Full title: Preliminary Rasch analysis of the Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness in adults with stroke

Short title: Rasch analysis: Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness

Jena Blackwood[1]; Sydney Carpentier[1]; Wei Deng [1]; Ann Van de Winckel[2*]

[1] Division of Rehabilitation Science, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Medical School, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States of America

[2] 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

avandewi@umn.edu

Abstract

Purpose

The Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness (MAIA) measures interoceptive body awareness, which includes aspects such as attention regulation, self-regulation, and body listening. Our purpose was to validate the MAIA in adults with stroke using Rasch Measurement Theory.

Methods

The original MAIA has 32 items grouped into 8 separately scored subscales that measure aspects of body awareness. Using Rasch Measurement Theory we evaluated the unidimensionality of the entire scale and investigated person and item fit, person separation reliability, targeting, local item dependence, and principal components analysis of residuals.

Results

Forty-one adults with chronic stroke (average 3.8 years post-stroke, 13 women, average age 57±13 years) participated in the study. Overall fit (χ^2=62.26, p=0.26) and item fit were obtained after deleting 3 items and rescoring 26 items. One participant did not fit the model (2.44%). There were no floor (0.00%) or ceiling effects (0.00%). Local item dependence was found in 42 pairs. The person separation reliability was 0.91, and the person mean location was 0.06±1.12 logits.

Conclusions

The MAIA demonstrated good targeting and reliability, as well as good item and person fit in adults with chronic stroke. A study with a larger sample size is needed to validate our findings.

Keywords: stroke, body awareness, interoception, validation studies, Rasch analysis

Introduction

Interoception is a multifaceted construct that has inspired investigation and debate among numerous clinical professions since the early 20th century [1–3]. Charles Sherrington (1906) was the first to describe internal visceral physical processes as interoceptive, and external processing including processing pain, temperature, light, sound, and smell, as exteroceptive [3–6]. Since then, interoception has been recognized as a complex interplay of major biological systems that can broadly be defined as the conscious or unconscious process of perceiving, interpreting, integrating, and managing bodily signals such as pain and autonomic sensory information [1–3,6–9].

Therefore, the proposed taxonomy of interoceptive terms has expanded to encompass the multiple facets of interoception such as interoceptive accuracy (e.g., heartbeat detection accuracy), and self-reported interoceptive body awareness or interoceptive sensibility, which is self-reported sensory awareness in response to "physiological states, processes (including pain and emotion), and actions (including movement)" [1,5,6,10,11].

Historically, increased body awareness and focus on internal sensations were associated with hypochondria, catastrophizing, and maladaptive coping strategies [6,7]. Contemporary advocates of mind-body training and therapies promote mindful body awareness –a non-judgmental conscious moment-to-moment presence coupled with acceptance of information from the body– as beneficial to overall physical, mental, and emotional health and function [6,7,12–14].

The growing popularity of body awareness training practices such as yoga, Tai Chi, and Qigong in Western culture, coupled with a therapeutic interest in body awareness training and

mindfulness practices, such as meditation and mindfulness-based stress reduction, has spurred investigations into the benefits of body awareness training and mindfulness practices across diverse clinical populations [7,10,12,15,16].

In persons with stroke, higher levels of body awareness have been associated with increased independence in performing activities of daily living, improved balance, and decreased fall risk [17]. In adults with stroke, yoga may be beneficial in regaining function and improving mental health, upper extremity strength, ambulation, balance, and achieving a greater connection and body acceptance [18–21]. Tai Chi has been shown to improve dual-task performance and reduce fall risk in individuals with stroke, while Qigong has shown reductions in cognitive decline [22–26].

Worldwide, approximately 15 million people suffer a stroke each year. Roughly, half are left with permanent disabilities impeding upper limb use in daily activities, balance, and ambulation as well as influencing mental health and coping strategies [27–35]. As part of the ongoing body of research, it is essential to use outcome measures that support accurate assessment of body awareness, especially when body awareness is assessed in studies with interventions aimed at training body awareness in this population.

Self-detection of interoceptive body awareness is commonly measured by self-report questionnaires, and a variety of them have been used to investigate changes in participants' responses to body awareness training interventions [6,7,36]. In 2009, Mehling *et al.* explored the construct of body awareness and self-report measures available at that time and reported that the available measures were unable to differentiate between "non-judgmental, meditative, mindful awareness of body sensations" and "anxiety-related hyper-vigilance toward body sensations" [7].

At that time, Mehling *et al.* (2012) adopted an operational definition of body awareness as an iterative process encompassing sensory awareness stemming from physiological states including pain, emotion, and movement and includes cognitive appraisal shaped by attitudes, culture, and individual belief systems [6]. Moreover, "dimensions of critical importance" were created to assist in recognizing the multifaceted nature of the construct's modern understanding [6].

Subsequently, in 2012, Mehling *et al.* developed the MAIA as a subjective measure of body awareness through an extensive mixed-methods process including focus group development of new scale items to fit the defined construct. Items were then field-tested with expert and novice mind-body practitioners [6,7,15].

The MAIA is a 32-item self-report instrument consisting of eight subscales spanning 5 overall dimensions and 13 subdimensions of interoceptive body awareness. More details on these dimensions and subdimensions can be found in Mehling *et al.* (2012) [6]. Items are scored on a Likert scale between 0 = Never to 5 = Always with unlabeled interim integers. Each of the 8 subscales is scored separately by averaging the items belonging to the respective subscale. A higher score on each subscale indicates "more positive body awareness", and though the Not-Distracting and Not-Worrying scales contain reverse-scored items, the higher scores reflect less worrying and less distraction when faced with discomfort [6,37]. In its original version, a total MAIA score is not calculated [6,38,39].

The MAIA was intended to differentiate between experienced and inexperienced mind-body practitioners, to measure changes in participants' outcomes after mind-body therapies, and to "differentiate between anxiety-driven hypervigilance and mindful attention styles" [6,11,40]. As such, the MAIA has been heavily utilized for body awareness training measurement in varied

populations, but to the best of the authors' knowledge, it has been used in only one previous observational study with adults with stroke [35,39]. At the time of publication, it has been translated into over 24 languages [41].

Internal consistency, correlations with related construct measures and between subscales, and confirmatory factor analysis were performed on the MAIA during its initial publication [6]. Mehling *et al.* (2012) originally demonstrated that most MAIA subscales had moderate to strong correlations with each other, but the "Not Distracting" and "Not Worrying" subscales showed only small to moderate correlations to the other subscales [6,39]. The internal consistency, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, was below 0.70 for the subscales "Noticing", "Not-Distracting", and "Not-Worrying" and was confirmed in some subsequent studies. The other subscales ranged from 0.79 to 0.87 [6,37,42–54]. The confirmatory factor analysis confirmed the multidimensionality of the scale [6].

Other researchers have since discarded the negatively worded items, changed the phrasing to positively worded sentences, or made other changes to the scale to improve the factor loading of the scale during some of the translations and validation studies [43–45,48,51,54–56]. Ferenzti *et al.* (2020) found that all the MAIA items measured "a general interoceptive awareness factor" with confirmatory factor analysis, but this general factor did not correlate with the subscales "Not-Distracting" and "Not-Worrying" [39].

