



---

## **Mixed Reality Experience Questionnaire (MREQ)—Reference**

Holger Regenbrecht

Cristina Botella

Rosa Baños

Thomas Schubert

---

**The Information Science  
Discussion Paper Series**

Number 2017/01

February 2017

ISSN 1177-455X

## University of Otago

### Department of Information Science

The Department of Information Science is one of six departments that make up the Otago Business School at the University of Otago. The department offers courses of study leading to a major in Information Science within the BCom, BA and BSc degrees. In addition to undergraduate teaching, the department is also strongly involved in postgraduate research programmes leading to MCom, MA, MSc and PhD degrees. Research projects in autonomous systems, data science, human computer interaction, information systems and software engineering, and intelligent computing and networking are particularly well supported.

The views expressed in this paper are not necessarily those of the department as a whole. The accuracy of the information presented in this paper is the sole responsibility of the authors.

### Copyright

Copyright remains with the authors. Permission to copy for research or teaching purposes is granted on the condition that the authors and the Series are given due acknowledgment. Reproduction in any form for purposes other than research or teaching is forbidden unless prior written permission has been obtained from the authors.

### Correspondence

This paper represents work to date and may not necessarily form the basis for the authors' final conclusions relating to this topic. It is likely, however, that the paper will appear in some form in a journal or in conference proceedings in the near future. The authors would be pleased to receive correspondence in connection with any of the issues raised in this paper, or for subsequent publication details. Please write directly to the authors at the address provided below, or via the email address in the paper (if provided). Details of final journal/conference publication venues for these papers are also provided on the Department's publications web pages: <http://www.otago.ac.nz/informationscience/publications/>. Any other correspondence concerning the Series should be sent to the DPS Coordinator.

Department of Information Science  
University of Otago  
P O Box 56  
Dunedin  
NEW ZEALAND

Fax: +64 3 479 8311  
email: [infoscience.dps@otago.ac.nz](mailto:infoscience.dps@otago.ac.nz)  
www: <http://www.otago.ac.nz/informationscience/>

# Mixed Reality Experience Questionnaire (MREQ) - Reference

**H. Regenbrecht**  
University of Otago  
New Zealand  
holger.regenbrecht@otago.ac.nz

**Cristina Botella**  
Universitat Jaume I de  
Castelló  
Spain  
botella@uji.es

**Rosa M Baños**  
University of  
Valencia  
Spain  
rosa.banos@uv.es

**Thomas Schubert**  
University of Oslo  
Norway  
thomas.wolfgang.schubert@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

The Mixed Reality Experience Questionnaire (MREQ) is designed to be used as a measure of a user's sense of presence and their general experienced perception of an Augmented Reality, Virtual Reality, or Augmented Virtuality environment. It consists of 33 seven-point-Likert-like items. Researchers might want to apply all or only some of those items.


This Technical Report serves as a reference. Researchers who use this MREQ are asked to send their findings and/or publications to the first author and to cite this Technical Report.

## Author Keywords

Sense of Presence, Mixed Reality, Augmented Reality, Questionnaire

## MIXED REALITY ENVIRONMENT: ELEMENTS

Figure 1 shows the relationships in a typical Mixed Reality environment. Those relationships form the basis for the MREQ.



**Figure 1. Overview of Relationships between User and MR Elements**

## Technical Report


Information Science, HCI  
University of Otago  
P.O. Box 56  
9054 Dunedin  
New Zealand

Contact: holger.regenbrecht@otago.ac.nz

## QUESTIONNAIRE CONSTRUCTION

The following table presents the list of all items which can be used in measuring the MR experience. We list primary and secondary (alternative) items to be applied in different scenarios and tasks.

All items have “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree” as anchors ranging from 1 to 7. No other qualifying information is given (e.g. no middle anchor text) (Likert-like scale) See figure 2 for an example.



**Figure 2. MREQ example item**

Items in square brackets in Table 1 can either be used as is or can be replaced by the actual name of the virtual object(s). E.g. “The cups belonged to the virtual environment.” Similar for all other texts in square brackets.

All or selected only items can be used (Table 1).

## Additional notes:

In collaborative MR environments [agents] would normally refer to other people present in the environment. Those might be real people present in the real environment (co-located) or more or less realistic visualisations (e.g. blue-c voxelized) or embedded video streams (like in cAR/PE! Regenbrecht (2004). [virtually presented agents] refers to avatars in different shapes and forms, like e.g. in SecondLife. Also, [agents] might be manually, automatically or AI-controlled animals or other creatures.

Virtual Environments within the real environment are for instance worlds-in-miniature (e.g. MagicBook worlds). Some users might also consider groups of virtual objects as belonging to one virtual environment (which often, in fact they are).

Some MR environments, e.g. clinical applications, require special, alternative items. This can be existing or modified versions of the MREQ or other questionnaires. Preferably one should try to modify MREQ questions.

**Table 1: MREQ questionnaire items**

No	Relation	Item(s)
1	P(RE)	There was a real world environment.
2	P(VE)	There was a virtual environment.
3	P(RO)	There were real objects.
4	P(VO)	There were virtual objects.
5	P(RA)	There were other (real) [agents].
6	P(VA)	There were virtual representations of other [agents].
7	P(Usr)	I could recognize myself in the environment.
8	Usr-VE	I felt I was part of the [virtual environment].
9	Usr-RE	I felt I was part of the [real environment].
10	Usr-RO	The [real objects] and I were in the same environment. (I felt I could have touched the [real objects])
11	Usr-VO	The [virtual objects] and I were in the same environment. (I felt I could have touched the [virtual objects])
12	Usr-RA	[Other agents] and I were in the same room.
13	Usr-VA	The [other virtually presented agents] and I were in the same environment.
14	VO-VE	The [virtual objects] belonged to the [virtual environment].
15	VO-RE	The [virtual objects] belonged to the [real environment].
16	VO-RO	I could not distinguish between [real objects] and [virtual objects].
17	VO-VO	The [virtual objects] were part of the same space.
18	VO-RA	[Agents] in the environment were in the same space as the [virtual objects]
19	VO-VA	Virtual [agents] were in the same space as the [virtual objects]
20	VE-RO	The [real objects] belonged to the [virtual environment].
21	VE-RA	The [agents] belonged to the virtual environment.
22	VE-VA	The virtually presented [agents] belonged to the [virtual environment].
23	VE-RE	[Virtual and real environments] formed one, common space.
24	VE-VE	The virtual environments presented belonged to each other.
25	RE-RO	The [real objects] belonged to the [real environment].
26	RE-RA	The [agents] were in the real environment.
27	RE-VA	The [virtually presented agents] belonged to the real environment.
28	RO-RO	The [real objects] belonged to each other
29	RO-RA	The [agents] and [real objects] were in the same environment. (The [agents] could have touched the real objects.)
30	RO-VA	The [virtually presented agents] and [real objects] were in the same environment. (The [virtually presented agents] could have touched the real objects.)
31	RA-RA	The [other agents] could have communicated with each other.
32	RA-VA	The [other agents] could have communicated with the [virtually presented ones].
33	VA-VA	The [other virtually presented agents] could have communicated with each other.

End of Technical Report.