

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

**Physical body experiences questionnaire simplified for active aging (PBE-QAG):  
Validation with Rasch measurement theory**

**Short title:** Rasch validation of the Physical Body Experiences Questionnaire Simplified for Active Aging

Wei Deng<sup>1</sup>, BS; Sydney Carpentier<sup>1</sup>, BA; Ann Van de Winckel<sup>2</sup>, PhD, MSPT, PT

<sup>1</sup>Division of Rehabilitation Science, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Medical School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States of America

<sup>2</sup>Division of Physical Therapy, Division of Rehabilitation Science, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Medical School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States of America

**Corresponding author:**

E-mail: [avandewi@umn.edu](mailto:avandewi@umn.edu) (AVDW)

## 20 **Abstract**

### 21 **Purpose**

22 To validate the Physical body experiences questionnaire simplified for active aging (PBE-QAG) with Rasch  
23 measurement theory. PBE-QAG measures body awareness during physical activity and includes dimensions  
24 of body-mind relationship, body acceptance, and awareness of physical skills and limits.

### 25 **Methods**

26 Adults without pain (n=269), with pain (n=61), with mental health conditions (n=200), and with stroke  
27 (n=36) were recruited at the Minnesota State Fair, Highland Fest, and in the Brain Body Mind Lab  
28 (University of Minnesota) and completed demographic and clinical questionnaires as well as the PBE-QAG.  
29 The PBE-QAG has 12 items, with scores ranging between 0 (totally true) to 4 (totally false). A low total  
30 score on the PBE-QAG reflects better body awareness. We evaluated item and person fit, targeting,  
31 unidimensionality, person separation reliability (PSR), local item dependence (LID), and differential item  
32 functioning (DIF) for demographic and clinical characteristics. We compared with Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA  
33 the person mean location in four groups: Adults with or without mental health conditions; and whether those  
34 groups did body awareness training.

### 35 **Results**

36 Unidimensionality and item fit were obtained after deleting 2 and rescored 5 items. Seven participants did  
37 not fit the model (1.23%). There was minimal floor (5.72%), no ceiling effect (0.00%), and no LID. No DIF  
38 was greater than 0.50 logits for any of the variables. The Wright-corrected PSR was 0.96. The person mean  
39 location was  $-1.71 \pm 1.21$  logits. Adults with mental health conditions who did not practice body awareness

40 had a higher person mean location [Median (IQR)=0.83(0.89) logits,  $p<0.0001$ ] versus the other three  
41 groups, reflecting lower body awareness.

## 42 **Conclusions**

43 PBE-QAG demonstrated good item and person fit, but the targeting is off. Therefore, the current version of  
44 PBE-QAG is not recommended for use in the general population. We encourage further validation of PBE-  
45 QAG in adults with mental health conditions who do not practice body awareness.

46

## 47 **Keywords**

48 Body, Awareness, Healthy Volunteers, Healthy Aging, Mental Health, Stroke, Validation Studies

## 49 **Abbreviations**

50 DIF: Differential Item Functioning

51 LID: Local Item Dependence

52 PBE-QAG: Physical Body Experiences Questionnaire Simplified for Active Aging

53 PCAR: Principal Components Analysis of Residuals

54 PSR: Person Separation Reliability

55 RUMM2030: Rasch Unidimensional Measurement Model 2030 software

## 56 **Introduction**

57 Adults with altered body awareness –such as adults with mental health conditions (i.e., anxiety and  
58 depression), with chronic pain, or with stroke– can improve their physical and mental functioning by  
59 practicing mindfulness or a mind and body approach such as yoga, Tai Chi, or Qigong [1–7]. Such practices  
60 help restore physical and mental health through at least two mechanisms: First, dysfunction in the  
61 autonomic nervous system is closely implicated in the onset and maintenance of disease states, and mind  
62 and body approaches help rebalance this dysfunction [8,9]. Second, these practices improve body awareness  
63 because they require a focused attention on the present moment, on bodily sensations, movements, thoughts,  
64 or feelings, and on stimuli from the environment, with a non-judgmental awareness and with acceptance  
65 [10–13]. When adults are aware of their body in the present moment, they can also more easily notice  
66 physical or mental unease and thus take action to regain a healthier state [13].

67         Body awareness in the context of mind and body approaches is defined as a perceptual  
68 understanding and awareness of (i) proprioception: body position and movement sense and how those body  
69 parts are situated in peripersonal space, (ii) exteroception: visual, tactile, auditory, and pain signals and their  
70 locations within the peripersonal space; and (iii) interoception: internal body states [13–21]. In addition,  
71 yoga training as well as regular physical training have been associated with adults having a more positive  
72 relationship with their body [22,23], and having a more conscious awareness of their physical skills and  
73 limitations [24].