Rasch Measurement Theory (RMT) can be used to assess the unidimensionality and the structural validity of a scale. RMT is a probabilistic model stating persons with a higher interoceptive body awareness would have a higher probability of obtaining a higher score on the items. RMT can therefore be used to verify whether the items fit the probabilistic mathematical Rasch model. With this analysis, the scale is transformed from an ordinal to an interval

measurement which improves instrument precision [57–63]. Structural validity and unidimensionality are evaluated through the overall fit of the scale, the item and person fit, threshold order of scoring categories within each item, person separation reliability (PSR), targeting, floor and ceiling effects, mean error variance, principal components analysis of residuals (PCAR), and local item dependence (LID) with residual correlations [59,60].

The aim of this study was to perform a Rasch analysis of the MAIA to evaluate its structural validity in adults with stroke and to assess its unidimensionality. To the best of our knowledge, the MAIA has not been validated with RMT before. Therefore, we performed a Rasch analysis to assess the structural validity of the MAIA in individuals with stroke for use in future research and clinical applications with this population.

Methods

Participants

Potential participants contacted the Brain Body Mind Lab members after seeing the study flier on the University Campus and in clinics, or through postings on the university websites. We included adults between 18-99 years of age who had an ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke and were medically stable, English speaking, and able to consent. We excluded participants with cognitive impairments (Mini-mental State Exam-brief version, <13/16), contractures in the upper extremity that would hinder testing arm movements, severe aphasia or apraxia, or other medical conditions that would preclude participation in the study. The study was approved by the University of Minnesota's Internal Review Board (IRB#STUDY00000821). The study was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants signed informed consent on paper and filled out the MAIA on paper.

Data Collection

We collected information on age, the hemispheric side of the stroke, time after stroke, and whether the stroke was ischemic or hemorrhagic. We assessed pain with the Numeric Pain Rating Scale (NPRS), depression with the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ- 9), and stroke-related neurologic deficit with the NIH stroke scale (NIHSS) [64–66]. Participants also indicated if they had taken part in any breathing exercises in the past if they were currently participating in breathing exercises regularly, and if they had past body awareness training experiences such as dance, martial arts, Tai Chi, Qigong, yoga, Pilates, or other body awareness training.

Statistical Analysis

Rasch analysis was performed using the Rasch Unidimensional Measurement Model (RUMM) 2030 software (RUMM Laboratory, Perth, WA) using a partial credit model and rating scale polytomous model to analyze overall fit, scoring thresholds, individual and item fit, and overall fit with item-trait interactions. All reverse scoring as necessitated by the MAIA scoring protocol was completed before the Rasch analysis so that higher scores would imply higher interoceptive awareness across all items. We decided to investigate the unidimensionality of the MAIA by analyzing all items together rather than perform a Rasch analysis per identified subscale.

A “threshold” is the point at which adjacent categories have the same likelihood of being selected [67,68]. Disordered thresholds reveal that the logical estimated order of the scale construct is not measured appropriately by the item response categories and that respondents may have had difficulty differentiating between categories and/or that not all categories were used [60,68–72]. Fit statistics indicate the appropriateness of person and item fit to the Rasch model [68]. Person and item fit residuals greater than +2.50 indicate misfitting items or persons,

and less than -2.50 indicate redundant items. Significant *p*-values for item fit are calculated with Bonferroni correction [60].

PSR differentiates the person's ability levels of the trait for research or clinical purposes, with PSR > 0.90 allowing the researcher or clinician to make decisions for individuals and ≥ 0.70 to make group decisions [60,73,74]. Floor and ceiling effects above 15% are considered problematic [60, 72]. The average person location within a range of -0.50 and 0.50 logits of average item location indicates adequate assessment targeting [60,75]. PCAR assesses the random variance in residuals, and if the variance is due to the underlying trait rather than other components [60,76]. LID is found when an item pair shares a greater degree of content compared to other assessment items [77,78]. Standard residual correlations of 0.20 or greater than the average of the standard residual item correlation indicate the presence of LID [60,79].

Results

Forty-one adults (average age 57±13.65 years, average time post-stroke 3.79±2.85 years) with unilateral ischemic brain lesions resulting in upper limb impairment participated in the study between September 27, 2017, and February 28, 2020. Participant demographics and stroke characteristics are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of study participants

	Adults with stroke (n=41)
Age (mean ± standard deviation; range)	57±13 (25 – 81)
Sex	
Men	28
Women	13
Type of Stroke	
Ischemic	31
Hemorrhagic	9
Unknown	1
Hemisphere of Stroke	
Left	29

Right	12
Time since stroke in years (mean; range)	3.79 (.50 - 10.50)
Current participation in breathing exercises (yes; no)	17; 24
Past participation in breathing exercises (yes; no)	18; 23
Past participation in body awareness training (yes; no)	19; 22
Current pain (NPRS) (yes; no)	21; 20
Depression (PHQ-9 >10) (yes; no)	6; 35
NIHSS (mean; range)	2.78; (0 - 9)
MMSE (mean; range)	15; (13 - 16)

Legend: NPRS = Numeric Pain Rating Scale, PHQ-9 = Patient Health Questionnaire–9, NIHSS = National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale Score, MMSE = Mini-Mental State Examination

The iteration table (S1 Table) details the step-by-step process of RMT analysis for the MAIA. More detailed explanations are below.

Upon initial analysis, 29 of the 32 items on the MAIA presented with disordered thresholds. Over the course of 5 iterations of rescoring, all 29 items were rescored by collapsing response categories. Nine of the original items were collapsed to dichotomous response categories [0 0 0 0 1 1], with the other rescored items varying on the spectrum of 3 to 4 collapsed response categories ([0 0 0 0 1 2], [0 0 0 1 1 2], [0 0 0 1 2 3], [0 0 1 1 2 2], [0 0 1 2 2 3]). Only items 14 and 15 retained the original scoring format [0 1 2 3 4 5].

Following rescoring, item 5 "*I do not notice (I ignore) physical tension or discomfort until they become more severe.*" displayed misfit (Fit Residual = 4.19; p = 0.0001) and was subsequently removed. Next, item 16 *"I can maintain awareness of my whole body even when a part of me is in pain or discomfort."* and item 23 *"When I feel overwhelmed, I can find a calm place inside."* were removed because they demonstrated a Guttman-like response pattern covering a wide logit-range from -9 logits to 1 logit as displayed (S1 Fig, S2 Fig). Next, items 11, 12, 18, 20, 26, 30, and 31 all displayed small thresholds in the middle scoring categories of each item's scale and were rescored to improve fit to the model as indicated in the iteration table

(S1 Table). Finally, item 25 was rescored due to a small threshold in the middle scoring categories. The resulting item location in logits for all items, after the above steps were completed, is listed in the S2 Table.

