specific areas of eye fixation (Huenerfauth & Kacorri, 2016).

General attitudes toward signing avatars are best assessed in the context of other viable alternatives. For instance, one could compare signing avatars to written text or a video showing a human signer to examine how people react to different information-sharing modes in a specific context. One research study compared human and avatar signers who presented math problems to Deaf young adults and compared their performance and attitudes toward the signers (Hansen et al., 2018). While participants all preferred the human signer, their mathematics performance was equal in response to questions posed by both signers. Users reported dissatisfaction with the avatar's lack of facial and body expression, and across many research studies, overall appearance and facial expressions are critical considerations for acceptable signing avatars.

Intrinsic characteristics of signing avatars themselves can influence how potential users respond to them. These aspects could include appearance, form, movement, or details regarding their production of signed language. Virtual human characters can range in appearance from highly realistic to highly stylized or cartoonish, and these appearances may impact users' reactions to the avatars. While appearance alone could impact users' comprehension of signing avatars, one study found that was not the case, and legibility was the same between highly realistic and stylized signing avatars (Adamo-Villani et al., 2015). However, comprehension is not the only important measurement for a signing avatar. People's emotional, holistic impressions of the characters may also be critical for successful interaction with a signing avatar, going beyond simply the need to comprehend signs. In the Adamo-Villani et al. study, users found the stylized avatar significantly more appealing than the realistic avatar, likely reflecting the effect of the uncanny valley (Mori et al., 2012; Shin et al., 2019). In another study, users preferred natural-style avatars over anime-style avatars (Brock et al., 2018). These subjective measures of preference and attitude towards avatars provide valuable insight into the multidimensional factors that impact avatars' success.

Extrinsic factors, such as the viewer's own language use and hearing status, may also contribute to the acceptance of and responses to signing avatars. Given the wide diversity of people who use American Sign Language, individual differences may profoundly change how people view and respond to signing avatars. For instance, prior work suggests that the language environment in which a sign language user grows up, or their level of fluency with ASL, may impact their likelihood of responding positively or negatively to signing avatars—for instance, more use and knowledge of ASL predicts harsher ratings of signing animations (Kacorri et al., 2015). The type of school that the

signer attended also was correlated with subjective judgments of signing animation—attending a residential Deaf school (where everyone’s primary mode of communication is signed language) was linked to harsher ratings of signing animations. Thus, both intrinsic and extrinsic factors are critical when developing and deploying signing avatars in any sector of society.

While other work has focused on either the intrinsic factors or extrinsic factors driving attitudes towards signing animations, here we attempted to identify both kinds of factors. For instance, if higher ASL proficiency is related to harsher criticisms of a signing avatar—is that true for different kinds of signing avatars?

Our research group has developed a motion-capture-based signing avatar for use in an immersive virtual reality ASL learning system. During development, we identified key features of the signing avatar that would teach users basic ASL signs (Quandt et al., 2020). Through prior work on signing avatars and embodied learning, we designed an ASL teacher avatar that has the following features 1) produce fluid, biologically plausible movements that resemble native ASL signers’ movements as much as possible; 2) display the facial expressions critical to correct ASL grammar, in a manner as close as possible to a native ASL signer; 3) be aesthetically pleasing, falling at the right point on the cartoon-to-realistic spectrum of animation styles; and 4) present as an “ideal” ASL teacher—knowledgeable, competent, kind, and professional. Using these guiding principles, we sought to examine intrinsic and extrinsic factors contributing to users’ reactions to signing avatars in the current study. For signing avatars to gain traction and acceptance in online or community spaces (e.g., signing avatars providing information in a train station), it will be critical to understand who will be most likely to attend to signing avatars, as well as identifying what features of the signing avatars will make them most successful.

Our pre-registered hypothesis was that signing avatars created from motion capture recordings would elicit more positive attitudes and impressions, higher comprehension, and more natural signing ratings than computer-synthesized avatars (<https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=uv6m9w>). We also examined the relationships between the age of sign language acquisition and avatar ratings and self-reported ASL fluency measures. Based on prior work in this area, we predicted that a younger age of acquisition and higher ASL fluency would result in less favorable views of signing avatars overall, whereas people who learn ASL later in life or are less fluent will be more accepting of, and give higher ratings to, motion-capture avatars.

To test these hypotheses, we conducted an online rating survey in which 184 ASL users rated two different types of signing avatars on an array of different dimensions, along with real human video control. We chose these three signers to sample the many possible signing avatars developed to date. We especially wanted to compare two different processing pipelines against a human benchmark, so we included one motion capture avatar (Mocap) and one computer-synthesized avatar (CS). We recruited a sample of raters from across the country, with a wide range of variations in ASL fluency, including deaf, hard-of-hearing, and hearing ASL users.

2 Methods

2.1 ASL signs

We selected eight individual ASL signs as the stimuli for this experiment: [MILK](#), [FRENCH-FRIES](#), [TOILET](#), [LIBRARY](#), [SPAGHETTI](#), [BACON](#), [MUSEUM](#), and [WEDDING](#) (links provide corpus representations of the signs, Caselli et al., 2016). The first four signs listed are produced with one hand, whereas the last four are symmetrical signs produced using two hands.

2.2 Video Stimuli

We created three types of video stimuli for the experiment (see Figure 1). Example videos of the three stimulus types are available at: <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.16877131.v2>.

2.2.1 Human signer

A female native ASL user was recorded against a blue background, producing each of the eight selected signs with natural sign production and facial expression. Each video clip started with 0.5 s of neutral body pose with arms at side, and then she signed one word. The clip ended at the end of the sign.

2.2.2 Computer-synthesized (CS) avatar

The same female native ASL user recorded for the human stimuli also coded the eight signs for the CS condition. She coded the movements of the computer-synthesized signing avatar (“Anna” character), created by JASigning, to produce the same eight signs as above. She used SigML-based coding input, which relies on the Hamburg Notation System (HamNoSys; Elliott et al., 2004). We recorded the screen to obtain video clips of each sign production, and each clip started with 0.5 s of neutral body pose and ended after the sign was complete.