74         Yet, because body awareness is a multidimensional concept, clinicians and researchers need reliable  
75 and valid assessments to measure changes in well-defined aspects of body awareness in their patients or  
76 participants, after they have completed mind and body treatments or a physical activity program. Therefore,  
77 these assessments should measure those relevant aspects of body awareness that adults with mental health  
78 conditions, with pain, or with stroke may have deficiencies in. Furthermore, it is necessary to know what the  
79 “normal scoring ranges” of those aspects of body awareness are, so that clinicians can properly interpret

80 changes or improvements in patient populations.

81 The “Physical Body Experiences Questionnaire simplified for active aging (PBE-QAG)”[25] is a 12-  
82 item scale that was inspired by a previously described instrument [26], but modified, simplified, and adapted  
83 for adults over 65 years of age. This questionnaire covers statements about four dimensions of body  
84 awareness related to physical activity (i.e., body-mind relationship, body acceptance, awareness of physical  
85 skills, and awareness of physical limitations). Those four dimensions were identified in a previously cited  
86 study in older adults with depression [27]. Participants respond to which extent those statements are true for  
87 them, by choosing a response between 1 (totally true) to 5 (totally false), with lower scores representing a  
88 higher level of body awareness.

89 Both Menzel (2010) and Cossu *et al.* (2018) confirmed the existence of the above mentioned four  
90 dimensions through confirmatory factor analysis and reported acceptable to good internal consistency for  
91 each of those domains (Cronbach’s alpha between 0.61-0.83) [25,26]. Cossu *et al.* (2018) further  
92 demonstrated that people who did more than 10 min of physical activity per week had a lower score on the  
93 PBE-QAG, reflecting a higher level of body awareness related to physical activity [25]. While those  
94 analyses give some indication on dimensionality (confirmatory factor analyses), and internal reliability  
95 (Cronbach’s alpha), they are insufficient to encompass the psychometric rigor needed to promote a scale for  
96 use in the clinic or in research. Rasch Measurement Theory transforms an ordinal scale into an interval scale  
97 level of measurement, by accounting for both the participant’s level of ability on the investigated trait and  
98 the relative item difficulty [28,29].

99 Therefore, as a next step in obtaining a more rigorous psychometric analysis of the PBE-QAG, the  
100 aims of this study were to evaluate the structural validity of the PBE-QAG with Rasch Measurement Theory  
101 in (i) healthy adults, to know which score range would be considered ‘normal’ body awareness related to  
102 physical activity; and in (ii) adults with known body awareness deficits, such as adults with mental health  
103 conditions, with pain, or with stroke, to verify whether this scale can accurately measure body awareness  
104 deficits in these populations.

## 105 **Materials and methods**

### 106 **Participants**

107 We recruited adults in the community and adults with chronic stroke between the ages of 18-99 years  
108 through volunteer sampling by means of flyers and website announcements. Additionally, adults signed up  
109 for research by expressing their interest at research booths at the Minnesota State Fair and Highland Fest.  
110 We also reached out per email to a list of healthy volunteers who had contacted the Brain Body Mind Lab  
111 (University of Minnesota) to express their interest in participating in research. We excluded pregnant  
112 women and adults who did not speak English. The study was approved by the University of Minnesota's  
113 Institutional Review Board (IRB# STUDY00005849 and STUDY00000821) and the study was performed  
114 in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

115         The healthy adults at the State Fair and Highland Fest, as well as healthy adults who received an  
116 email, accessed the REDCap questionnaires through a secure REDCap web link. After reading and  
117 providing consent, they were quizzed on the comprehension of the content of the consent form through the  
118 University of California, San Diego Brief Assessment of Capacity to Consent (UBACC) [30]. They then  
119 completed the survey on a tablet (at the State Fair or Highland Fest) or on their own computer. All  
120 information was stored automatically on the secure University of Minnesota REDCap platform. We did not  
121 collect any personal or identifiable information from healthy adults and from any adults signing up for  
122 research at the Minnesota State Fair or Highland Fest. Adults with stroke signed informed consent on paper  
123 and their assessments were collected on paper.

## 124 **Main outcome measures**

125 The survey encompassed questions on general health, which included questions on pain, mental health  
126 conditions, or presence of conditions or diseases, as well as questions about demographics and current  
127 practices of mindfulness, breathing exercises or body awareness training, such as yoga, Qigong, or Pilates.

128 As mentioned in the introduction, the PBE-QAG measures four dimensional factors of body  
129 awareness related to physical activity (i.e., mind-body relationship, body acceptance, awareness of physical  
130 skills, and awareness of physical limits), with a lower total score on the items representing a higher level of  
131 body awareness related to physical activity. In order to perform the Rasch analysis, we reorganized the  
132 scoring categories 1-5 to scoring categories 0-4.

## 133 **Statistical analysis**

134 Rasch Measurement Theory is based on a probabilistic model, which states that a person with higher  
135 ability on a certain trait should have a higher probability of obtaining a better score (in our case, a  
136 better score is a lower score). Rasch analysis transforms an ordinal scale into an interval scale with  
137 the ability of the persons and difficulty of the items represented on the same log-odds ratio (logits)  
138 units. We used Rasch Unidimensional Measurement Model (RUMM) 2030 software (RUMM  
139 Laboratory, Perth, WA, Australia) for the Rasch analysis.