S1 Fig. Category probability curve for Item 16 in adults with stroke

Legend: The category probability curve shows the probability of each category being selected on the Y-axis and the X-axis shows the item measured in logits demonstrating the person's ability of their body awareness in relation to the question *"I can maintain awareness of my whole body even when a part of me is in pain or discomfort."*

S2 Fig. Category probability curve for Item 23 in adults with stroke

Legend: The category probability curve shows the probability of each category being selected on the Y-axis and the X-axis shows the item measured in logits demonstrating the person's ability of their body awareness in relation to the question *"When I feel overwhelmed, I can find a calm place inside."*

The person mean location was 0.05±1.13 logits indicating that the MAIA item difficulty was well-targeted for this population. There was no floor (0.00%) or ceiling effect (0.00%). We found that only 1 of the 41 participants displayed misfit (2.44% of the total group). The PSR was 0.91 indicating that the scale can be used for individual decision-making. The mean error variance was 0.12 logits, which is a small error estimate.

The revised Rasch-based MAIA is shown in Table 2 with items listed in order of difficulty on the logit scale from the easiest item at the top to the most difficult item at the bottom.

Table 2. Rasch-based MAIA

Original Item Number	New Item Number	Never					Always
17.	1. am able to consciously focus on my body as a whole.	0	0	1	2	2	3
15.	2. I can refocus my attention from thinking to sensing my body.	0	1	2	3	4	5

14.	I3. I can return my awareness to my body if I am distracted.	0	1	2	3	4	5
31.	4. I feel my body is a safe place.	0	0	0	1	1	2
3.	5. I notice where in my body I am comfortable.	0	0	0	0	1	1
20.	6. I notice that my body feels different after a peaceful experience.	0	0	0	1	1	1
30.	7. I am at home in my body.	0	0	0	1	1	2
2.	8. I notice when I am comfortable in my body.	0	0	0	0	1	1
25.	9. I can use my breath to reduce tension.	0	0	0	1	1	2
32.	10. I trust my body sensations.	0	0	0	0	1	2
9.	11. I start to worry something is wrong if I feel any discomfort.	0	0	0	0	1	1
12.	12. I can maintain awareness of my inner bodily sensations even when there is a lot going on around me.	0	0	0	1	1	2
22.	13. I notice how my body changes when I feel happy / joyful.	0	0	0	0	1	2
11.	14. I can pay attention to my breath without being distracted by things happening around me.	0	0	0	1	1	2
21.	15. I notice that my breathing becomes free and easy when I feel comfortable.	0	0	0	0	1	2
24.	16. When I bring awareness to my body, I feel a sense of calm.	0	0	0	1	2	3
26.	17. When I am caught up in thoughts, I can calm my mind by focusing on my body/breathing.	0	0	0	1	1	2
8.	18. When I feel physical pain, I become upset.	0	0	0	0	1	1

28.	19. When I am upset, I take time to explore how my body feels.	0	0	1	1	2	2
18.	20. I notice how my body changes when I am angry.	0	0	0	1	1	2
1.	21. When I am tense, I notice where the tension is located in my body.	0	0	0	0	1	1
13.	22. When I am in conversation with someone, I can pay attention to my posture.	0	0	0	0	1	1
10.	23. I can notice an unpleasant body sensation without worrying about it.	0	0	0	0	1	2
4.	24. I notice change in my breathing, such as whether it slows down or speeds up.	0	0	0	0	1	1
29.	25. I listen to my body to inform me about what to do.	0	0	0	1	1	2
19.	26. When something is wrong in my life I can feel it in my body.	0	0	0	1	1	2
6.	27. I distract myself from sensations of discomfort.	0	0	0	0	1	1
27.	28. I listen for information from my body about my emotional state.	0	0	0	0	1	2
7.	29. When I feel pain or discomfort, I try to power through it.	0	0	0	0	1	1

In sum, the Rasch analysis resulted in a 29-item MAIA scale with a good overall fit, and good item and person fit (S3 Fig).

S3 Fig. Person-item threshold distribution in adults with stroke

Legend: The X-axis logit ruler represents item difficulty and respondent ability. The blue histograms show item difficulty level frequencies, whereas the pink histograms represent the frequencies of the respondent's ability level of interoceptive body awareness. Higher levels of body awareness are indicated by higher logit values.

We report the score-to-measure in Table 3, which shows the conversion from ordinal total scores to logits to logit-based % from 0-100 for the total score. Our score-to-measure data provided should only be used with full data sets.

Table 3. Rasch based MAIA score conversion

Total MAIA Score	Logit	Converted to logits 0-100
0	-5.93	0.00
1	-5.00	8.66
2	-4.33	14.95
3	-3.84	19.51
4	-3.45	23.12
5	-3.13	26.09
6	-2.86	28.60
7	-2.63	30.76
8	-2.42	32.68
9	-2.24	34.39
10	-2.07	35.94
11	-1.92	37.37
12	-1.77	38.69
13	-1.64	39.91
14	-1.52	41.07
15	-1.40	42.16
16	-1.29	43.20
17	-1.18	44.20
18	-1.08	45.16
19	-0.98	46.08
20	-0.88	46.97
21	-0.79	47.83
22	-0.70	48.69

23	-0.61	49.52
24	-0.52	50.33
25	-0.43	51.13
26	-0.35	51.93
27	-0.26	52.72
28	-0.18	53.51
29	-0.09	54.30
30	-0.01	55.09
31	0.08	55.89
32	0.16	56.68
33	0.25	57.49
34	0.34	58.31
35	0.43	59.14
36	0.52	59.99
37	0.61	60.86
38	0.71	61.74
39	0.81	62.65
40	0.91	63.59
41	1.01	64.56
42	1.12	65.57
43	1.23	66.62
44	1.35	67.73
45	1.48	68.89
46	1.61	70.14
47	1.75	71.46
48	1.91	72.90
49	2.08	74.47
50	2.26	76.22
51	2.48	78.20

52	2.73	80.51
53	3.03	83.32
54	3.42	86.96
55	3.99	92.26
56	4.82	100.00

The overall fit of the model χ^2(DF)=74.59 (58), p=0.07, as well as item fit showed that the MAIA can assess interoceptive awareness as a unidimensional construct. The PCAR analysis showed an eigenvalue of 4.78 and a percentage variance of 16.49%, indicating that underneath the broader aspect of interoceptive awareness, the MAIA may encompass about 5 aspects of interoceptive awareness. The paired *t*-tests showed that the person location on the subtests created by the positive (items 2, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29) and negative (items 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 30, 31) loadings on the first principal component showed that 21.95% of the person locations were significantly different between the subtests, confirming the underlying aspects of the MAIA. In the same vein, LID was found in 42 item pairs (S3 Table). The "Attention Regulation" and "Emotional Awareness" scales each contributed 14 pairs to LID.

Discussion

The main results of this pilot Rasch analysis in adults with stroke showed a 29-item MAIA scale with a good overall fit, and good item and person fit (S3 Fig). Moreover, the MAIA was well-targeted for adults with chronic stroke. This result was obtained after extensive rescoring of the items, which may be explained for several different reasons.