2.2.3 Mocap avatar

We created the motion-capture signing avatar according to methods described in more detail in Quandt et al., 2020. The motion capture data was recorded using a 16-camera Vicon motion capture system (Vicon Industries, Inc., Hauppauge, NY) with a custom-built Faceware Pro HD Mark 3.2 Headcam (Faceware, Austin, TX) facial expression camera. According to industry standards, one hundred twenty-three markers were placed on the signer’s body, with labeling managed by Vicon Blade. Twenty-five markers were placed on each hand to ensure fidelity of hand movement information. The same female native signer who created the other stimuli produced eight signs during motion capture recording. We created eight video clips in which each clip started with ~0.5 s of a neutral body pose and ended after the sign was complete.

2.3 Task

Participants took the survey online. Study data were collected and managed using REDCap electronic data capture tools hosted at Gallaudet University (Harris et al., 2019; Harris et al., 2009). REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) is a secure, web-based software platform designed to support data capture for research studies. The presentation of the signers and the specific sign rating items was randomized, and two different forms were created with different randomized orders. All items mentioned here are presented in detail in the Analyses section (Section 2.5). At the start of the survey, participants completed an informed consent form approved by the Gallaudet University Institutional Review Board. Next, participants answered several sets of questions. Before seeing any stimuli, participants answered questions about their general interest in signing avatars. Next, they saw a brief clip of each of the three Signers producing a short phrase (e.g., “Nice to meet you”) and rated their overall attitudes toward each Signer. In the next section, they saw the video clips of each Signer producing individual signs (described in Video Stimuli, Section 2.2). For each sign, they rated comprehension and naturalness. Following the individual sign ratings, each Signer was shown again, and participants gave ratings about their impressions of the Signer and rated them on several presumed characteristics. Finally, participants provided demographic information (birth date, sex,

215 hearing status, preferred forms of communication, age of acquisition of ASL [Age of Acquisition],
216 and self-reported fluency in ASL).

217 2.4 Participants

218 Participants were recruited via online advertising, and we compensated them with a gift card in
219 exchange for their time. Participants self-reported their hearing status, and we used those responses to
220 group the participants. 83 deaf, 34 hard-of-hearing, and 67 hearing ASL users were included in the
221 sample. Table 1 shows participant demographics for each of the three groups. The table shows that
222 Age of Acquisition and self-reported ASL fluency differed significantly between groups, with large
223 effect sizes. On average, deaf participants reported the earliest Age of Acquisition and highest
224 fluency with ASL. Hearing participants reported the latest Age of Acquisition, and post-hoc tests
225 revealed the Hearing group had equivalent self-ratings of fluency as the Hard-of-Hearing group ($t =$
226 $.021$, $p_{\text{Tukey}} = 1.00$).

227 2.5 Variables

228 A short introduction regarding signing avatars was presented: “*Virtual human characters can be*
229 *made to communicate using signed languages. These “signing avatars” could potentially be used in*
230 *many different areas of life. For example, a signing avatar may be able to translate spoken*
231 *languages into sign language. In the future, you could see signing avatars when taking exams,*
232 *watching the news, or when interacting with customer service.*” We then asked five questions
233 regarding overall interest in signing avatars: *Signing avatars could be helpful... 1) ...for*
234 *understanding information on a website [website]; 2) ...for communicating information in a public*
235 *place (e.g., airport, train station) [public place]; 3) ...as interpreters in a face-to-face meeting [face-*
236 *to-face]; 4) I would enjoy seeing or interacting with signing avatars [personal enjoyment]; 5) Other*
237 *people would enjoy seeing or interacting with signing avatars [others’ enjoyment].* These responses
238 were given as 1-5 ratings, with Strongly Disagree as 1, Neutral as 3, and Strongly Agree as 5.

239 In line with our *a priori* predictions, we derived four new variables (Attitude, Impressions,
240 Comprehension, and Naturalness) from the questionnaire by averaging responses to specific survey
241 questions. The Attitude variable reflects averaged responses to the following, all of which were rated
242 from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree): *I would feel comfortable interacting with this signer;*
243 *I would feel confident about receiving important information from this signer (e.g., news about*
244 *COVID-19 or hurricanes); I would trust the information I received from this signer; and I feel like I*
245 *could share personal information with this signer (e.g., feelings, secrets, medical history).* Inter-item
246 correlations and correlations between the individual items and the Attitude variable were consistently
247 high for all three Signers (Human correlations between $r = .36$ and $r = .81$; Mocap correlations
248 between $r = .65$ and $r = .89$; CS correlations between $r = .67$ and $r = .91$; all $ps < .001$).

249 The Impressions variable reflects averaged responses to the following, using the same 1-5 rating
250 scale as above: *This signer signs like a fluent deaf signer; This signer would be a good model of ASL*
251 *for people who are learning to sign; This signer has appropriate use of facial expressions; This*
252 *signer has appropriate use of body language; This signer’s movements look clear.* Inter-item
253 correlations and correlations between the individual items and the Impressions variable were
254 consistently high for all three Signers (Human correlations between $r = .39$ and $r = .83$; Mocap
255 correlations between $r = .40$ and $r = .82$; CS correlations between $r = .66$ and $r = .91$; all $ps < .001$).

256 In line with prior work (Kacorri et al., 2017), we calculated the Comprehension variable by averaging
257 the responses to *This signing was easy for me to understand* for each of the eight individual signs

258 produced by each signer. The Naturalness variable was calculated by averaging the responses to *This*
 259 *signing looked natural* for each of the eight individual signs produced by each signer. Both questions
 260 used the same 1-5 rating scale described above.

261 As documented in our pre-registration, our analyses included within-group conditions based on the
 262 type of signer: Human signer, Mocap avatar, CS avatar. There were no between-group experimental
 263 condition assignments; however, we sorted the data into three groups based on self-reported
 264 demographics (Deaf, Hard-of-Hearing, Hearing). To conduct exploratory analyses, we also used the
 265 response to *What age were you when you first learned a sign language?* as the independent variable
 266 Age of Acquisition.

267 2.6 Analyses

268 To identify relationships between Age of Acquisition and general attitudes toward signing avatars,
 269 we conducted a Spearman's correlation including the factors of Age of Acquisition, Website, Public
 270 Place, Face-to-face, Personal enjoyment, and Others' Enjoyment. Using a correlation allowed us to
 271 examine the continuous variable of Age of Acquisition to answer whether increasingly later Age of
 272 Acquisition is associated with any specific changes in interest or enjoyment of avatars.