140 To assess structural validity and unidimensionality, we evaluated the presence of disordered  
141 thresholds, item and person fit, person separation reliability (PSR), local item dependence (LID),  
142 differential item functioning (DIF), principal components analysis of residuals (PCAR), and  
143 targeting, the latter which includes floor- and ceiling effect. A scale is considered unidimensional  
144 when all items reflect the same underlying construct. Disorder thresholds of items indicate that the  
145 order of the response categories is not following the logical estimated order of the underlying  
146 construct [31,32]. Individual person- and item-fit statistics are reported as Residuals and Chi-square

147 statistics, with Fit Residuals greater than +2.50 and less than -2.50 indicating item misfit, and item  
148 redundancy, respectively.

149 The PSR is a measure of precision that reflects how well persons can be differentiated into  
150 different levels of low and high ability of the trait in order to serve the clinical or research purpose  
151 [33]. To distinguish different ability levels among persons, this value should be at minimum 0.70 for  
152 group decisions; and over 0.90 in order to make decisions for individuals [28,34,35]. Another  
153 measurement of precision is the mean error variance, reflecting the Root Mean Square standard  
154 Error computed over the persons or over the items [36]. Floor and ceiling effects become  
155 problematic when 15% or more of the sample obtains a minimum or maximum score on the  
156 assessment [37]. Adequate targeting of the assessment is obtained when the average person location  
157 is within a range of -0.50 and 0.50 logits of the average item location [38].

158 DIF evaluates whether the hierarchy of the items of the measurement is preserved across  
159 demographic or clinical factors [39]. A shift greater than 0.50 logits is considered evidence of DIF  
160 [40]. In this study, we evaluated whether the following demographic or clinical parameters would  
161 differentially affect the item structure: sex (female, male, other); age (below 65 or above 65 years of  
162 age); the presence of pain (yes, no); groups (healthy adults, adults with mental health conditions,  
163 adults with pain, adults with stroke); currently having a breathing practice (yes, no); currently doing  
164 relaxation exercises such as mindfulness exercise, meditation or body scan exercises (yes, no); and  
165 currently doing any type of body awareness training such as Tai Chi, Qigong, martial arts, yoga,  
166 dance, etc. (yes, no).

167 PCAR indicates the extent to which variance in the residuals is random. If so, then  
168 unidimensionality is implied because this variance is then explained by the underlying trait, and not  
169 by other underlying traits. PCAR's output of the first contrast will reflect this with an eigenvalue of  
170 less than 2 and with the percent variance explained by this first contrast being less than 10% [41]. If  
171 this is not the case, then unidimensionality can be further tested by performing a series of

172 independent *t*-tests of 2 subtests of items that load respectively positively and negatively  
173 (correlations above and below 0.30) on the first contrast. Multidimensionality is noted when more  
174 than 5% of these *t*-tests are significant [28].

175 Finally, LID occurs when a pair of items shares a greater degree of content with each other than  
176 with other items of the assessment. LID is reported for standardized residual item correlations that  
177 are at least 0.20 above the average residual item correlation.[42] For all analyses, where appropriate,  
178 Bonferroni corrected *p*-values are reported.

## 179 **Results**

### 180 **Demographic and clinical data**

181 We recruited 566 adults among which 269 were healthy adults (age=51±17 years), 200 were adults with  
182 self-reported mental health conditions (age=47±16 years), 61 were adults with self-reported pain  
183 (age=58±14 years), and 36 were adults with chronic stroke resulting in left or right hemiplegia or  
184 hemiparesis of the upper limb (age=58±13 years). Table 1 displays the demographic and clinical data of  
185 each of those groups.

186 **Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristic of participants by group**

	<b>Healthy adults (n=269)</b>	<b>Adults with mental health conditions (n=200)</b>	<b>Adults with pain (n=61)</b>	<b>Adults with chronic stroke (n=36)</b>
Age (years, mean±SD)	50.91±17.01	46.66±16.41	57.72±13.85	58.00±12.93
Gender				
Female	113	52	26	11

Male	155	148	35	25
Other	1	0	0	0
Level of education (years, mean±SD)	5.84±1.77	5.85±1.93	5.89±1.84	5.56±1.66
Ethnicity				
Not Hispanic or Latino	266	196	60	36
Hispanic or Latino	3	4	1	0
Racial background				
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0	1	0
Asian	20	7	3	2
Black/ African American	5	5	1	1
White	234	180	53	30
Multiracial	4	5	1	2
Other	5	3	2	1
Pain	0	47	61	18
Mental health conditions	0	200	0	2
Current breathing exercise	95	100	22	13
Current relaxation exercise	72	87	13	NA
Current body awareness training	82	72	16	13

187 **Legend:** NA = not assessed

## 188 **Rasch Measurement Theory**

189 The iteration analysis table (S1 Table) shows the step-by-step iteration of the Rasch analysis  
 190 performed on the PBE-QAG. Per iteration step, the table displays the number of rating scales  
 191 categories and number of items, person mean location in logits, mean error variance, floor and  
 192 ceiling effect, overall fit, item and person fit, number of items with disordered thresholds, PCAR,

193 and PSR at every iteration step. We provided a Wright-corrected PSR (PSR<sub>w</sub>) because our person  
 194 measures were not well aligned with the item measures and the original calculation of PSR is  
 195 affected by this misalignment.