First, when the MAIA items were developed, the original wording of question items asked respondents to rate "how true" an item was for them. However, after some pretests, this wording was found to be "difficult" and subsequently changed to "how often" this item was true

for them [6]. Therefore, it makes sense that 9 of the 29 items we retained were maximally efficiently rescored in a dichotomous format, more like “True” or “False” questions. Additionally, using END form formatting (i.e., labeling extreme categories with unlabeled interim options) may have contributed to the necessity to merge several scoring categories [80,81].

There is also debate in the research community as to whether combining positively and negatively worded items in the same scale may result in measurement inaccuracies [82,83]. In our analysis, only 1 of the deleted reverse-scored items was negatively worded (item 5). However, several previous studies have omitted various negatively worded items from the “Not-Distracting” and “Not-Worrying” subscales for poor factor loading [42,43,45,47,51,54].

Our results confirmed that the MAIA measures approximately 5 overarching aspects of interoceptive awareness as originally found by Mehling *et al.* (2012). The items that had a positive loading on the first principal component came primarily from the “Emotional Awareness” (EA) (items 19, 20, 21, 22) and “Body Listening” (BL) (items 27, 28, 29) subscales with one item from the “Noticing” subscale (item 2). This fits with the original finding from Mehling *et al.* (2012) of moderate correlations (r=.60) between EA and BL scales. Mehling *et al.* (2012) also specified that items from the EA and BL subscales were part of the same overarching dimension of “Mind Body Integration” (dimension 5) whereas item 2 (“I notice where I am tense in my body.”) is from the dimension of “Noticing” (dimension 1) also originally known as “Awareness of Body Sensations” [6]

The items with negative loadings on the first principal component contained primarily items from the “Attention Regulation” (AR) (items 11, 12, 13, 14, 17) and “Trusting” (TR) (items 30, 31) subscales. Mehling *et al.* (2012) originally found the AR and TR scales to also be

moderately correlated (*r*=.50) [6]. The AR and TR subscales were originally found to measure 2 different areas of interoceptive awareness, the “Capacity to Regulate Attention” (dimension 3) and “Trusting Body Sensations” (dimension 4) aspects respectively [6]. In other words, our analysis of positive and negative loadings is consistent with 4 of the original dimensions purported to be measured by the MAIA excluding only the dimension of “Emotional Reactions and Attentional Response to a Sensation " which contains all the originally reverse-scored items from the “Not-Worrying” and Not-Distracting” subscales. This overarching dimension may be measured by the MAIA, yet we cannot confirm this based on our analysis.

To the best of our knowledge, only one other previous study utilized the MAIA in adults with stroke, specifically to measure recovery of body awareness impairments after acute stroke recovery, and to identify the associations between body awareness impairments and “sensation, motor impairment, self-efficacy, and quality of life” after stroke [35]. Serrada *et al.* (2021) found that body awareness as measured by the MAIA had a “poor association” with other measures utilized in their study including the NIHSS, the Functional Independence Measure, the Body Perception Disturbance scale, and the Stroke Impact Scale [64,84–87]. However, Serrada *et al.* (2021) did not have their study participants fill out the MAIA at baseline due to concerns of the MAIA being “inappropriate” to administer immediately after a stroke. Their participants were enrolled 1 - 14 days post-stroke, so consequently participants only filled out the MAIA at 1- and 6 months post-stroke. Serrada *et al.* (2021) did not recommend using the MAIA in adults after stroke due to the potential of the questions being “too distressing for someone in the acute stroke phase” and because their authors posited that neglect and hypo-vigilance would be more common after stroke than hypervigilance [35].

Serrada *et al.* (2021) proposed that the development of a measure of body awareness that is appropriate for use after acute stroke is necessary, and we agree. We did not encounter distress when acquiring the MAIA in our sample, but we recruited only adults with chronic stroke. Also, about 50% of our participants had past or current experience with breathing exercises and/or past body awareness training and thus the type of questions asked on the MAIA might have been more familiar to some of them.

Study limitations

Our pilot Rasch results in our small sample are promising, but a RMT in a larger sample size is needed to confirm our findings. Also, we only recruited adults with chronic stroke and thus cannot generalize our findings to adults with acute or subacute stroke. A larger sample will also allow for DIF analysis as well as other types of reliability and reproducibility.

Conclusion

Our pilot Rasch-based MAIA indicates promising results for future use of the MAIA in adults with chronic stroke. Further studies are needed to validate the findings and complete the psychometrics on the MAIA.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences of the National Institutes of Health Award Number UL1TR000114. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health's National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences. The funders have no role in study design, data collection, and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank all participants as well as the volunteers who assisted the principal investigator (AVDW) at the Minnesota State Fair and Highland Fest. Our profound gratitude goes to Marc Noël for the critical review of the manuscript.

Authors' contributions

All authors contributed substantially to parts of the manuscript, critically revised it for content, approved the final version, and agreed to be accountable for the accuracy and integrity of this work. Specific contributions include:

- Conception or design of the work: AVDW
- Acquisition and analysis of evidence: AVDW, JB
- Interpretation of evidence: AVCW, JB, WD, SC
- Writing - original draft – AVDW, JB
- Writing - review and editing - AVDW, JB, WD, SC

References

1. Khalsa SS, Adolphs R, Cameron OG, Critchley HD, Davenport PW, Feinstein JS, et al. Interoception and Mental Health: A Roadmap. Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging. 2018;3: 501–513.

2. Chen WG, Schloesser D, Arensdorf AM, Simmons JM, Cui C, Valentino R, et al. The Emerging Science of Interoception: Sensing, Integrating, Interpreting, and Regulating Signals within the Self. Trends Neurosci. 2021;44: 3–16.

3. Ceunen E, Vlaeyen JWS, Van Diest I. On the Origin of Interoception. Front Psychol. 2016;7: 743.

4. Sherrington SCS. The Integrative Action of the Nervous System. Cambridge University Press; 1947.

5. Garfinkel SN, Seth AK, Barrett AB, Suzuki K, Critchley HD. Knowing your own heart: distinguishing interoceptive accuracy from interoceptive awareness. Biol Psychol. 2015;104: 65–74.

6. Mehling WE, Price C, Daubenmier JJ, Acree M, Bartmess E, Stewart A. The Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness (MAIA). PLoS One. 2012;7: e48230.

7. Mehling WE, Gopisetty V, Daubenmier J, Price CJ, Hecht FM, Stewart A. Body awareness: construct and self-report measures. PLoS One. 2009;4: e5614.

8. Craig AD. How do you feel? Interoception: the sense of the physiological condition of the body. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2002;3: 655–666.

9. Craig AD (bud). Interoception and emotion: A neuroanatomical perspective. Handbook of emotions, 3rd ed. 2008;3: 272–292.

10. Farb N, Daubenmier J, Price CJ, Gard T, Kerr C, Dunn BD, et al. Interoception, contemplative practice, and health. Front Psychol. 2015;6: 763.

11. Mehling W. Differentiating attention styles and regulatory aspects of self-reported interoceptive sensibility. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2016;371: 20160013.

12. Brower V. Mind-body research moves towards the mainstream. EMBO Rep. 2006;7: 358–361.

13. Khoury NM, Lutz J, Schuman-Olivier Z. Interoception in Psychiatric Disorders: A Review of Randomized, Controlled Trials with Interoception-Based Interventions. Harv Rev Psychiatry. 2018;26: 250–263.