273 To examine between-group differences and test our registered predictions, we conducted one-way
 274 repeated measures ANOVAs comparing ratings from three Groups (Deaf, Hard of Hearing, Hearing)
 275 on three types of avatars (Human, Mocap, & CS avatar) and one dependent variable for each *a priori*
 276 prediction (Attitudes, Impressions, Comprehension, and Naturalness). Our data did not match the
 277 assumption of sphericity for these ANOVAs, so Greenhouse-Geisser-corrected *p* values are shown
 278 for all analyses to account for this violation.

279 To identify the relationship between Age of Acquisition upon the ratings of the different signers, we
 280 conducted a Spearman's correlation, including the Age of Acquisition, and Comprehension,
 281 Naturalness, Attitude, and Impressions scores for all three signers. As above, using a correlation
 282 allowed us to examine the continuous variable of Age of Acquisition in more detail.

283 We also conducted exploratory analyses using the factor of self-reported Fluency in ASL (from 1-5
 284 with 1 being not at all; 5 being extremely). We excluded any respondents who answered 1 from the
 285 dataset. We conducted ANOVAs on the five primary dependent variables with a fixed factor of
 286 Fluency rating.

287 Finally, we conducted exploratory analyses on the ratings of how "creepy" each signer was because
 288 creepiness has a close link to the extensive literature on the uncanny valley effect (Kättsyri et al.,
 289 2015; Mori et al., 2012), and is commonly identified as one of the limiting factors of interacting with
 290 humanoid characters (Ho et al.; Inkpen & Sedlins, 2011).

291 3 Results

292 3.1 Overall Ratings

293 Figure 2 shows the mean ratings across all participants for overall interest in signing avatars, both in
 294 three different scenarios, and the general expectation of enjoyment for self and others. There were no
 295 significant differences between Groups on the items reflecting overall interest. Across all three
 296 groups, a repeated-measures ANOVA revealed a large significant difference in interest regarding
 297 signing avatars in three different domains: Website, Public Place, and Face-to-Face ($F(1.63,301.75) =$

76.97, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .30$). A Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc test revealed that Face-to-Face interest was significantly lower than either of the other two domains ($ps < .001$), while there was no difference between interest in Website or Public Place. We also ran a correlation between Age of Acquisition and overall interest ratings, which revealed a significant correlation between Age of Acquisition and ratings of personal enjoyment and others' enjoyment (see Table 2). In other words, people who acquired ASL later were more likely to express interest and enjoyment of avatars, whereas earlier learners reported less interest and enjoyment.

3.2 Planned analyses: Attitudes, Impressions, Comprehension, and Naturalness

A two-way ANOVA was used to examine the effect of Signer type and Group on Attitudes, Impressions, Comprehension, and Naturalness. There was a small significant between-subjects effect of Group on Attitude ratings ($F(2,181) = 7.46$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .03$), in which the Deaf group gave lower Attitude ratings overall ($M = 3.17$) than the Hard-of-Hearing group ($M = 3.65$) or Hearing group ($M = 3.44$). We observed a large significant within-subjects main effect of Signer ($F(1.72,322.40) = 185.764$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .32$), in which the Human signer garnered the highest Attitude score ($M = 4.40$, $SD = .617$), followed by the Mocap avatar ($M = 3.02$, $SD = 1.01$), and the CS avatar garnered the least favorable Attitude score ($M = 2.647$, $SD = 1.12$). We also observed a small significant interaction effect on Attitude ratings between Group and Signer ($F(3.56,322.40) = 9.03$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .03$; see Figure 3). A Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc test revealed that while the Deaf group's Attitude ratings were significantly different from the Hard-of-Hearing and Hearing groups ($p = .001$ and $.03$, respectively), the Hard-of-Hearing and Hearing groups did not differ. A Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc test revealed that Attitude ratings for all three Signers were statistically different from one another (all $p < .005$).

There was a small significant between-subjects effect of Group on Impression ratings ($F(2,181) = 3.47$, $p = .03$, $\eta^2 = .008$), in which the Hard-of-Hearing group gave higher Impression ratings ($M = 3.65$), while the Deaf group ($M = 3.37$) and the Hearing group ($M = 3.39$) gave lower ratings. We observed a large significant within-subjects main effect of Signer ($F(1.67,302.57) = 278.00$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .46$), in which the Human signer garnered the highest Impression score ($M = 4.67$, $SD = .50$), followed by the Mocap avatar ($M = 3.28$, $SD = .05$), and the CS avatar garnered the least favorable Impression score ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.21$). We also observed a small significant interaction effect on Impression ratings between Group and Signer ($F(3.43,302.57) = 10.05$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .03$; see Figure 4). A Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc test revealed that the only significant difference between groups was that the Deaf group's Impression ratings were significantly different from the Hard-of-Hearing group ($p = .036$), while other group comparisons were not significantly different. A Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc test revealed that Impression ratings for all three Signers were statistically different from one another (all $p < .001$).

There was a small significant between-subjects effect of Group on Comprehension ratings ($F(2,181) = 4.67$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .012$), in which the Hearing group ($M = 3.86$) gave higher Comprehension ratings, while the Deaf group ($M = 3.57$) and the Hard-of-Hearing ($M = 3.61$) group gave lower ratings. We observed a large significant within-subjects main effect of Signer ($F(1.39,250.96) = 239.76$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .42$), in which the Human signer garnered the highest Comprehension score ($M = 4.62$, $SD = .56$), followed by the Mocap avatar ($M = 3.79$, $SD = .72$), and the CS avatar garnered the lowest Comprehension score ($M = 2.62$, $SD = 1.13$). We also observed a small significant interaction effect on Comprehension ratings between Group and Signer ($F(2.77,250.96) = 6.72$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .02$; see Figure 5). A Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc test revealed that the only significant difference between groups was that the Deaf group's Comprehension ratings were

significantly different from the Hearing group ($p = .01$), while other group comparisons were not significantly different. A Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc test also revealed that Comprehension ratings for all three Signers were statistically different from one another (all $p < .001$).

There was no main effect of Group on Naturalness ratings ($F(2,181) = 1.062$, $p = .348$, $\eta^2 = .003$). We observed a large significant within-subjects main effect of Signer ($F(1.59,287.42) = 272.55$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .45$), in which the Human signer garnered the highest Naturalness score ($M = 4.62$, $SD = .56$), followed by the Mocap avatar ($M = 3.46$, $SD = .87$), while the CS avatar received the lowest Naturalness ratings ($M = 2.17$, $SD = 1.28$). We also observed a small significant interaction effect on Naturalness ratings between Group and Signer ($F(3.18,287.42) = 8.54$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .03$; see Figure 6). A Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc test revealed that Naturalness ratings for all three Signers were statistically different from one another (all $p < .001$).

