This paper discusses the development of instruments to measure individual differences in behavior during infancy. The Infant Temperament Questionnaire (ITQ), which was designed to measure the temperament dimensions identified by the New York Longitudinal Study (NYLS), constituted the methodological starting point in the search for a dimensional description of infant temperament. The Baby Behavior Questionnaire (BBQ) was constructed and administered to 791 infants between 3 and 10 months of age. The Toddler Behavior Questionnaire (TBQ) was constructed and administered to 357 infants between 11 and 15 months of age. Identified factors were required to exhibit unidimensionality, that is, relationship to a unifying element; generality across several situations; and stability across samples. Seven factors identified in both instruments included intensity and activity, regularity, approach-withdrawal, sensory sensitivity, attentiveness, manageability, and sensitivity to new food. In addition, an adaptability factor was identified for the TBQ. These factors were not close replicates of NYLS dimensions. Although previous research suggested that a manageability factor would be representative of infant irritability, the identified manageability factor was unexpectedly constituted of a broad conglomerate of diverse behaviors. A list of 19 references is included. (BC)
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The main aim of this paper is to present work done for establishing a meaningful structure encompassing the behavioral diversity seen in young infants. I will try to highlight issues of conceptualization which often occur in work with dimensional structures, established with strict statistical treatment of data. In this context I will also relate some of our work done to gain a deeper understanding of dimensions brought forth by the multivariate techniques used.

**NYLS dimensions and the dimensionality of the ITQ**

The practical aim of our work, which was begun in the mid 70's, was of course to establish an instrument for description of individual differences in behavior during infancy. Theoretical and methodological inspiration came from the NYLS (e.g. Thomas & Chess, 1977) with their starting point in the phenomenon itself - the variability of the total behavioral repertoire in young children. Temperament was seen as the HOW of behavior, that is, the stylistic aspect of behavior. The nine NYLS dimensions of temperament (see Table 1) had been derived from careful interviewing of parents and visual content analyses of interview protocols concerning the behavior of 22 3-month-old infants.

The advantage of this approach was the exhaustive and relatively unbiased collection of data obtained concerning infant behavior variability. The drawbacks were that the subjective nature of the content analysis employed gave no assurance that behaviors grouped
together constituted separate categories, it did not allow for unique behavior variance to be identified, and that the small sample size left the possibility open for unrepresentativeness in the behavioral data and in the temperament structure.

In our search for a dimensional description of infant temperament, Carey's (1970) Infant Temperament Questionnaire (ITQ), designed to measure the NYLS dimensions, constituted the methodological starting point. We used the ITQ in a pilot study (N=128) of 3-4 month-olds who were rated by their parents.

Although we were well aware of the inadequate sample size for multivariate statistical treatment, we still tried exploratory factor analysis as a first step. This work with the original ITQ resulted in a 9-factor orthogonal principal component structure (see Table 2) as the most meaningful solution to the problem of grouping the 59 items (from the original 70 items, 11 had to be discarded due to low response frequencies; Hagekull, 1989). The conclusions were clear:

1. the ITQ provided a useful starting point for the search for a dimensional structure describing behavioral individuality in young infants, because broad dimensions reflecting behavioral dispositions could be identified.

2. the obtained dimensions were no close replicates of the NYLS's nine dimensions. Only rhythmicity corresponded to an original NYLS dimension (cf. Rapoport et al., 1977; Sanson et al., 1987).
For our further work along these lines we postulated the following criteria for factors to be considered as reflecting temperament (Table 3):

1. unidimensionality - a unifying element for the diverse items clustered in a factor, referring to a possible child disposition, should be identified
2. generality - a factor should reflect behaviors in several situations
3. stability of factors across samples

**Dimensionality of infant behavior**

On the basis of pilot study results the Baby Behavior Questionnaire (BBQ) was constructed and tried out in a representative sample of 791 3-10 month-old infants (Bohlin, Hagekull, & Lindhagen, 1981). About 70% of the 54 BBQ items originated from the ITQ. To cover the behavioral repertoire of one-year-olds, some BBQ items were altered and some were added to form the Toddler Behavior Questionnaire (TBQ) which was used in a sample of 357 infants, aged 11-15 months. It contained 60 items, 60% of which came from the ITQ (Hagekull, Lindhagen, Bohlin, 1980).