14. de Jong M, Lazar SW, Hug K, Mehling WE, Hölzel BK, Sack AT, et al. Effects of Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy on Body Awareness in Patients with Chronic Pain

and Comorbid Depression. Front Psychol. 2016;7: 967.

15. Mehling WE, Wrubel J, Daubenmier JJ, Price CJ, Kerr CE, Silow T, et al. Body Awareness: a phenomenological inquiry into the common ground of mind-body therapies. Philos Ethics Humanit Med. 2011;6: 6.

16. Ludwig DS, Kabat-Zinn J. Mindfulness in medicine. JAMA. 2008;300: 1350–1352.

17. Ahn S-N. Differences in body awareness and its effects on balance function and independence in activities of daily living for stroke. J Phys Therapy Sci. 2018;30: 1386–1389.

18. Garrett R, Immink MA, Hillier S. Becoming connected: the lived experience of yoga participation after stroke. Disabil Rehabil. 2011;33: 2404–2415.

19. Schmid AA, Miller KK, Van Puymbroeck M. Yoga After Stroke Leads to Improvements in Multiple Domains of Quality of Life. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2015;96: e93.

20. Chan W, Immink MA, Hillier S. Yoga and exercise for symptoms of depression and anxiety in people with poststroke disability: a randomized, controlled pilot trial. Altern Ther Health Med. 2012;18: 34–43.

21. Schmid AA, Van Puymbroeck M, Altenburger PA, Schalk NL, Dierks TA, Miller KK, et al. Poststroke balance improves with yoga: a pilot study. Stroke. 2012;43: 2402–2407.

22. Taylor-Piliae RE, Hoke TM, Hepworth JT, Latt LD, Najafi B, Coull BM. Effect of Tai Chi on physical function, fall rates and quality of life among older stroke survivors. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2014;95: 816–824.

23. Wu S, Chen J, Wang S, Jiang M, Wang X, Wen Y. Effect of Tai Chi Exercise on Balance Function of Stroke Patients: A Meta-Analysis. Med Sci Monit Basic Res. 2018;24: 210–215.

24. Chan W-N, Tsang WW-N. Effect of Tai Chi Training on Dual-Tasking Performance That Involves Stepping Down among Stroke Survivors: A Pilot Study. Evid Based Complement Alternat Med. 2017;2017: 9134173.

25. Zheng G, Zheng Y, Xiong Z, Ye B. Effect of Baduanjin exercise on cognitive function in patients with post-stroke cognitive impairment: a randomized controlled trial. Clin Rehabil. 2020;34: 1028–1039.

26. Au-Yeung SSY, Hui-Chan CWY, Tang JCS. Short-form Tai Chi improves standing balance of people with chronic stroke. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2009;23: 515–522.

27. Hackett ML, Yapa C, Parag V, Anderson CS. Frequency of depression after stroke: a systematic review of observational studies. Stroke. 2005;36: 1330–1340.

28. Love MF, Sharrief A, Chaoul A, Savitz S, Beauchamp JES. Mind-Body Interventions,

Psychological Stressors, and Quality of Life in Stroke Survivors. Stroke. 2019;50: 434–440.

29. Dobkin BH. Clinical practice. Rehabilitation after stroke. N Engl J Med. 2005;352: 1677–1684.

30. Alamer A, Getie K, Melese H, Mazea H. Effectiveness of Body Awareness Therapy in Stroke Survivors: A Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled Trials. OAJCT. 2020;12: 23–32.

31. World Health Organization - Eastern Mediterranean Region. [cited 25 Apr 2021]. Available: http://www.emro.who.int/health-topics/stroke-cerebrovascular-accident/index.html

32. Sinyor D, Amato P, Kaloupek DG, Becker R, Goldenberg M, Coopersmith H. Post-stroke depression: relationships to functional impairment, coping strategies, and rehabilitation outcome. Stroke. 1986;17: 1102–1107.

33. Hyndman D, Ashburn A, Yardley L, Stack E. Interference between balance, gait and cognitive task performance among people with stroke living in the community. Disabil Rehabil. 2006;28: 849–856.

34. Hussain N, Alt Murphy M, Sunnerhagen KS. Upper Limb Kinematics in Stroke and Healthy Controls Using Target-to-Target Task in Virtual Reality. Front Neurol. 2018;9: 300.

35. Serrada I, Hordacre B, Hillier S. Recovery of Body Awareness After Stroke: An Observational Study. Front Neurol. 2021;12: 745964.

36. Murphy J, Brewer R, Plans D, Khalsa SS, Catmur C, Bird G. Testing the independence of self-reported interoceptive accuracy and attention. Q J Exp Psychol . 2020;73: 115–133.

37. Mehling WE, Acree M, Stewart A, Silas J, Jones A. The Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness, Version 2 (MAIA-2). PLoS One. 2018;13: e0208034.

38. Hanley AW, Mehling WE, Garland EL. Holding the body in mind: Interoceptive awareness, dispositional mindfulness and psychological well-being. J Psychosom Res. 2017;99: 13–20.

39. Ferentzi E, Olaru G, Geiger M, Vig L, Köteles F, Wilhelm O. Examining the Factor Structure and Validity of the Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness. J Pers Assess. 2020; 1–10.

40. Freedman A, Hu H, Liu ITHC, Stewart AL, Adler S, Mehling WE. Similarities and Differences in Interoceptive Bodily Awareness Between US-American and Japanese Cultures: A Focus-Group Study in Bicultural Japanese-Americans. Cult Med Psychiatry. 2020. doi:10.1007/s11013-020-09684-4

41. Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness. [cited 9 Aug 2021]. Available: https://osher.ucsf.edu/research/maia

42. Calì G, Ambrosini E, Picconi L, Mehling WE, Committeri G. Investigating the relationship between interoceptive accuracy, interoceptive awareness, and emotional susceptibility. Front Psychol. 2015;6: 1202.

43. Valenzuela-Moguillansky C, Reyes-Reyes A. Psychometric properties of the multidimensional assessment of interoceptive awareness (MAIA) in a Chilean population. Front Psychol. 2015;6: 120.

44. Machorrinho J, Veiga G, Fernandes J, Mehling W, Marmeleira J. Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness: Psychometric Properties of the Portuguese Version. Percept Mot Skills. 2019;126: 87–105.

45. Baranauskas M, Grabauskaitė A, Griskova-Bulanova I. Psychometric Characteristics of Lithuanian Version of Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness (MAIA LT). Neurologijos seminarai. 2016;20. Available: https://osher.ucsf.edu/sites/osher.ucsf.edu/files/inline-files/MAIA_Lithuanian_Validation.pdf

46. Eggart M, Todd J, Valdés-Stauber J. Validation of the Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness (MAIA-2) questionnaire in hospitalized patients with major depressive disorder. PLoS One. 2021;16: e0253913.

47. Fujino H. Further validation of the Japanese version of the Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness. BMC Res Notes. 2019;12: 530.