3.3 Exploratory Analyses: Creepiness

There was no main effect of Group on Creepiness ratings ($F(2,181) = .319$, $p = .727$, $\eta^2 < .001$). We observed a large significant within-subjects main effect of Signer ($F(1.92,483.25) = 137.98$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .31$), in which the Human signer garnered the lowest Creepiness score ($M = 1.46$, $SD = .98$), followed by the Mocap avatar ($M = 2.54$, $SD = 1.30$), while the CS avatar received the highest Creepiness ratings ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.35$). We also observed a small significant interaction effect on Creepiness ratings between Group and Signer ($F(3.85,483.25) = 2.84$, $p < .026$, $\eta^2 = .01$; see Figure 7). A Bonferroni-corrected post-hoc test revealed that Creepiness ratings for all three Signers were statistically different from one another (all $p < .001$).

3.4 Exploratory Analyses: Age of Acquisition and Fluency

We ran a correlation between the four primary variables and users' Age of Acquisition to disentangle the age of ASL acquisition from Group membership. The correlation showed that Age of Acquisition is significantly negatively correlated with Comprehension and Impression ratings of the Human signer; as the age of acquisition increases, the average Comprehension and Impression scores of the Human signer decreased (p values of $< .01$; See Table 3). We also observed a significant positive correlation between Age of Acquisition and Attitude rating toward the Mocap avatar ($p < .05$). All four ratings of the CS signer (Comprehension, Naturalness, Attitude, and Impressions) were higher when the Age of Acquisition was later (p values $< .001$). In other words, those who learned ASL later in life were more likely to give high ratings to the CS signer.

We also conducted ANOVAs to examine the relationship between fluency and ratings on the four primary dependent measures (see Figure 8). For all four dependent measures (Comprehension, Naturalness, Impression, and Attitude), we observed a significant effect of the signer, in results that echo the consistent findings throughout this study. The Human garnered the highest ratings for all measures, the Mocap signer was next highest, and the CS avatar was rated lowest. Of particular interest here, we asked to what extent these ratings varied based on the rater's self-reported ASL fluency. There was a small significant interaction effect on Comprehension ratings between Fluency and Signer ($F(4.142,211.496) = 3.628$, $p = .006$, $\eta^2 = .02$). As seen in Figure 8, a Bonferroni-corrected simple main effects comparison showed that for only the CS avatar, Comprehension ratings decreased with increasing fluency ($F(3, 12.37) = 3.31$, $p = .021$). There was a small significant interaction effect on Impression ratings between Fluency and Signer ($F(4.879,292.715) = 2.33$, $p = .044$, $\eta^2 = .02$; see Figure 8), but simple main effects comparisons did not yield any significant findings. For Attitude and Naturalness, there was no significant interaction effect.

4 Discussion

The current study's purpose was to understand better what determines ASL users' responses toward signing avatars. We designed an online rating study to gather responses from a large, diverse sample of ASL users, gathering information about their responses to different types of signers, as well as information about their own language use. Our primary hypothesis was that signing avatars created from motion capture recordings would elicit more positive attitudes and impressions, higher comprehension, and more natural signing ratings than computer-synthesized avatars (<https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=uv6m9w>). We also predicted the similarity between ratings for the mocap avatar and the human signer across those four variables. Finally, we predicted that earlier Age of Acquisition and higher self-reported ASL fluency would result in less favorable views of signing avatars overall than people who learn ASL later in life or are less fluent.

The results presented here reflect a diverse array of responses. Participants included signers across a wide range of ASL fluency levels, and we gathered data from ASL users who were hearing, hard-of-hearing and deaf. The sample of participants was not limited to any particular region or university, so it is unlikely that the cultural norms of a particular signing community are systematically over-represented. Taken together with the relatively large sample size, the wide variety of respondents means that our results may be more broadly generalizable than results from a study collected at a single location with smaller sample size.

4.1 Overall responses to signing avatars

One exploratory question we asked was in which situations people were most interested in seeing or interacting with signing avatars. We asked participants to rate whether signing avatars would be helpful for understanding information on a website or for communicating information in a public place, and on average, respondents agreed that signing avatars would be helpful in those situations (see Figure 2). However, a signing avatar acting as an interpreter in a face-to-face meeting was rated significantly worse, which we did not find surprising due to face-to-face interactions' fluid and personal nature. These findings reinforce the notion that signing avatars hold the most promise—and stand to be most accepted by the community—in circumstances where rote, impersonal information is being shared (WFD & WASLI, 2018; Bragg et al., 2019). There was no significant difference between groups on these ratings. There were no significant relationships between Age of Acquisition and responses to the situation-related questions, suggesting that perceptions of helpfulness in different scenarios do not differ based on language background and hearing status. The correlation did reveal a higher likelihood of enjoying interactions with signing avatars as the Age of Acquisition increases (see Table 2), suggesting that later ASL learners are generally more open to signing avatars.

4.2 What determines responses to signing avatars?

4.2.1 Intrinsic factors

In this study, we compared three types of signers: a human native ASL user (Human), an avatar created using computer-synthesized motion (CS avatar), and an avatar created using motion capture recording (Mocap avatar). We included these three signers to compare two examples of different types of avatars against a high-level control of a native human signer, whom we expected to garner relatively high ratings on all dependent measures. Across the four primary variables (Attitudes, Impressions, Comprehension, and Naturalness), respondents gave the human signer the highest ratings, the Mocap avatar the next highest, and the CS avatars the lowest ratings. For these four variables, the within-group differences between Signers were quite large. For all four variables, all

three Signers were significantly different from one another. These findings confirm our pre-registered predictions that signing avatars created from motion capture recordings would elicit more positive attitudes and impressions, higher comprehension, and more natural signing ratings than computer-synthesized avatars. On all factors, people rated the Human significantly higher than the Mocap avatar, suggesting that while they viewed the Mocap avatar more positively than the CS avatar, fluid motion alone is not sufficient to garner higher responses; visual appearance matters as well. Even when an avatar moves like a human, people respond less positively if it does not look human. Taken together, the differences between the avatars suggest that this Mocap avatar presented a significant advantage over the CS avatar, while at the same time, neither avatar is viewed as positively as a real human signer.