196 The following iterations were performed: First, five items were rescored to scoring options [0 1  
 197 2 2 3] instead of [0 1 2 3 4] because of reversed thresholds. These five items were: Item 2 "*I avoid*  
 198 *doing things that can expose me to the risk of hurting myself physically*"; item 3 "*I am perfectly*  
 199 *aware of my physical limits*"; item 5 "*I trust that my body can learn new abilities*"; item 7 "*Doing*  
 200 *vigorous physical activity can give me more strength and energy*"; and item 11 "*I do not feel*  
 201 *comfortable pushing my body beyond its physical limits*".

202 Next, item 11 (Fit Residual=6.99;  $p < 0.0001$ ), and item 2 (Fit Residual=6.33;  $p < 0.0001$ ) were  
 203 deleted because of misfit. The misfit of item 11 is consistent with Menzel (2010) and Cossu *et al.*  
 204 (2018)'s findings that this item was not associated with high loadings in their factor analysis. After  
 205 deleting items 11 and 2, item 1 "*I do not feel ashamed of my body at all*" displayed misfit (Fit  
 206 Residual=3.77,  $p = 0.00016$ ), but removing item 1 worsened the targeting ( $-1.89 \pm 1.26$ ) as well as the  
 207 PSR value, which led us to the decision to keep this item in the scale. The resulting overall fit was  
 208  $\chi^2$  (DF)=171.33 (80),  $p < 0.0001$ . Table 2 shows the resulting item location in logits for each item  
 209 after the above steps were completed.

210 **Table 2. Item fit statistics of the Rasch-based PBE-QAG**

Original number	Item Number and Description of Rasch-based PBE-QAG	Item location (logits)	SE	Fit Residuals	<i>p</i> -value
Item 1	1. I do not feel ashamed of my body at all.	-1.15	0.05	3.66	0.0003
Item 4	2. The physical activity I have been doing makes me feel satisfied and proud of myself.	-0.51	0.05	0.52	0.54
Item 9	3. I feel in harmony with my body.	-0.37	0.05	-2.58	0.002


Item 12	4.	I feel that the clarity of my thoughts depends on my physical well-being and my energy.	-0.07	0.06	2.69	0.14
Item 3	5.	I am perfectly aware of my physical limits.	0.15	0.07	2.64	0.02
Item 10	6.	Mastering new physical abilities gives me great satisfaction.	0.27	0.06	-0.17	0.62
Item 8	7.	I feel aware of my physical abilities while respecting my imperfections.	0.28	0.06	-2.65	0.001
Item 5	8.	I trust that my body can learn new abilities.	0.36	0.07	-0.35	0.06
Item 7	9.	Doing vigorous physical activity can give me more strength and energy.	0.48	0.07	-0.01	0.85
Item 6	10.	Feeling in tune with my body makes me think that I am effective and productive.	0.56	0.07	-3.46	0.0003

211 **Legend:** SE = Standard Error

212 Table 3 shows the scoring categories of the Rasch-based BPE-QAG, taking into account the  
 213 revisions proposed by the Rasch analysis.

214 **Table 3.** Revised Rasch-based BPE-QAG

Rasch-based PBE-QAG	Totally true				Totally false	
	0	1	2	3	4	4
1. I do not feel ashamed of my body at all.	0	1	2	3	4	
2. The physical activity I have been doing makes me feel satisfied and proud of myself.	0	1	2	3	4	
3. I feel in harmony with my body.	0	1	2	3	4	
4. I feel that the clarity of my thoughts depends on my physical well-being and my energy.	0	1	2	3	4	
5. I am perfectly aware of my physical limits.	0	1	2	2	3	
6. Mastering new physical abilities gives me	0	1	2	3	4	



215

216 Additionally, we found excellent person fit as only 1.23% (7 participants out of 566) had a misfit  
 217 with a Fit Residual greater than 2.5. The item threshold map (Fig 1) displays the items hierarchy  
 218 from the easiest item on the top to the hardest item on the bottom. There was minimal floor (5.72%)  
 219 and no ceiling effect (0.00%). Reliability expressed through PSRw was high (0.96) with a mean  
 220 standard error of 0.32 logits.