48. Todd J, Barron D, Aspell JE, Toh EKL, Zahari HS, Khatib NAM, et al. Translation and validation of a Bahasa Malaysia (Malay) version of the Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness (MAIA). PLoS One. 2020;15: e0231048.

49. Reis D. Further insights into the German version of the Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness (MAIA): Exploratory and Bayesian structural equation modeling approaches. Eur J Psychol Assess. 2019;35: 317–325.

50. Bornemann B, Herbert BM, Mehling WE, Singer T. Differential changes in self-reported aspects of interoceptive awareness through 3 months of contemplative training. Front Psychol. 2014;5: 1504.

51. Mehling WE, Daubenmier J, Price CJ, Acree M, Bartmess E, Stewart AL. Self-reported interoceptive awareness in primary care patients with past or current low back pain. J Pain Res. 2013;6: 403–418.

52. Brown TA, Berner LA, Jones MD, Reilly EE, Cusack A, Anderson LK, et al. Psychometric Evaluation and Norms for the Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness (MAIA) in a Clinical Eating Disorders Sample. Eur Eat Disord Rev. 2017;25: 411–416.

53. Lin F-L, Hsu C-C, Mehling W, Yeh M-L. Translation and Psychometric Testing of the Chinese Version of the Multidimensional Assessment of Interoceptive Awareness. J Nurs Res. 2017;25: 76–84.

54. Shoji M, Mehling WE, Hautzinger M, Herbert BM. Investigating Multidimensional Interoceptive Awareness in a Japanese Population: Validation of the Japanese MAIA-J. Front Psychol. 2018;9: 1855.

55. Gim W-S, Sim K-L, Cho O-K. Korean multidimensional assessment of interoceptive awareness (K-MAIA): Development and validation. Korean J Stress Res. 2016;24: 177–192.

56. Mul C-L, Stagg SD, Herbelin B, Aspell JE. The Feeling of Me Feeling for You: Interoception, Alexithymia and Empathy in Autism. J Autism Dev Disord. 2018;48: 2953–2967.

57. Van de Winckel A, Feys H, van der Knaap S, Messerli R, Baronti F, Lehmann R, et al. Can quality of movement be measured? Rasch analysis and inter-rater reliability of the Motor Evaluation Scale for Upper Extremity in Stroke Patients (MESUPES). Clin Rehabil. 2006;20: 871–884.

58. Tennant A, McKenna SP, Hagell P. Application of Rasch analysis in the development and application of quality of life instruments. Value Health. 2004;7 Suppl 1: S22–6.

59. Andrich D, Marais I. A Course in Rasch Measurement Theory: Measuring in the Educational, Social and Health Sciences. Springer, Singapore; 2019.

60. Deng W, Carpentier S, Van de Winckel A. Physical body experiences questionnaire simplified for active aging (PBE-QAG): Validation with Rasch measurement theory. bioRxiv. medRxiv; 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.06.01.21258192

61. Van de Winckel A, Feys H, Lincoln N, De Weerdt W. Assessment of arm function in stroke patients: Rivermead Motor Assessment arm section revised with Rasch analysis. Clin Rehabil. 2007;21: 471–479.

62. Van de Winckel A, Ottiger B, Bohlhalter S, Nyffeler T, Vanbellingen T. Comprehensive ADL Outcome Measurement after Stroke: Rasch Validation of the Lucerne ICF-Based Multidisciplinary Observation Scale (LIMOS). Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 2019. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2019.02.012

63. Van de Winckel A, Gauthier L. A Revised Motor Activity Log Following Rasch Validation (Rasch-Based MAL-18) and Consensus Methods in Chronic Stroke and Multiple Sclerosis. Neurorehabil Neural Repair. 2019; 1545968319868717.

64. Kwah LK, Diong J. National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS). J Physiother. 2014;60: 61.

65. Cossu G, Loi E, Carta MG, Bramanti A. The Physical Body Experiences Questionnaire Simplified for Active Aging (PBE-QAG). Clin Pract Epidemiol Ment Health. 2018;14: 70–77.

66. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. “Mini-mental state”. A practical method for grading

the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. J Psychiatr Res. 1975;12: 189–198.

67. Tesio L. Measuring behaviours and perceptions: Rasch analysis as a tool for rehabilitation research. J Rehabil Med. 2003;35: 105–115.

68. Khadka J, Gothwal VK, McAlinden C, Lamoureux EL, Pesudovs K. The importance of rating scales in measuring patient-reported outcomes. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2012;10: 80.

69. Reeve B, Fayers P. Applying item response theory modelling for evaluating questionnaire item and scale properties. In: Assessing Quality of Life in Clinical Trials: Methods and Practice 2nd edn (ed Fayers,P M;Hays,R D), Oxford University Press, Oxford. 2005. pp. 55–73.

70. Wright BD, Mok M. Understanding Rasch measurement: Rasch models overview. J Appl Meas. 2000;1: 83–106.

71. Pallant JF, Tennant A. An introduction to the Rasch measurement model: an example using the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS). Br J Clin Psychol. 2007;46: 1–18.

72. Robinson M, Johnson AM, Walton DM, MacDermid JC. A comparison of the polytomous Rasch analysis output of RUMM2030 and R (ltm/eRm/TAM/lordif). BMC Med Res Methodol. 2019;19: 36.

73. Reliability and separation of measures. [cited 11 Oct 2021]. Available: https://www.winsteps.com/winman/reliability.htm

74. Tennant A, Conaghan PG. The Rasch measurement model in rheumatology: what is it and why use it? When should it be applied, and what should one look for in a Rasch paper? Arthritis Rheum. 2007;57: 1358–1362.

75. Displacement measures. [cited 23 Oct 2021]. Available: https://winsteps.com/winman/displacement.htm

76. Smith EV Jr. Detecting and evaluating the impact of multidimensionality using item fit statistics and principal component analysis of residuals. J Appl Meas. 2002;3: 205–231.

77. Mallinson T, Kozlowski AJ, Johnston MV, Weaver J, Terhorst L, Grampurohit N, et al. A. Rasch Reporting Guideline for Rehabilitation Research (RULER): The RULER Statement. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2022. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.03.013

78. Van de Winckel A, Kozlowski AJ, Johnston MV, Weaver J, Grampurohit N, Terhorst L, et al. Reporting Guideline for RULER: Rasch Reporting Guideline for Rehabilitation Research – Explanation & Elaboration manuscript. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2022. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2022.03.019

79. Christensen KB, Makransky G, Horton M. Critical Values for Yen's Q3: Identification of Local Dependence in the Rasch Model Using Residual Correlations. Applied Psychological

Measurement. 2017. pp. 178–194. doi:10.1177/0146621616677520

80. Windschitl PD, Wells GL. Measuring psychological uncertainty: Verbal versus numeric methods. J Exp Psychol Appl. 1996;2: 343–364.

81. Menold N. Rating-Scale Labeling in Online Surveys: An Experimental Comparison of Verbal and Numeric Rating Scales with Respect to Measurement Quality and Respondents' Cognitive Processes. Sociol Methods Res. 2020;49: 79–107.