Attitudes, Impressions, Comprehension, and Naturalness each garnered similar patterns of responses. The Attitudes variable included questions about whether people would feel comfortable sharing or receiving information from the signer (see Variables section). Respondents had very positive attitudes toward the human signer ($M = 4.40$ out of 5), whereas they reported significantly less interest in exchanging information with either kind of avatar. The Impressions variable measured visual judgments of how the signer moved, looked, and signed (see Variables section). Respondents had very positive impressions of the Human's movements and signing ($M = 4.67$ out of 5), and the Mocap avatar garnered lower Impression responses, which were still significantly better than Impressions of the CS avatar. The Comprehension and Naturalness measures showed how well each Signer was understood and whether their sign production was natural or not. Both the Comprehension and Naturalness variables followed the same pattern again, with large significant differences between signers. Lastly, we conducted the exploratory analysis on Creepiness and found that as predicted, the CS avatar was judged as the creepiest, while the Mocap avatar was less creepy, and as expected, the Human signer garnered very low creepiness ratings. Taken together, we see resounding support for the predicted differences between avatars. We show that compared to the CS avatar, ASL users overall had more positive attitudes and impressions of the Mocap signer, who they also found to be more comprehensible and natural.

4.2.2 Extrinsic factors

We were particularly interested in how a person's own language background would influence their ratings of the avatars. Overall, we saw significant effects of Group on Attitude, Impression, and Comprehension, but no effect of group on Naturalness or Creepiness. The Deaf group gave significantly lower Attitude ratings than the other two groups. In contrast, for Impression ratings, the difference was driven by the Hard-of-Hearing group giving significantly higher ratings than the Deaf group. For Comprehension, the difference was driven by the Hearing group giving significantly higher ratings compared to the Deaf group.

Overall, we see that while hearing status is related to people's responses to signing avatars, the exact nature of that relationship varies depending on what type of characteristic they are judging. For example, the Hearing group's higher Comprehension ratings may reflect their lower ASL fluency, resulting in more forgiveness for unclear or unnatural movements because they lack the necessary knowledge to correctly discriminate between different productions of a sign. In the current work, we had about half as many Hard-of-Hearing respondents ($N = 34$) as we did in the Deaf and Hearing groups. This smaller group size, as well as the wide range of experiences which may lead people to identify as hard-of-hearing (Israelite et al., 2002; Luey et al., 1995), means that the responses from this group are hard to interpret in comparison to either the Deaf or Hearing groups.

4.2.3 Intrinsic and extrinsic factor interactions

To understand signers' feelings towards signing avatars more thoroughly, we also looked at interactions between intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Specifically, we asked how people's language background and hearing status are related to the ratings of the different types of signers. These analyses were motivated by the idea that more fluent signers, especially deaf signers, may be more sensitive to signing avatars' movement dynamics and facial expressions than people who are newer or less fluent users of ASL. We observed small but significant Group x Signer interactions for all four primary factors and the exploratory factor of Creepiness. Though there were many specific differences driving the interactions (see Figures 3-7), the Hard-of-Hearing group showed different responses for many of the different variables. For Attitudes, Impressions, Naturalness, and Creepiness, the Hard-of-Hearing group responded overall more positively to the CS Avatar than the other two groups and more negatively to the Human signer. We observed that the Hard-of-hearing group displayed a different profile of responses than the Deaf group, but the interpretation of these differences is limited due to the diversity of the sample and the smaller size Hard-of-Hearing group. Comprehension ratings showed that the Deaf group judged the CS Avatar less comprehensible than the other two groups.

In addition to analyzing Group differences, we also conducted analyses using self-reported Fluency as an independent variable and correlations with the Age of Acquisition variable. While Group and Fluency are certainly related, as seen in the significantly higher Fluency ratings for the Deaf group on average (Table 1), analyzing by Fluency gives us a clearer picture of how proficiency in ASL, rather than hearing status alone, is related to the perceptions of signing avatars. This distinction is important because, within the Groups, fluency varies widely—for instance, the Deaf group includes many people whose first language is ASL and who are highly fluent, yet also includes later, less proficient Deaf learners of ASL. From the Group x Fluency analyses, we observed that higher fluency related to lower Comprehension ratings for the CS signer (see Figure 8). For Impressions, we saw the same pattern in which people with higher ASL fluency had more negative Impressions toward the CS signer. The correlation between Age of Acquisition and the four primary variables mirrored this finding. For all four variables, people with an earlier Age of Acquisition rated the CS avatar more negatively (see Table 3). These findings are essential because they show that more fluent and earlier signers are particularly sensitive to the odd movements of the CS avatar. In contrast, Fluency was not related to Comprehension or Impression ratings for the Mocap avatar (confirmed by post-hoc testing, p values of .80 and .148, respectively), suggesting that those ratings of the Mocap avatar do not differ based on the viewer's own fluency. We suggest that this may be because the Mocap avatar's movements come from a recording of a human native signer. While she does not look entirely human, and there may be features of her appearance that people find odd, her sign production reflects the authentic signing movements of a native Deaf signer. This finding adds to prior work suggesting that people are highly sensitive to the motion characteristics of humanoid agents (Saby et al., 2011; Thompson et al., 2011; White et al., 2007). This work also echoes past findings in the field which demonstrated that ASL users who attended Deaf Residential schools (where ASL is the primary language) were more harsh judges of computer synthesized ASL animations (Kacorri et al., 2017).

The different experiences of Deaf, Hard-of-Hearing, and Hearing people who use ASL and the differences based on their fluency in ASL are critical to consider when developing signing avatars. Users' language experiences appear related to their responses to signing avatars, and critically, certain types of signing avatars may be more prone to negative responses from particular groups of people. When developing signing avatars, one key aspect of design considerations must be who the intended audience or user will be (Bragg et al., 2019). Our data show that deaf or fluent signers are

likely to have more negative views of signing avatars, especially when animated with computer-synthesized motion. At the same time, developers must consider the vast diversity of the deaf experience when designing signing avatars for use in any particular situation. For instance, many deaf and hard-of-hearing people do not grow up in an environment where signed language is used (Mitchell & Karchmer, 2004) and do not receive signed language exposure during early developmental years (Kushalnagar et al., 2011). Some of them may later choose to learn sign language, and people in this group represent an important demographic for signing avatars. As later ASL learners, as shown by our data, those people may have a more accepting view of signing avatars.

These complex relationships between the user's background and the avatar they see are essential if avatars are used in educational, medical, or face-to-face settings. The work we present here echoes work from other domains of human-computer interaction, in which the preference for more authentic human experience drives the acceptance of virtual human assistants (Fernandes & Oliviera, 2021; Cherif & Lemoine, 2019).