221 **Fig 1. Item threshold map.**

222 The item threshold map shows the item hierarchy in terms of item difficulty, with the easiest item on  
 223 top (original item number 1: *I do not feel ashamed of my body at all*) and the hardest item on the  
 224 bottom (original item number 6: *Feeling in tune with my body makes me think that I am effective and*  
 225 *productive*). The location of the thresholds between the scoring categories are represented on the  
 226 logit scale at the bottom (the horizontal black line). This horizontal black line (interval logit scale)  
 227 also represents the level of body awareness related to physical activity that participants have, with a  
 228 higher score reflecting a lower body awareness level.

229 However, targeting of the person mean location relative to the item mean location was  
 230 problematic: the person mean location was  $-1.71 \pm 1.21$  logits, as is demonstrated in Fig 2. Even  
 231 though Cossu *et al.* (2018) designed the scale for older adults, our Rasch analysis showed that the  
 232 average person location for adults who are 65 years old or older is  $-2.07 \pm 1.29$ , which demonstrates  
 233 that the item difficulty of this scale is not well targeted for this age group. Additionally, the average  
 234 person location for adults under 65 years of age is  $-1.59 \pm 1.15$ , which means that the targeting is off  
 235 for this age group as well.

236 **Fig 2. Person-Item threshold distribution.**

237 The pink histograms represent the frequency of participants at their body awareness ability level from a high  
 238 level of body awareness (lowest logit value on the left side of the scale) to a low level of body awareness  
 239 (highest logit value on the right side of the scale). The frequency of item thresholds is represented at the  
 240 bottom of the figure (diagonal blue stripes histogram) on the same logit scale, organized from easiest items  
 241 (left) to hardest items (right).

242 Furthermore, as can be seen in Table 4, the scoring categories 3 and 4 have the lowest response  
 243 frequencies (i.e., less than 10 responses). This means that adults living in the community do not  
 244 often report having low levels of body awareness related to physical activity.

245 **Table 4.** Frequency of categories

<b>Original</b>	<b>Item Number and Description of the Rasch-</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>number</b>	<b>based PBE-QAG</b>	<b>Totally</b>				<b>Totally</b>
		<b>true</b>				<b>false</b>
Item 1	1. I do not feel ashamed of my body at all	90	172	133	105	34
Item 4	2. The physical activity I have been doing makes me feel satisfied and proud of myself	199	171	98	49	17

Item 9	3. I feel in harmony with my body	140	212	133	42	7
Item 12	4. I feel that the clarity of my thoughts depends on my physical well-being and my energy	240	184	81	24	5
Item 3	5. I am perfectly aware of my physical limits	207	246	77	4	
Item 10	6. Mastering new physical abilities gives me great satisfaction	250	181	83	17	3
Item 8	7. I feel aware of my physical abilities while respecting my imperfections	215	214	83	19	3
Item 5	8. I trust that my body can learn new abilities	263	186	81	4	
Item 7	9. Doing vigorous physical activity can give me more strength and energy	308	165	57	4	
Item 6	10. Feeling in tune with my body makes me think that I'm effective and productive	297	180	45	9	3

246

247 There was no DIF greater than 0.50 logits for any of the variables. The PCAR analysis  
 248 demonstrated an eigenvalue of the first contrast of 1.78 but the percent variance was 17.82%, which  
 249 indicates there could be more than one dimension in this scale. Thus, there are subsets of items  
 250 representing different aspects or dimensions of body awareness. The item subset with positive  
 251 principal component loadings on the first contrast were items 5, 6, 7, and 10, likely reflecting a  
 252 dimension of “awareness of physical skills”. The item subset with negative principal component  
 253 loadings on the first contrast were items 1, 8 and 9, likely reflecting a dimension of “body  
 254 acceptance”. The independent *t*-tests between the two subtests showed that only 3.94% of the  
 255 independent *t*-tests were significant, thereby supporting the unidimensionality of the PBE-QAG.

256 There was no consequential LID as there were no standardized residual item correlations of at  
257 least 0.20 above the average residual item correlation ( $r=0.10$ ).

258 Interestingly, we observed that 12 of the 26 adults with person measures above 0 logits had  
259 mental health conditions, such as anxiety, depression, or bipolar disorder. This led us to look at the  
260 person-item threshold distribution per group (Fig 3).

261 **Fig 3. Person-Item threshold distribution per group.**

262 The pink histograms represent the frequency of the participants' body awareness level (high body awareness  
263 level to low body awareness level, from left to right). The histograms at the top are organized per group, i.e.,  
264 healthy adults (blue), adults with mental health conditions (red), adults with pain (green), and adults with  
265 stroke (purple). The frequency of item thresholds is represented at the bottom of the figure (diagonal blue  
266 stripes histogram) on the same logit scale, organized from easiest items (left) to hardest items (right).

267 Based on prior evidence of beneficial effects of body awareness training on mental health  
268 conditions,[43,44] we did a Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA test, to examine the impact on average person  
269 measures on four specific groups: healthy adults with and without currently performing body  
270 awareness training; and adults with mental health conditions with and without currently performing  
271 body awareness training. The result showed that adults with mental health conditions who are not  
272 doing any body awareness training have a significantly higher average person measure location  
273 (Median (IQR)=0.83(0.89) logits,  $p<0.0001$ ) compared to the other three groups (Fig 4).

