

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 Deng¹, BS; Sydney Carpentier¹, BA; Ann Van de Winckel², PhD, MSPT, PT

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

²Division 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 (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 rescoring 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 ± 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**

	Healthy adults (n=269)	Adults with mental health conditions (n=200)	Adults with pain (n=61)	Adults with chronic stroke (n=36)
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_w) 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 ± 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 χ^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
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 ± 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 ± 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 ± 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

Original	Item Number and Description of the Rasch-	0	1	2	3	4
number	based PBE-QAG	Totally				Totally
		true				false
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.

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.

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