82. van Sonderen E, Sanderman R, Coyne JC. Ineffectiveness of reverse wording of questionnaire items: let's learn from cows in the rain. PLoS One. 2013;8: e68967.

83. Suárez-Álvarez J, Pedrosa I, Lozano LM, García-Cueto E, Cuesta M, Muñiz J. Using reversed items in Likert scales: A questionable practice. Psicothema. 2018;30: 149–158.

84. Glenny C, Stolee P. Comparing the functional independence measure and the interRAI/MDS for use in the functional assessment of older adults: a review of the literature. BMC Geriatr. 2009;9: 52.

85. Granger CV, Hamilton BB, Keith RA, Zielezny M, Sherwin FS. Advances in functional assessment for medical rehabilitation. Top Geriatr Rehabil. 1986;1: 59.

86. Ten Brink AF, Halicka M, Vittersø AD, Jones HG, Stanton TR, Bultitude JH. Validation of the Bath CRPS Body Perception Disturbance Scale. J Pain. 2021;22: 1371–1384.

87. Duncan PW, Bode RK, Min Lai S, Perera S, Glycine Antagonist in Neuroprotection Americans Investigators. Rasch analysis of a new stroke-specific outcome scale: the Stroke Impact Scale. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2003;84: 950–963.

Supporting Information

Table S1. Iteration table MAIA

Analysis	Items	Rating scale groups	Person mean (SD) logits	Mean error variance	Floor effect n (%)	Ceiling effect n (%)	Overall Chi-square (DF) p-value	PSR	Number of items with disordered thresholds	Number misfitting Items (item #)	PCAR Eigenvalue 1st contrast (%)	Number of mis-fitting persons (%)
All items (n = 41)	32	192	.55 (.42)	0.021	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	123.90 (64) *p* = 0.00001	.88	29	1 (7)	5.68 (17.76%)	5 (12.20%)
Rescore 1 27 items to [001234]	32	165	.33 (.49)	0.025	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	117.63 (64) *p* = 0.00005	.90	29	1 (7)	5.67 (17.73%)	3 (7.32%)
Rescore 2 22 items to [000123]	32	143	0.25 (.62)	0.035	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	121.62 (64) *p* = 0.00002	.91	17	2 (5, 7)	5.58 (17.44%)	3 (7.32%)
Rescore 3 6 items to [000011] 9 items to [000012] 3 items to [001223] 1 item to [011223] 1 item to [012233]	32	114	0.21 (.89)	0.063	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	90.72 (64) *p* = 0.016	.92	6	0	5.10 (15.94%)	2 (4.88%)
Rescore 4 3 items to [000011] 2 items to [000112] 1 item to [001123]	32	109	.22 (.94)	0.072	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	94.19 (64) *p* = 0.0084	.92	1	1 (5)	4.86 (15.19%)	2 (4.88%)
Rescore 5	32	108	.25	0.073	0 (0%)	0 (0)%	78.68 (62)	.93	0	1 (5)	4.83	2

1 item to [001122]			(.93)				p = 0.0075				(15.11%)	(4.88%)
Delete 1 Item 5	31	104	0.25 (1.05)	0.083	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	78.68 (62) p = 0.075	.93	0	0	4.82 (15.55%)	1 (2.44%)
Delete 2 Item 16	30	100	0.12 (1.03)	0.083	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	74.38 (60) p = 0.10	0.92	0	0	4.80 (16.01%)	1 (2.44%)
Delete 3 Item 23	29	95	0.47 (1.03)	0.087	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	62.25 (58) p = 0.33	0.92	0	0	4.73 (16.31%)	1 (2.44%)
Rescore c 5 items to [000112] 1 item to [000123]	29	86	0.05 (1.12)	0.11	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	70.16 (58) p = 0.06	0.91	0	0	4.78 (16.48%)	1 (2.44%)
Rescore d 1 item to [000111] 2 items to [000112]	29	85	0.05 (1.13)	0.12	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	74.59 (58) p = 0.07	0.91	0	0	4.78 (16.49%)	1 (2.44%)

Legend: RSG = Rating Scale Categories, PM = Person Mean Logits, SD = Standard Deviation, MEV = Mean Error Variance, FE = Floor Effect, CE = Ceiling Effect, DF = Degrees of Freedom, PSR = Person Separation Reliability, DT = Disordered Thresholds, PCAR = Principal Components Analysis of Residuals

S2 Table. Item fit statistics of the Rasch-based MAIA

Original Item Number	Item number and Description of Rasch-based MAIA	Item location (logits)	SE	Fit Residuals	Chi-Square (DF=2)	*p*-value
Item 17	1. I am able to consciously focus on my body as a whole.	-1.63	0.26	0.27	3.13	0.21
Item 15	2. I can refocus my attention from thinking to sensing my body.	-1.62	0.18	0.22	1.18	0.55
Item 14	3. I can return awareness to my body if I am distracted.	-1.26	0.17	1.62	0.25	0.88
Item 31	4. I feel my body is a safe place.	-0.83	0.29	-0.54	1.06	0.59
Item 3	5. I notice where in my body I am comfortable.	-0.48	0.35	-0.11	0.02	0.99
Item 20	6. I notice that my body feels different after a peaceful experience.	-0.48	0.35	-0.19	0.67	0.72
Item 30	7. I am at home in my body.	-0.47	0.28	0.00	0.81	0.67
Item 2	8. I notice when I am comfortable in my body.	-0.37	0.35	-0.75	0.85	0.65
Item 25	9. I can use my breath to reduce tension.	-0.29	0.29	-0.46	0.51	0.78
Item 32	10. I trust my body sensations.	-0.29	0.23	-1.03	3.43	0.18
Item 9	11. I start to worry that something is wrong if I feel any discomfort.	-0.19	0.35	2.45	7.79	0.02
Item 12	12. I can maintain awareness of my inner bodily sensations even when there is a lot going on around me.	-0.16	0.27	-0.40	3.17	0.21
Item 22	13. I notice how my body changes when I am angry.	-0.13	0.24	-0.75	1.24	0.54
Item 11	14. I can pay attention to my breath without being distracted by things happening around me.	-0.05	0.25	0.50	1.03	0.60

Item 21	15. I notice that my breathing becomes free and easy when I am comfortable.	-0.02	0.24	0.07	0.63	0.73
Item 24	16. When I bring awareness to my body, I feel a sense of calm.	-0.01	0.21	-1.67	6.18	0.05
Item 26	17. When I am caught up in thoughts, I can calm my mind by focusing on my body/breathing.	0.08	0.27	-0.75	2.07	0.36
Item 8	18. When I start to feel physical pain, I become upset.	0.11	0.35	1.33	0.83	0.66
Item 28	19. When I am upset, I take time to explore how my body feels.	0.18	0.25	0.32	4.19	0.12
Item 18	20. I notice how my body changes when I am angry.	0.25	0.28	-0.35	0.56	0.76
Item 1	21. When I am tense, I notice where the tension is located in my body.	0.26	0.35	0.12	0.12	0.94
Item 13	22. When I am in conversation with someone, I can pay attention to my posture.	0.35	0.35	0.77	2.17	0.34
Item 10	23. I can notice an unpleasant body sensation without worrying about it.	0.37	0.24	3.10	3.47	0.18
Item 4	24. I notice changes in my breathing, such as whether it slows down or speeds up.	0.48	0.35	0.12	1.09	0.58
Item 29	25. I listen to my body to tell me what to do.	0.59	0.27	0.02	0.26	0.88
Item 19	26. When something is wrong in my life, I can feel it in my body.	0.62	0.27	0.21	3.08	0.21
Item 6	27. I distract myself from sensations of discomfort.	1.02	0.37	0.84	11.68	0.00
Item 27	28. I listen for information from my body about my emotional state.	1.09	0.26	0.31	11.55	0.46
Item 7	29. When I feel pain or discomfort, I try to power through it.	2.86	0.59	0.61	11.61	0.11