274 **Fig 4. Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA for four groups divisions.**

275 HNB: healthy adults who are not doing any body awareness training. HYB: healthy adults who are doing  
276 body awareness training. MNB: adults with mental health conditions who are not doing any body awareness  
277 training. MYB: adults with mental health conditions who are doing body awareness training.

## 278 **Discussion**

279 The present study demonstrates a Rasch-based validation of the PBE-QAG scale, which measures body  
280 awareness during physical activity. In relation to our aims, i.e., to evaluate the structural validity of the  
281 PBE-QAG with Rasch Measurement Theory in (i) healthy adults, to know which score range would be  
282 considered ‘normal’ body awareness related to physical activity; and in (ii) adults with known body  
283 awareness deficits, such as adults with mental health conditions, with pain, or with stroke, to verify whether  
284 this scale can accurately measure body awareness deficits in these populations, we present our two main  
285 findings below.

286 First, even though the Rasch validation reported a good item and person fit, the targeting is off for  
287 the adults recruited in our study. The average person location is  $-1.71 \pm 1.21$ , which means that participants in  
288 our study have a higher body awareness level than the PBE-QAG scale is designed to target. This means  
289 that adults living in the community would thus need a scale with more difficult items so that we can more  
290 accurately measure their level of body awareness related to physical activity. Therefore, the current form of  
291 the scale is not recommended for use in adults living in the community. Furthermore, the targeting of the  
292 scale would need to be solved before interpretations can be made about what a ‘normal scoring range’ of  
293 body awareness related to physical activity represents in healthy adults.

294 Because the targeting was off, we were also not able to clearly distinguish healthy adults from adults  
295 with pain or with stroke. Yet, we were able to demonstrate that adults with mental health conditions who do  
296 not perform body awareness training have a significantly higher average person measure location on the  
297 PBE-QAG than the adults who perform body awareness training or those who did not have mental health  
298 conditions. This leads us to presume that the current Rasch-based version of the scale might be more suited  
299 for adults with mental health conditions who are not currently training body awareness. Further validation of  
300 the scale will demonstrate if targeting can be achieved in this specific group. If so, this scale could then be  
301 used to evaluate changes in body awareness in adults with mental health conditions, after interventions that

302 are known to improve body awareness, such as specific physical exercises or mind and body practices.

## 303 **Study limitations**

304 Although we obtained a large sample size overall, our sample size of adults with stroke and adults with pain  
305 were smaller. Therefore, once items have been added to improve the targeting of the scale, a new Rasch  
306 validation in a larger sample of adults with stroke and adults with pain would be needed to ascertain the  
307 targeting and structural validity of the PBE-QAG in adults with stroke or pain.

## 308 **Conclusions**

309 The Rasch-based PBE-QAG demonstrates good item and person fit, but the targeting is off. Adding items  
310 that target more complex aspects of body awareness related to physical activity might be needed before a  
311 new Rasch validation can be performed (i) to test whether the PBE-QAG is able to produce adequate  
312 targeting in people living in the community and (ii) to establish what a ‘normal range’ would represent in  
313 healthy adults. Based on our finding in our large sample size, we suggest that the current version of the  
314 Rasch-based PBE-QAG might be better suited for adults with mental health conditions who are not doing  
315 any body awareness training, but this needs to be validated with future studies.

## 316 **Funding**

317 AVDW’s research was supported by the National Institutes of Health’s National Center for Advancing  
318 Translational Sciences, grant UL1TR002494. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does  
319 not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health’s National Center for  
320 Advancing Translational Sciences. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis,  
321 decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

## 322 **Acknowledgments**

323 The authors thank all participants as well as the volunteers who assisted the principal investigator (AVDW)  
324 at the Minnesota State Fair and at Highland Fest.