5 Limitations and future directions

This study replicates specific findings from the literature, particularly the more negative responses from more fluent signers (Kacorri et al., 2015) and the complex multidimensional factors which affect users' views of signing avatars (Kipp et al., 2011). We also go beyond prior work to better portray the complex relationship between people's own language background and the way they approach and react to different types of signing avatars. However, our results only represent the specific virtual human avatars used here, so extrapolation beyond these instances should be taken with caution. Dozens of different signing avatars have been developed over the years, and it is beyond the scope of the study to draw conclusions about those not included in this study. Another limitation of the current work is that most ratings were given in response to individual words, so more work is needed to understand how signers respond to transitions between signs and grammatical aspects of avatar signing.

Signing avatar technology changes quickly. Since the stimulus creation in 2019-early 2020, advances in motion capture, facial expression recording, and computer synthesis of signed language have all continued to accelerate rapidly, so newer versions of signing avatars may not encounter the same responses as the ones included here. Achieving greater success with signing avatars may come from cross-disciplinary collaboration, such as ensuring that technical development occurs with meaningful input from signed language linguistics (Bragg et al., 2019). Researchers in signed language linguistics have had a long ongoing discussion on best representing signed languages in notation systems (Hochgesang, 2014; Miller, 2001). Continued collaboration between sign linguists and avatar developers may allow for improved representation of sign language by virtual humans. Our current findings, as well as several ethical considerations recently discussed in the field (de Mulder, 2021; Bragg et al., 2019; Quandt & Malzkahn, in review), suggest that deaf signers should serve as the models for signing avatars to ensure quality and cultural relevance. Finally, it would be helpful to carry out a similar study with a cross-design in which avatars varied by appearance and movement type. Such a study would allow for comparison between responses to two avatars who look the same but whose motions are different and compare responses to two avatars who look different but whose motions are the same.

6 Conclusion

In the work presented here, we found that movement quality and appearance significantly impact users' ratings of signing avatars and that signed language users with earlier Age of Acquisition (and more fluency) are the most sensitive to the movement quality issues seen in avatars based on computer-synthesized motions. Given that this sensitivity was not evident for the Mocap avatar, we suggest that developers of signing avatars must retain the fluid movements integral to signed languages. Since people who learn ASL earlier are more likely to rely on it as a primary language, interference of computer-generated movements into signed content is unlikely to be met with acceptance by the users for whom signing avatars may be the most useful.

7 Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Carly Leannah, Jason Lamberton, Jianye Wang, Yiqiao Wang, Melissa Malzkuhn, and Michael Halenar for their contributions to this work.

8 Funding

We recognize support from National Science Foundation grant #1839379 and Gallaudet University's VL2 Center.

9 Author Contributions

LCQ conceptualized and supervised the study, conducted formal analysis and visualization, acquired funding, drafted and wrote the work. ASW contributed to the conceptualization, methodology, investigation, and review/editing of the work. MS contributed to conceptualization, methodology, data curation, and review/editing of the work. KW contributed to the methodology, investigation, and review/editing of the work. RF contributed to investigation and review/editing of the work.

10 References

- Adamo-Villani, N., & Anasingaraju, S. (2016). Toward the Ideal Signing Avatar. *EAI Endorsed Transactions on e-Learning*, 3(11).
- Adamo-Villani, N., Lestina, J., & Anasingaraju, S. (2015, September). Does Character's Visual Style Affect Viewer's Perception of Signing Avatars?. In *Second International Conference on E-Learning, E-Education, and Online Training* (pp. 1-8). Springer, Cham.
- Alexanderson, S., & Beskow, J. (2015). Towards Fully Automated Motion Capture of Signs--Development and Evaluation of a Key Word Signing Avatar. *ACM Transactions on Accessible Computing*, 7(2). doi:10.1145/2764918
- Barber, S., Wills, D., Smith, M. J., & Leigh, W. (2010). *Psychotherapy with deaf clients from diverse groups*: Gallaudet University Press.
- Bragg, D., Koller, O., Bellard, M., Berke, L., Boudreault, P., Braffort, A., ... & Ringel Morris, M. (2019, October). Sign language recognition, generation, and translation: An interdisciplinary perspective. In *The 21st international ACM SIGACCESS conference on computers and accessibility* (pp. 16-31).

- 597 Brock, H., Nishina, S., & Nakadai, K. (2018). *To animate or anime-te? Investigating sign avatar*
598 *comprehensibility*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on
599 Intelligent Virtual Agents, Sydney, NSW, Australia. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3267851.3267864>
- 600 Caselli, N. K., Sehyr, Z. S., Cohen-Goldberg, A. M., & Emmorey, K. (2016). ASL-LEX: A lexical
601 database of American Sign Language. *Behavior Research Methods*, 49, 784-801.
- 602 Chérif E, Lemoine J-F. Anthropomorphic virtual assistants and the reactions of Internet users: An
603 experiment on the assistant's voice. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (English Edition)*.
604 2019;34(1):28-47. doi:10.1177/2051570719829432
- 605 De Mulder, M. (2021). Is “good enough” good enough? Ethical and responsible development of sign
606 language technologies. *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Automatic*
607 *Translation for Signed and Spoken Languages (AT4SSL)*.
- 608 Elliott, R., Glauert, J. R. W., Jennings, V., & Kennaway, J. R. (2004). *An overview of the SiGML*
609 *notation and SiGMLSigning software system*. Paper presented at the Fourth international
610 Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation.
- 611 Fernandes, T., & Oliviera, E. (2021). Understanding consumers' acceptance of automated
612 technologies in service encounters: Drivers of digital voice assistants adoption. *Journal of*
613 *Business Research*, 122, 190-191.
- 614 Gibet, S. (2018, May). Building french sign language motion capture corpora for signing avatars. In
615 *Workshop on the Representation and Processing of Sign Languages: Involving the Language*
616 *Community, LREC 2018*.
- 617 Hansen, E. G., Loew, R. C., Laitusis, C. C., Kushalnagar, P., Pagliaro, C. M., & Kurz, C. (2018).
618 Usability of American Sign Language videos for presenting mathematics assessment content.
619 *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 23(3), 284 294. doi:10.1093/deafed/eny008
620 PMID - 29659894
- 621 Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Minor, B. L., Elliott, V., Fernandez, M., O'Neal, L., ... & REDCap
622 Consortium. (2019). The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of
623 software platform partners. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 95, 103208.
- 624 Harris, P. A., Taylor, R., Thielke, R., Payne, J., Gonzalez, N., & Conde, J. G. (2009). Research
625 electronic data capture (REDCap)—a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for
626 providing translational research informatics support. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 42(2),
627 377-381.
- 628 Ho, C. C., MacDorman, K. F., & Pramono, Z. D. (2008, March). Human emotion and the uncanny
629 valley: a GLM, MDS, and Isomap analysis of robot video ratings. In *2008 3rd ACM/IEEE*
630 *International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)* (pp. 169-176). IEEE.
631
- 632 Hochgesang, J.A. (2014). Using Design Principles to Consider Representation of the Hand in Some
633 Notation Systems. *Sign Language Studies* 14(4), 488-542. [doi:10.1353/sls.2014.0017](https://doi.org/10.1353/sls.2014.0017).
- 634 Huenerfauth, M., & Kacorri, H. (2016). Eyetracking Metrics Related to Subjective Assessments of
635 ASL Animations. *The Journal on Technology and People with Disabilities*, 69-79.