The BBQ sample allowed cross-validation across both two age groups (3-6 months and 6-10 months) and two random samples in each age group. The TBQ sample was also randomly split in two groups. After a number of factor analyses, comparing solutions with different number of factors, solutions with different rotations, and from different ages, we came up with two solutions, one applicable to the whole BBQ age range and one for the
TBQ ages (Table 4). The chosen crossvalidated solutions showed considerable similarity across ages. Looking closer at the factor contents, the criteria postulated made us exclude the new food factors (situation specific), and the adaptability factor (not stable in cross-validation). The criterion of unidimensionality, that is, that a unifying behavioral disposition should be discernible in the factor, was fulfilled in most factors. Energy level or expenditure is easily inferred from the behaviors in the Intensity/Activity dimensions, and rhythmicity in more biologically regulated behaviors is seen as the disposition behind Regularity. The Approach-Withdrawal dimension which only consisted of behaviors in new social situations could tap the disposition of sociability and/or early shyness. Sensory Sensitivity reflects threshold and reactivity to strong environmental stimulation, and Attentiveness the infant's capacity to detect and react to small environmental changes. There is, however, one notable exception: the Manageability factor, appearing in the older age groups and increasing its importance as regards explained variance (not found in the youngest group, emerging in the second age group and appearing invariably as factor number 1 or 2 in all solutions from the TBQ sample). This factor contained items reflecting persistence, adaptability, mood, and activity in a large variety of situations (see Table 5) but the unifying element was difficult to see. Although it did not fit in with our previously set criterion of unidimensionality, we were
reluctant to throw it out of the system mainly because of its increasing importance in explaining behavioral variance. So we tentatively named the factor Manageability, because it seemed to have something to do with how easy the child was to handle for the parent in various situations. We remained puzzled and intrigued by this factor and I will return to it later.

To relate our clusters of items to temperament research and constructs, we applied the NYLS criterion of temperament dimensions as reflecting the HOW of behavior (rather than the WHAT or WHY) to the factors we had accepted as descriptive of infant behavioral differences. Could the unifying element in each factor be seen as a stylistic aspect of behavior? This was clearly the case for the Intensity/Activity factors, for the factors describing rhythmicity in biologically based functions, for the Approach-Withdrawal dimensions, describing emotional reactivity to novel persons and situations, and for the factors dealing with sensitivity to sensory stimulation. Also Manageability seemed to describe HOW the infant reacted and behaved in a number of situations. The unifying behavioral element in the Attentiveness factors, on the other hand, was more likely to be alertness or cognitive capacity. Most items described whether a reaction occurred or not rather than the how of responding, and these factors were thus seen as reflecting a broad behavioral, but not a behavioral style, dimension. However, as has been discussed by Mary Rothbart (1989), attentional processes have been included
in several other temperament approaches. A distinction between attention-getting and attention-holding processes could be made. In our dimensional structure, this distinction was reflected in that attention-getting behaviors had clustered in the Attentiveness factors, while behaviors indicative of attention-holding processes were found in the Manageability factors.

To conclude this section of the presentation I would say that with factor analysis applied with fairly strict methodological and conceptual constraints, we had achieved a promising structure in which all factors could be related to temperament theory. The factors were again with the exception of Regularity, no close replicates of the NYLS dimensions; some factors such as Sensory Sensitivity and Approach-Withdrawal were more narrow, others combined items from different scales, such as Intensity/Activity. Finally, the factor analytic work had also resulted in unexpected findings, such as the broad conglomerate of diverse behaviors in the dimension of Manageability. More work was clearly needed to understand this factor. I will exemplify with results from some of the studies we have done and try to show how our understanding has grown as regards the Manageability dimension.