## 325 **References**

- 326 1. Danielsson L, Rosberg S. Opening toward life: experiences of basic body awareness therapy in persons  
327 with major depression. *Int J Qual Stud Health Well-being*. 2015;10: 27069.
- 328 2. Schmid AA, Miller KK, Van Puymbroeck M, DeBaun-Sprague E. Yoga leads to multiple physical  
329 improvements after stroke, a pilot study. *Complement Ther Med*. 2014;22: 994–1000.
- 330 3. Lindvall MA, Anderzén Carlsson A, Forsberg A. Basic Body Awareness Therapy for patients with  
331 stroke: Experiences among participating patients and physiotherapists. *J Bodyw Mov Ther*. 2016;20:  
332 83–89.
- 333 4. Henriksson J, Wasara E, Rönnlund M. Effects of Eight-Week-Web-Based Mindfulness Training on  
334 Pain Intensity, Pain Acceptance, and Life Satisfaction in Individuals With Chronic Pain. *Psychol Rep*.  
335 2016;119: 586–607.
- 336 5. Dunleavy K, Kava K, Goldberg A, Malek MH, Talley SA, Tutag-Lehr V, et al. Comparative  
337 effectiveness of Pilates and yoga group exercise interventions for chronic mechanical neck pain: quasi-  
338 randomised parallel controlled study. *Physiotherapy*. 2016;102: 236–242.
- 339 6. Cramer H, Lauche R, Daubenmier J, Mehling W, Büssing A, Saha FJ, et al. Being aware of the painful  
340 body: Validation of the German Body Awareness Questionnaire and Body Responsiveness  
341 Questionnaire in patients with chronic pain. *PLoS One*. 2018;13: e0193000.
- 342 7. Chen C-H, Hung K-S, Chung Y-C, Yeh M-L. Mind–body interactive qigong improves physical and  
343 mental aspects of quality of life in inpatients with stroke: A randomized control study. *Eur J*  
344 *Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2019;18: 658–666.
- 345 8. Streeter CC, Gerbarg PL, Saper RB, Ciraulo DA, Brown RP. Effects of yoga on the autonomic nervous

- 346 system, gamma-aminobutyric-acid, and allostasis in epilepsy, depression, and post-traumatic stress  
347 disorder. *Med Hypotheses*. 2012;78: 571–579.
- 348 9. Ali N, Nater UM. Salivary Alpha-Amylase as a Biomarker of Stress in Behavioral Medicine. *Int J*  
349 *Behav Med*. 2020;27: 337–342.
- 350 10. Cebolla A, Miragall M, Palomo P, Llorens R, Soler J, Demarzo M, et al. Embodiment and body  
351 awareness in meditators. *Mindfulness* . 2016;7: 1297–1305.
- 352 11. Bishop SR, Lau M, Shapiro S, Carlson L, Anderson ND, Carmody J, et al. Mindfulness: A proposed  
353 operational definition. *Clinical psychology: Science and practice*. 2004;11: 230–241.
- 354 12. Fischer D, Messner M, Pollatos O. Improvement of Interoceptive Processes after an 8-Week Body  
355 Scan Intervention. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2017;11: 452.
- 356 13. Mehling WE, Wrubel J, Daubenmier JJ, Price CJ, Kerr CE, Silow T, et al. Body Awareness: a  
357 phenomenological inquiry into the common ground of mind-body therapies. *Philos Ethics Humanit*  
358 *Med*. 2011;6: 6.
- 359 14. Van de Winckel A, De Patre D, Rigoni M, Fiecas M, Hendrickson TJ, Larson M, et al. Exploratory  
360 study of how Cognitive Multisensory Rehabilitation restores parietal operculum connectivity and  
361 improves upper limb movements in chronic stroke. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10: 20278.
- 362 15. Garfinkel SN, Manassei MF, Hamilton-Fletcher G, In den Bosch Y, Critchley HD, Engels M.  
363 Interoceptive dimensions across cardiac and respiratory axes. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*.  
364 2016;371. doi:10.1098/rstb.2016.0014
- 365 16. Park H-D, Blanke O. Coupling Inner and Outer Body for Self-Consciousness. *Trends Cogn Sci*.  
366 2019;23: 377–388.

- 367 17. Daprati E, Sirigu A, Nico D. Body and movement: consciousness in the parietal lobes.  
368 *Neuropsychologia*. 2010;48: 756–762.
- 369 18. Dijkerman HC, de Haan EH. Somatosensory processes subserving perception and action. *Behav Brain*  
370 *Sci*. 2007;30: 189–201; discussion 201–39.
- 371 19. Gibson J. Mindfulness, Interoception, and the Body: A Contemporary Perspective. *Front Psychol*.  
372 2019;10: 2012.
- 373 20. Khalsa SS, Adolphs R, Cameron OG, Critchley HD, Davenport PW, Feinstein JS, et al. Interoception  
374 and Mental Health: A Roadmap. *Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging*. 2018;3: 501–513.
- 375 21. Young KS, van der Velden AM, Craske MG, Pallesen KJ, Fjorback L, Roepstorff A, et al. The impact  
376 of mindfulness-based interventions on brain activity: A systematic review of functional magnetic  
377 resonance imaging studies. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 2018;84: 424–433.
- 378 22. Mahlo L, Tiggemann M. Yoga and positive body image: A test of the Embodiment Model. *Body*  
379 *Image*. 2016;18: 135–142.
- 380 23. Alleva JM, Tylka TL, van Oorsouw K, Montanaro E, Perey I, Bolle C, et al. The effects of yoga on  
381 functionality appreciation and additional facets of positive body image. *Body Image*. 2020;34: 184–  
382 195.
- 383 24. Gammage KL, Drouin B, Lamarche L. Comparing a Yoga Class with a Resistance Exercise Class:  
384 Effects on Body Satisfaction and Social Physique Anxiety in University Women. *J Phys Act Health*.  
385 2016;13: 1202–1209.
- 386 25. Cossu G, Loi E, Carta MG, Bramanti A. The Physical Body Experiences Questionnaire Simplified for  
387 Active Aging (PBE-QAG). *Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health*. 2018;14: 70–77.