- 636 Inkpen, K. M., & Sedlins, M. (2011). *Me and my avatar: exploring users' comfort with avatars for*
637 *workplace communication*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the ACM 2011 conference
638 on computer supported cooperative work.
- 639 Israelite, N., Ower, J., & Goldstein, G. (2002). Hard-of-hearing adolescents and identity construction:
640 Influences of school experiences, peers, and teachers. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf*
641 *Education*, 7(2), 134-148.
- 642 Kacorri, H., Huenerfauth, M., Ebling, S., Patel, K., & Willard, M. (2015, October). Demographic and
643 experiential factors influencing acceptance of sign language animation by deaf users. In
644 *Proceedings of the 17th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers &*
645 *Accessibility* (pp. 147-154).
- 646 Kättsyri, J., Förger, K., Mäkäraäinen, M., & Takala, T. (2015). A review of empirical evidence on
647 different uncanny valley hypotheses: Support for perceptual mismatch as one road to the
648 valley of eeriness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 390. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00390
- 649 Kennaway, J. R., Glauert, J. R. W., & Zwitterlood, I. (2007). Providing signed content on the
650 Internet by synthesized animation. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*
651 *(TOCHI)*, 14(3), 15. doi:10.1145/1279700.1279705
- 652 Kipp, M., Nguyen, Q., Heloir, A., & Matthes, S. (2011). *Assessing the deaf user perspective on sign*
653 *language avatars*. Paper presented at The proceedings of the 13th international ACM
654 SIGACCESS conference on Computers and accessibility, Dundee, Scotland, UK.
655 <https://doi.org/10.1145/2049536.2049557>
- 656 Kushalnagar, P., Topolski, T. D., Schick, B., Edwards, T. C., Skalicky, A. M., & Patrick, D. L.
657 (2011). Mode of Communication, Perceived Level of Understanding, and Perceived Quality of
658 Life in Youth Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing. *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf*
659 *Education*, 16(4), 512-523. doi:10.1093/deafed/enr015
- 660 Luey, H. S., Glass, L., & Elliott, H. (1995). Hard-of-hearing or deaf: Issues of ears, language, culture,
661 and identity. *Social Work*, 40(2), 177-182.
- 662 Miller, C. (2001). Section I: Some reflections on the need for a common sign notation. *Sign*
663 *Language & Linguistics*, 4(1-2), 11-28.
- 664 Mitchell, R. E., & Karchmer, M. (2004). Chasing the mythical ten percent: Parental hearing status of
665 deaf and hard of hearing students in the United States. *Sign Language Studies*, 4(2), 138-163.
- 666 Mori, M., Mac Dorman, K. F., & Kageki, N. N. (2012). The uncanny valley [Bukimi no tani]. *IEEE*
667 *Robotics and Automation*, 19(2), 98-100.
- 668 Naert, L., Larboulette, C., & Gibet, S. (2020). A survey on the animation of signing avatars: From
669 sign representation to utterance synthesis. *Computers & Graphics*, 92, 76-98.
670 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cag.2020.09.003>
- 671 Quandt, L., Lamberton, J., Willis, A., Wang, J., Weeks, K., Kubicek, E., & Malzkahn, M. (2020).
672 *Teaching ASL signs using signing avatars and immersive learning in virtual reality*. Paper

- presented at the ASSETS '20: The 22nd International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on
Computers and Accessibility.
- Saby, J. N., Marshall, P. J., Smythe, R., Bouquet, C. A., & Comalli, C. E. (2011). An investigation of
the determinants of motor contagion in preschool children. *Acta Psychologica*, 1-6.
doi:10.1016/j.actpsy.2011.06.008
- Saunders, B., Camgoz, N. C., & Bowden, R. (2020). *Progressive transformers for end-to-end sign
language production*. Paper presented at the European Conference on Computer Vision.
- Shao, Q., Sniffen, A., Blanchet, J., Hillis, M. E., Shi, X., Haris, T. K., ... & Balkcom, D. (2020).
Teaching American Sign Language in Mixed Reality. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive,
Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, 4(4), 1-27.
- Shin, M., Kim, S. J., & Biocca, F. (2019). The uncanny valley: No need for any further judgments
when an avatar looks eerie. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 94, 100-109.
- Stoll, S., Camgoz, N. C., Hadfield, S., & Bowden, R. (2020). Text2Sign: towards sign language
production using neural machine translation and generative adversarial networks. *International
Journal of Computer Vision*, 128(4), 891-908.
- Thompson, J. C., Trafton, J. G., & McKnight, P. (2011). The perception of humanness from the
movements of synthetic agents. *Perception*, 40(6), 695-704.
- White, G., McKay, L., & Pollick, F. (2007). Motion and the uncanny valley. *Journal of Vision*, 7(9),
477-477.
- World Federation of the Deaf & World Association of Sign Language Interpreters. (2018). *WFD and
WASLI Statement on Use of Signing Avatars*. [https://wfdeaf.org/news/resources/wfd-wasli-
statement-use-signing-avatars/](https://wfdeaf.org/news/resources/wfd-wasli-statement-use-signing-avatars/)

698 Figure Captions

699 **Figure 1.** The three signers producing the ASL sign LIBRARY. Top: avatar created using motion
 700 capture (Mocap avatar); middle: avatar created using SigML coding on the JASigning system (CS
 701 avatar); bottom: human signer. For this figure, one still frame was captured every three frames
 702 starting from approximate sign onset.