The conceptualization of the Manageability dimension

We had some preliminary ideas about the Manageability factor as being an indirect representation of irritability and possibly also more reflective of the parent-child relationship than the rest of the factors.
Adhering to the general idea of behavioral variability as being partly of constitutional origin (Goldsmith et al., 1987), we started out searching for an early appearing infant characteristic, possibly irritability, as underlying the Manageability dimension. In a study of 37 newborns, assessed with the Brazelton Neonatal Behavioral Assessment, regulation of state in the newborn period predicted manageability at 4 months ($r = .35$) and orienting and habituation were related to 12-month manageability ($r = .38$ and $r = -.36$; Hagekull, 1985). These results fit in nicely with BBQ/ TBQ item content at the different ages (see Table 5). In the Manageability factors, activity and adaptability to new routines were important features in the younger sample together with persistence, while persistence and mood items were more prominent at the older ages. Thus, the more self-regulatory ability (and probably the less irritability) the newborn infant had shown, the more content s/he was as a 4 month old baby when left to amuse her/himself and when encountering in new situations. When concentration, persistence, and mood became more important aspects of manageability around one year of age, the neonatal capability of orienting to new stimuli was shown to be of predictive value. Rapid habituation in newborn infants was predictive of negative mood and low persistence, which might be seen as equivalent to rapid habituation, at 12 months. We interpreted this as yielding some indirect support for the idea of a relationship between Manageability and early irritability.
The relationship between manageability and irritability was more directly explored in a study of 29 3-7 month-olds. Maternal ratings of manageability were found to be associated with direct observations of frequency of irritability outbursts during a period of 8 days (r = .45; Hagekull, 1989). The irritability or negative emotionality disposition thus suggested to be a uniting feature for the diverse manageability items also led us to search for the association between manageability and the well-known temperamental constellation of difficult temperament (Thomas, Chess, & Birch, 1968), which also has connections to negative emotionality. By using the LISREL causal model building programs we found support for a difficult child construct in the oldest age group (11-15 month-olds). Manageability was the most important factor in the second order factor analysis used to study the latent construct of difficultness (Hagekull, 1985).

Because infant irritability would seem to be an important characteristic for the developing parent-child relationship, these findings also strengthened our preliminary ideas about manageability as important in a relationship context. We have received support for this in that manageability has been found to relate to both observed behavior of mothers (and children) and to maternal role satisfaction (Hagekull & Bohlin, 1986; 1990). In preliminary analyses, Manageability has also been found to predict infant attachment behavior with fathers in a modified Strange situation.
was especially strong for female infants (Hagekull & Bohlin, 1988).

In recent research, using temperament as a predictor variable, infant manageability, based on data aggregated from ages 10, 15, and 20 months, has been shown to predict outgoing conduct problems (aggressive and concentration problem behaviors; $r=-.36$) studied with the Behar and Stringfield (1974) Preschool Behavior Questionnaire in a sample of about 100 4-year-olds (Hagekull & Bohlin, 1990). This result is in line with recent reports (Bates, Maslin, & Frankel, 1985; Kyrios & Prior, 1990) about predictability from difficult temperament.

**The development of the Manageability dimension**

Finally a few words about the development of Manageability in terms of another temperament structure. To investigate the connection between infant temperament and early preschool temperament we have used the BBQ and TBQ for the younger ages and the Buss and Plomin (1975) EASI questionnaire measuring Emotionality, Activity, Sociability, and Impulsivity for age ranges above the ones BBQ and TBQ were developed for. This has been done in an ongoing longitudinal study of about 110 children, so far followed from 6 weeks to 4 years of age. At age 20 months, both TBQ and F\SI were used, spaced one month apart. An exploratory factor analysis on maternal data, factoring items from both questionnaires yielded an interesting structure where the manageability persistence items clustered together with impulsivity items in one
factor and the TBQ mood items formed a factor of its own. This structure was replicated using paternal data. Predictions from infant manageability (aggregated mother and father data from 10, 15, and 20 months) to the EASI dimensions at two age periods, 28-36 months and 43-48 months (aggregated mother and father data), showed Manageability to be the main predictor of Impulsivity and Emotionality at both age periods. In regression analyses, Manageability also gave independent significant negative contributions to the prediction of Activity and to Sociability when the shyness aspect was taken out (see Table 6).