Legend: SE = Standard Error, DF = Degrees of Freedom

S3 Table. Local Item Dependence (Residual correlation ≥ 0.37)

Item number	RC	Scale
1. When I am tense, I notice where the tension is located in my body. 2. I notice when I am uncomfortable in my body.	0.53	NOT NOT
1. When I am tense, I notice where the tension is located in my body. 3. I notice where in my body I am comfortable.	0.42	NOT NOT
2. I notice when I am uncomfortable in my body. 3. I notice where in my body I am comfortable.	0.47	NOT NOT
1. When I am tense, I notice where the tension is located in my body. 26. When I am caught up in my thoughts, I can calm my mind by focusing on my body/breathing.		NOT SR
8. When I feel physical pain, I become upset. 9. I start to worry something is wrong if I feel any discomfort.	0.49	NW NW
11. I can pay attention to my breath without being distracted by things happening around me. 12. I can maintain awareness of my inner bodily sensations even when there is a lot going on around me.	0.59	AR AR
12. I can maintain awareness of my inner bodily sensations even when there is a lot going on around me. 27. I listen for information from my body about my emotional state.	0.58	AR BL
12. I can maintain awareness of my inner bodily sensations even when there is a lot going on around me. 29. I listen to my body to inform me about what to do.	0.40	AR BL
13. When I am in conversation with someone, I can pay attention to my posture. 14. I can return awareness to my body if I am distracted.	0.55	AR AR
13. When I am in conversation with someone, I can pay attention to my posture. 17. I am able to consciously focus on my body as a whole.	0.39	AR AR
13. When I am in conversation with someone, I can pay attention to my posture. 19. When something is wrong in my life, I can feel it in my body.	0.44	AR EA

13. When I am in conversation with someone, I can pay attention to my posture. 29. I listen to my body to inform me about what to do.	0.38	AR BL
14. I can return awareness to my body if I am distracted. 17. I am able to consciously focus on my body as a whole.	0.50	AR AR
14. I can return awareness to my body if I am distracted. 18. I notice how my body changes when I am angry.	0.41	AR EA
14. I can return awareness to my body if I am distracted. 19. When something is wrong in my life, I can feel it in my body.	0.42	AR EA
14. I can return awareness to my body if I am distracted. 29. I listen to my body to inform me about what to do.	0.44	AR BL
15. I can refocus my attention from thinking to sensing my body. 24. When I bring awareness to my body, I feel calm.	0.38	AR SR
17. I am able to consciously focus on my body as a whole. 19. When something is wrong in my life, I can feel it in my body	0.37	AR EA
17. I am able to consciously focus on my body as a whole. 27. I listen for information from my body about my emotional state.	0.48	AR BL
18. I notice how my body changes when I am angry. 19. When something is wrong in my life, I can feel it in my body.	0.37	EA EA
18. I notice how my body changes when I am angry. 30. I am at home in my body	0.47	EA TR
18. I notice how my body changes when I am angry. 31. I feel my body is a safe place	0.42	EA TR
19. When something is wrong in my life, I can feel it in my body. 22. I notice how my body changes when I am angry.	0.51	EA EA
20. I notice that my body feels different after a peaceful experience. 22. I notice how my body changes when I am happy / joyful.	0.51	EA EA
20. I notice that my body feels different after a peaceful experience. 27. I listen for information from my body about my emotional state.	0.39	EA BL

20. I notice that my body feels different after a peaceful experience. 28. When I am upset, I take time to explore how my body feels.	0.54	EA BL
20. I notice that my body feels different after a peaceful experience. 30. I am at home in my body.	0.37	EA TR
20. I notice that my body feels different after a peaceful experience. 31. I feel my body is a safe place.	0.55	EA TR
21. I notice that my breathing becomes free and easy when I feel comfortable. 28. When I am upset, I take time to explore how my body feels.	0.39	EA BL
21. I notice that my breathing becomes free and easy when I feel comfortable. 29. I listen to my body to inform me about what to do.	0.43	EA BL
21. I notice that my breathing becomes free and easy when I feel comfortable. 30. I am at home in my body.	0.46	EA TR
22. I notice how my body changes when I am angry. 30. I am at home in my body.	0.39	EA TR
22. I notice how my body changes when I am angry. 31. I feel my body is a safe place.	0.46	EA TR
24. When I bring awareness to my body, I feel a sense of calm. 25. I can use my breath to reduce tension.	0.42	SR SR
24. When I bring awareness to my body, I feel a sense of calm. 26. When I am caught up in my thoughts, I can calm my mind by focusing on my body/breathing.	0.47	SR SR
25. I can use my breath to reduce tension. 26. When I am caught up in my thoughts, I can calm my mind by focusing on my body/breathing.	0.62	SR SR
27. I listen for information from my body about my emotional state. 28. When I am upset, I take time to explore how my body feels.	0.37	BL BL
28. When I am upset, I take time to explore how my body feels. 30. I am at home in my body.	0.50	BL TR

28. When I am upset, I take time to explore how my body feels. 31. I feel my body is a safe place.	0.48	BL TR
30. I am at home in my body. 31. I feel my body is a safe place.	0.73	TR TR
30. I am at home in my body. 32. I trust my body sensations.	0.43	TR TR
31. I feel my body is a safe place. 32. I trust my body sensations.	0.53	TR TR

Legend: RC (Residual Correlation), NOT (Noticing), ND (Not-Distracting), NW (Not-Worrying), AR (Attention Regulation), EA (Emotional Awareness), SR (Self-Regulation), BL (Body Listening), TR (Trusting)


Person-Item Threshold Distribution
(Grouping Set to Interval Length of 0.20 making 40 Groups)
PERSONS
No. Mean SD
Total [41] 0.051 1.129
Frequency
10
5
0
24.4%
12.2%
0.0%
-5
-4
-3
-2
-1
0
1
2
3
Location (logits)
ITEMS
Freq
0
5
10
0.0%
8.9%
17.9%

I0016 Maintain body awareness when i Locn = -3.656 Spread = 2.067 FitRes = -0.899 ChiSq[Pr] = 0.150 SampleN = 41



I0023 When overwhelmed find calm pla Locn = -2.122 Spread = 1.553 FitRes = 0.818 ChiSq[Pr] = 0.882 SampleN = 41