PRESENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

(Witmer & Singer, Vs. 3.0, Nov. 1994)*
Revised by the UQO Cyberpsychology Lab (2004)

Characterize your experience in the environment, by marking an "X" in the appropriate box of the 7-point scale, in accordance with the question content and descriptive labels. Please consider the entire scale when making your responses, as the intermediate levels may apply. Answer the questions independently in the order that they appear. Do not skip questions or return to a previous question to change your answer.

WITH REGARD TO THE EXPERIENCED ENVIRONMENT

1. How m	uch were y	ou able to	control ev	ents?			
NOT AT A	ALL	SO	OMEWHA	 AT	COM	PLETELY	
2. How re	sponsive w	vas the envi	ronment t	o actions tl	nat you ini	tiated (or p	erformed)?
NOT RESPONS	SIVE		ODERAT ESPONSI			PLETELY PONSIVE	
3. How na	atural did y	our interact	tions with	the enviro	nment seer	n?	
EXTREM ARTIFICI		<u> </u> B0	ORDERLI	NE		PLETELY IATURAL	
4. How m	uch did the	e visual asp	ects of the	environm	ent involve	e you?	
NOT AT A	ALL	 SC	 OMEWH <i>A</i>	 AT	COM	 PLETELY	
5. How na		the mechan	ism which	controlled	l movemer	nt through	the
EXTREM:		 B0	ORDERLI	NE		PLETELY	

6. How compelling was your sense of objects moving through space?						
		1 1				
NOT AT ALL	MODERATELY	VERY				
	COMPELLING	COMPELLING				
	riences in the virtual env	ironment seem consistent with your				
real world experiences?						
		1 1				
NOT	MODERATELY	VERY				
CONSISTENT	CONSISTENT	CONSISTENT				
	001(010121(1	0 01 10 10 1 11 1				
	te what would happen ne	ext in response to the actions that				
you performed?						
NOT AT ALL	SOMEWHAT	 COMPLETELY				
NOT AT ALL	SOMEWHAI	COMPLETELT				
9. How completely were voi	able to actively survey	or search the environment using				
vision?						
NOT AT ALL	SOMEWHAT	COMPLETELY				
10. II		- 1 in aid - 4b inter-1 in				
10. How compelling was yo	ur sense of moving arour	nd inside the virtual environment?				
		1				
NOT	MODERATELY	VERY				
COMPELLING	COMPELLING	COMPELLING				
11. How closely were you able to examine objects?						
NOT AT ALL		VEDV				
NOT AT ALL	PRETTY CLOSELY	VERY				
	CLOSELY	CLOSELY				
12. How well could you examine objects from multiple viewpoints?						
12. 110 oli codia jod onu		,				
NOT AT ALL	SOMEWHAT	EXTENSIVELY				

13. How involved were	you in the virtual environm	ent experience?		
NOT	MILDLY	COMPLETELY		
INVOLVED	INVOLVED	ENGROSSED		
14. How much delay did	l you experience between yo	our actions and expected outcomes?		
NO DELAYS	MODERATE	LONG		
	DELAYS	DELAYS		
15. How quickly did you	adjust to the virtual enviro	onment experience?		
NOT AT ALL	SLOWLY	LESS THAN		
		ONE MINUTE		
16. How proficient in m	oving and interacting with t	the virtual environment did you feel	at	
the end of the experience	-			
NOT	REASONABLY	VERY		
PROFICIENT	PROFICIENT	PROFICIENT		
17. How much did the v assigned tasks or require	- · · ·	re or distract you from performing		
NOT AT ALL	INTERFERED	PREVENTED		
	SOMEWHAT	TASK PERFORMANCE		
18. How much did the c with other activities?	ontrol devices interfere with	h the performance of assigned tasks	or	
NOT AT ALL	 INTERFERED	INTERFERED		
NOT AT ALL	SOMEWHAT	GREATLY		
10 11 11				
19. How well could you	concentrate on the assigned	d tasks or required activities rather		
	concentrate on the assigned used to perform those tasks	d tasks or required activities rather or activities?		

IF THE	E VIRTUAL	ENVIRON	MENT IN	CLUDED	SOUNDS:		
20. Ho	ow much did	the auditory	y aspects o	of the enviro	onment invo	olve you?	
NOT A	AT ALL	S	SOMEWH	AT	COMF	PLETELY	
21. Ho	ow well could	d you identi	fy sounds?	?			
		_					
NOT A	AT ALL	S	OMEWH	АТ	COMF	PLETELY	
22. Ho	ow well could	d you locali	ze sounds:	?			
NOT A		_		<u> </u>			
NOT A	AT ALL	۵	OMEWH	AI	COMP	PLETELY	
	E VIRTUAL						TOUCH): using touch?
I	I	1	I	1	I I	1	
NOT A	T ALL		-	SOMEWH	IAT	COMF	PLETELY
24. Ho	ow well could	d you move	or manipu	ılate object	s in the virtu	ıal enviror	nment?
			<u> </u>	_			
NOT A	AT ALL SOM	1EWHAT		EXTE	NSIVELY		

Last version: March 2013

*Original version: Witmer, B.G. & Singer. M.J. (1998). Measuring presence in virtual environments: A presence questionnaire. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 7(3), 225-240. Revised factor structure: Witmer, B.J., Jerome, C.J., & Singer, M.J. (2005). The factor structure of the Presence Questionnaire. *Presence*, 14(3) 298-312.

Questionnaire sur l'État de Présence (QÉP) Laboratoire de Cyberpsychologie de l'UQO

<u>Validation of the French-Canadian version developed by the UQO Cyberpsychology</u> Lab:

- ➤ 101 participants completed the questionnaire following an immersion in a virtual environment;
- ➤ Cronbach's Alpha = .84
- Now 19 items (for VEs without sound/touch) et 24 items (for VEs with sounds/touch)

Scoring:

Total: Items 1 to 19 (reverse items 14, 17, 18)

- « Realism » : Items 3 + 4 + 5 + 6 + 7 + 10 + 13
- « Possibility to act » : Items 1 + 2 + 8 + 9
- « Quality of interface »: Items (all reversed) 14 + 17 + 18
- « Possibility to examine »: Items 11 + 12 + 19
- « Self-evaluation of performance » : Items 15 + 16
- « Sounds* » : Items 20 + 21 + 22
- « Haptic* » : Items 23 + 24

* NOTE: Scoring of « sounds » and « haptic » are not part of the factor analysis of the French version.

Norms (French version):

	Moyenne	Écart type
Total	104.39	18.99
« Realism »	29.45	12.04
« Possibility to act »	20.76	6.01
« Quality of interface »	15.37	5.15
« Possibility to examine»	15.38	4.90
« Auto-évaluation de la performance »	11.00	2.87

Last version: March 2013

^{*}Original version: Witmer, B.G. & Singer. M.J. (1998). Measuring presence in virtual environments: A presence questionnaire. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 7(3), 225-240. The factor structure of the Presence Questionnaire. *Presence*, 14(3) 298-312. Revised factor structure: Witmer, B.J., Jerome, C.J., & Singer, M.J. (2005). The factor structure of the Presence Questionnaire. *Presence*, 14(3) 298-312.