To sum up our work with Manageability, this dimension is now conceptualized as originating in a negative emotionality or irritability dimension seen early in life, and it develops into impulsivity and negative emotionality in the early preschool period. It is probably of significance for the developing parent-child relationship and for the development of preschoolers' outgoing problem behaviors. So far, it has been the most "productive" dimension in our set of factors in terms of yielding interesting results in correlational studies.

So I will conclude this presentation by emphasizing the importance of a sound psychometric and conceptual base for further work in temperament. At the same time as I stress the importance of strict criteria, I will also point to the necessity of not adhering too strictly to them. Adhering to such a strategy, we now think we have a
dimensional structure of temperament in infancy which is a useful and conceptually fairly clear system for describing the large variability of infant behavior.
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Table 1.

**The NYLS Nine Dimensions of Temperament**

- Activity Level
- Rhythmicity (Regularity)
- Approach or Withdrawal
- Adaptability
- Intensity of Reaction
- Threshold of Responsiveness
- Quality of Mood
- Distractibility
- Attention Span and Persistence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot Study Factors from the ITQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reactivity to wet or soiled diapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intensity/activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhythmicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reactivity to food variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threshold and persistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adaptability/approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeding behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mood, adaptability, approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

**Criteria for Temperament Dimensions**

1. **unidimensionality** - a unifying element for the diverse items clustered in a factor, referring to a possible child disposition, should be identified

2. **generality** - a factor should reflect behaviors in several situations

3. **stability across samples**
Table 4.

**Interpreted Factor Solutions From the BBQ and the TBQ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor BBQ sample</th>
<th>TBQ sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no. 3-10 mo.</td>
<td>11-15 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=791</td>
<td>n=357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Intensity/Activity
2. Regularity
3. Approach-Withdrawal
4. Sensory Sensitivity
5. Attentiveness
6. Manageability
7. Sensitivity to New Food
8. --

---

Intenstity/Activity
Manageability
Regularity
Approach-Withdrawal
Sensory Sensitivity
Sensory to New Food
Attentiveness
Adaptability
### Items in the Manageability Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BBQ (3 - 10 mo.)</th>
<th>TBQ (11 - 15 mo.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persistence in self-amusement</td>
<td>Persistence in self-amusement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence in toy play</td>
<td>Persistence in toy play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence watching TV/ &quot;reading&quot; books</td>
<td>Persistence in social play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration during feed</td>
<td>Mood during diaper change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood during diaper change</td>
<td>Mood when face is wiped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood when being dressed</td>
<td>Mood when having nails cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood after feed</td>
<td>Act. during diaper change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity during diaper change</td>
<td>Activity during diaper change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity during bath</td>
<td>Activity during bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability of sleep habits in new places</td>
<td>Adaptability in new situations/places</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.

Manageability and Irritability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>newborns</td>
<td>Reg. of state - Man.</td>
<td>4 mo</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newborns</td>
<td>Orienting - Man.</td>
<td>12 mo</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newborns</td>
<td>Habituation - Man.</td>
<td>12 mo</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7 mo</td>
<td>Freq. of irr. - Man.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difficult child construct - Manageability
- Intensity/Activity -.40
- Regularity -.32
- Approach-Withdrawal -.15
Manageability in Relationship Contexts

15 mo  
- Man. - Mother neg. behavior     -.51
- Man. - Child neg. behavior     -.32
- Man. - Child pos. behavior     .39

3.5 mo  
- Man. - Maternal role satisfaction 4 mo .30
- Man. - " irritability 4 mo -.40
- Man. - " stress 4 mo -.26
- Man. - " coping 4 mo .34
- Man. - " role satisfaction 10 mo .30

10 mo  
- Man. - Cry 12 mo -.29
- Man. - Proximity seeking 12 mo -.40
- Man. - Avoidance 12 mo .51

10,15,20 mo  
- Man. - Outgoing conduct
- behavior problems 4 yrs -.36
Table 7.
Predictions From Infant Manageability (Aggregated Mother and Father Data From Ages 10, 15, and 20 Months) to EASI Dimensions at Two Age Periods (N=110 and 105)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>28-36 mo.</th>
<th>43-48 mo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.

**Dimensional Development of Manageability**

irritability $\rightarrow$ manageability $\rightarrow$ impulsivity
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