703 **Figure 2.** Responses across all participants, on agreement that signing avatars could be helpful for
 704 understanding information on a website, communicating information in a public place, or acting as an
 705 interpreter in a face-to-face meeting. The fourth and fifth columns show average responses across all
 706 respondents to whether the respondent would enjoy or expect others to enjoy seeing or interacting
 707 with signing avatars. 1 = strongly disagree - 5 = strongly agree, for all variables. Error bars show
 708 standard deviations.

709 **Figure 3.** Average ratings of Attitudes toward the three Signers, between three Groups. The attitude
 710 rating reflects a respondent's willingness to accept important information from the signer and
 711 willingness to share information with the signer (for details, see Variables). Ratings could range from
 712 1 (negative attitude) to 5 (positive attitude). Error bars show 95% confidence intervals.

713 **Figure 4.** Average ratings of Impressions of the three signers, between three groups. The impression
 714 rating reflects a respondent's overall judgments of the signer's ASL fluency, movement quality, and
 715 expressiveness (for detail, see Variables). Ratings could range from 1 (negative impression) to 5
 716 (positive impression). Error bars show 95% confidence intervals.

717 **Figure 5.** Average ratings of Comprehension of the three Signers between three Groups. The
 718 comprehension rating reflects the degree to which the respondent could understand each of the eight
 719 signs produced by each signer (for detail, see section Variables). Ratings could range from 1 (did not
 720 understand) to 5 (easy to understand). Error bars show 95% confidence intervals.

721 **Figure 6:** Average ratings of Naturalness of the three Signers, between three Groups. The naturalness
 722 rating reflects the degree to which each of the eight signs produced by each signer looked natural (for
 723 detail, see Variables). Ratings could range from 1 (unnatural) to 5 (natural). Error bars show 95%
 724 confidence intervals.

725 **Figure 7.** Average ratings of the Creepiness of the three Signers, between three Groups. The
 726 creepiness rating reflects the degree to which each signer was judged to be "creepy" (for detail, see
 727 Variables). Ratings could range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Error bars show
 728 95% confidence intervals.

729 **Figure 8.** Fluency ratings (self-reported 1 = not at all to 5 = extremely; respondents who reported 1
 730 were excluded) and ratings on Comprehension, Impression, Attitude, and Naturalness, for the three
 731 types of Signers (CS avatar, C; Mocap avatar, M; Human signer, H). Error bars show standard
 732 deviations. Asterix represents a significant effect of Fluency on Comprehension for the CS signer
 733 only.

734

735

736 Tables

	Deaf	Hard-of-hearing	Hearing	F(2,181)	p	eta2
N	83	34	67	-	-	-
Age of ASL acquisition, years. M (SD)	5.74 (6.57)	10.66 (6.34)	17.21 (8.88)	43.72	<.001	.326
Self-reported ASL fluency; 1-5; M (SD)	4.56 (.68)	3.76 (.86)	3.76 (.89)	23.23	<.001	.204
Age; M (SD)	31.25 (10.81)	29.44 (8.25)	28.96 (8.59)	1.23	.294	.01
				χ^2		
Sex count; Male, Female, Other	34, 47, 2	17, 15, 2	15, 50, 2	10.7	.030	-

737 **Table 1.** Participant demographics for three groups and statistical comparisons between groups.

738

Spearman's Correlations

Variable	Age Acq.	Website	Public Place	Face-to-face	Personal Enjoy	Others Enjoy
1. Age Acq.	Spearman's rho	—				
2. Website	Spearman's rho	.065	—			
3. Public Place	Spearman's rho	.030	.408 ***	—		
4. Face-to-face	Spearman's rho	.116	.377 ***	.178 *	—	
5. Personal Enjoy	Spearman's rho	.190 **	.498 ***	.374 ***	.395 ***	—
6. Others Enjoy	Spearman's rho	.170 *	.413 ***	.383 ***	.274 ***	.566 ***

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

739 **Table 2.** Spearman's correlation between Age of Acquisition and overall acceptance of signing
740 avatars.

741

Variable	Age Acq.	CompH	NaturalH	AttitudeH	ImpH	CompM	NaturalM	AttitudeM	ImpM	CompC	NaturalC	AttitudeC	ImpC
1. Age Acq.	—												
2. CompH	-0.20 **	—											
3. NatH	-0.13	0.80 ***	—										
4. AttH	-0.08	0.55 ***	0.57 ***	—									
5. ImpH	-0.23 **	0.69 ***	0.71 ***	0.53 ***	—								
6. CompM	0.07	0.35 ***	0.32 ***	0.28 ***	0.26 ***	—							
7. NatM	0.09	0.09	0.14	0.15 *	0.036	0.71 ***	—						
8. AttM	0.17 *	-0.22 **	-0.12	0.10	-0.16 *	0.40 ***	0.62 ***	—					
9. ImpM	0.03	-0.10	-0.03	0.11	-0.04	0.44 ***	0.65 ***	0.654 ***	—				
10. CompC	0.39 ***	-0.42 ***	-0.37 ***	-0.15 *	-0.40 ***	0.38 ***	0.38 ***	0.502 ***	0.337 ***	—			
11. NatC	0.35 ***	-0.53 ***	-0.43 ***	-0.19 *	-0.45 ***	0.15 *	0.39 ***	0.523 ***	0.387 ***	0.84 ***	—		
12. AttC	0.39 ***	-0.44 ***	-0.36 ***	-0.13	-0.40 ***	0.11	0.39 ***	0.615 ***	0.418 ***	0.65 ***	0.77 ***	—	
13. ImpC	0.33 ***	-0.51 ***	-0.46 ***	-0.20 **	-0.48 ***	0.12	0.34 ***	0.511 ***	0.433 ***	0.77 ***	0.85 ***	0.71 ***	—

Table 3. Correlation between Age of Acquisition and comprehension, naturalness, impression, and attitude ratings for the three signers. Asterisks denote p-value thresholds: * <.05, ** <.01, *** <.001.

Motion capture avatar

Computer synthesized avatar

Live human signer

Figure 2.TIFF

Figure 3.TIFF

Figure 4.TIFF

Figure 5.TIFF

Figure 6.TIFF

Figure 7.TIFF

Figure 8.TIFF