- 388 26. Menzel JE. The Psychometric Validation of the Physical Body Experiences Questionnaire. University  
389 of South Florida. 2010. Available: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/1710/>
- 390 27. Mura G, Carta MG. Physical activity in depressed elderly. A systematic review. *Clin Pract Epidemiol*  
391 *Ment Health*. 2013;9: 125–135.
- 392 28. Tennant A, Conaghan PG. The Rasch measurement model in rheumatology: what is it and why use it?  
393 When should it be applied, and what should one look for in a Rasch paper? *Arthritis Rheum*. 2007;57:  
394 1358–1362.
- 395 29. Van de Winckel A, Gauthier L. A Revised Motor Activity Log Following Rasch Validation (Rasch-  
396 Based MAL-18) and Consensus Methods in Chronic Stroke and Multiple Sclerosis. *Neurorehabil*  
397 *Neural Repair*. 2019; 1545968319868717.
- 398 30. Jeste DV, Palmer BW, Appelbaum PS, Golshan S, Glorioso D, Dunn LB, et al. A new brief instrument  
399 for assessing decisional capacity for clinical research. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2007;64: 966–974.
- 400 31. Pallant JF, Tennant A. An introduction to the Rasch measurement model: an example using the  
401 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS). *Br J Clin Psychol*. 2007;46: 1–18.
- 402 32. Robinson M, Johnson AM, Walton DM, MacDermid JC. A comparison of the polytomous Rasch  
403 analysis output of RUMM2030 and R (ltm/eRm/TAM/lordif). *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2019;19: 36.
- 404 33. Reliability and separation of measures. [cited 30 Jan 2021]. Available:  
405 <https://www.winsteps.com/winman/reliability.htm>
- 406 34. Mallinson T, Schepens Niemiec SL, Carlson M, Leland N, Vigen C, Blanchard J, et al. Development  
407 and validation of the activity significance personal evaluation (ASPEn) scale. *Australian Occupational*  
408 *Therapy Journal*. 2014. pp. 384–393. doi:10.1111/1440-1630.12155


- 409 35. Kerlinger FN, Lee HB. Foundations of behavioral research 4th ed. Holt, NY. 2000.
- 410 36. Table 3.1 Summaries of persons and items. [cited 30 May 2021]. Available:  
411 [https://www.winsteps.com/winman/table3\\_1.htm](https://www.winsteps.com/winman/table3_1.htm)
- 412 37. McHorney CA, Tarlov AR. Individual-patient monitoring in clinical practice: are available health  
413 status surveys adequate? *Qual Life Res.* 1995;4: 293–307.
- 414 38. Displacement measures. [cited 30 Jan 2021]. Available:  
415 <https://www.winsteps.com/winman/displacement.htm>
- 416 39. Uddin MN, Amirul Islam FM. Psychometric evaluation of an interview-administered version of the  
417 WHOQOL-BREF questionnaire for use in a cross-sectional study of a rural district in Bangladesh: an  
418 application of Rasch analysis. *BMC Health Services Research.* 2019. doi:10.1186/s12913-019-4026-0
- 419 40. Tristán A. An adjustment for sample size in DIF analysis. [cited 30 Jan 2021]. Available:  
420 <http://www.rasch.org/rmt/rmt203e.htm>
- 421 41. Smith EV Jr. Detecting and evaluating the impact of multidimensionality using item fit statistics and  
422 principal component analysis of residuals. *J Appl Meas.* 2002;3: 205–231.
- 423 42. Christensen KB, Makransky G, Horton M. Critical Values for Yen’s Q3: Identification of Local  
424 Dependence in the Rasch Model Using Residual Correlations. *Appl Psychol Meas.* 2017;41: 178–194.
- 425 43. Price CJ, Hooven C. Interoceptive Awareness Skills for Emotion Regulation: Theory and Approach of  
426 Mindful Awareness in Body-Oriented Therapy (MABT). *Front Psychol.* 2018;9: 798.
- 427 44. Xu A, Zimmerman CS, Lazar SW, Ma Y, Kerr CE, Yeung A. Distinct Insular Functional Connectivity  
428 Changes Related to Mood and Fatigue Improvements in Major Depressive Disorder Following Tai Chi  
429 Training: A Pilot Study. *Front Integr Neurosci.* 2020;14: 25.

430 **Supporting information**


431 **S1 Table. Iterations analysis table of the PBE-QAG.** DF=Degrees of Freedom; PCAR=Principal

432 Components Analysis of Residuals; PSR=Person Separation Reliability; PSRw=Wright corrected PSR;


433 RMSE=Root Mean Square Error (reflected as Mean Error Variance in RUMM2030)



# Person-Item Threshold Distribution



## Person-Item Threshold Distribution



Groups

