

Technical FAQ's:

Singer-Loomis Type Deployment Inventory (SL-TDI)

What is the short history of the Singer-Loomis? When and by whom was the SL-TDI created?

Version 1 of the SL-TDI was created in 1979 by June Singer, Ph.D. and Mary Loomis, Ph.D. June Singer is a world renowned Jungian Analyst who received her Analyst training at the C.G. Jung Institute in Zurich, Switzerland. She is the founder of the C.G. Jung Institute of Chicago and the author of many books and dozens of articles on Jungian psychology. Mary Loomis is also a Jungian Analyst. She was trained to be a Jungian Analyst at the C.G. Jung Institute of Chicago. Mary has written one book, many articles and is well known for her efforts to bridge the Native American Medicine Wheel with Jungian Type concepts.

Drs. Singer and Loomis evolved the Singer-Loomis to Version 3 before selling the copyright to Consulting Psychologist Press (CPP) of Palo Alto, California in 1983. CPP listed the Singer-Loomis in their clinical catalog from 1984 through 1995. The copyright to the inventory was purchased from CPP by Drs. Singer and Loomis in late 1995 and transferred to Drs. Elizabeth and Larry Kirkhart in February 1996. The Kirkhart's immediately initiated a process to revise the instrument and created a new organization, Moving Boundaries, inc., to produce, market and nurture the Singer-Loomis. The revision was directed by the Kirkhart's and done with the assistance of June Singer, Martha Newell (a Jungian Analyst), and a number of professional colleagues in the field of human resource development. Because the process for doing the revision had been planned in advance of February, Version 4 was ready for beta testing by early May 1996.

June Singer was the first person to administer Version 4.0 of the Singer-Loomis. She did so with approximately 50 Jungian oriented psychologists at a conference in Barbados in May 1996. Since that time, Version 4 has been administered to thousands of individuals. Reliability statistics have been generated on the Moving Boundaries research database as the database has grown from several hundred to several thousand. This information shows that the SL-TDI meets or exceeds conventional psychometric reliability standards for a personality inventory (based on Cronbach's Alpha). An independent reliability and validity study of the SL-TDI, conducted by three members of the Psychology Department at Texas A&M (Randolph Arnau, David Rosen and Bruce Thompson) was published in the June 2000 issue of the *Journal of Analytical Psychology*. Their reliability data is virtually identical to the reliability data produced by Moving Boundaries' in-house studies.

In May 2002, Version 5.0 was put in final form. This version was created by Drs. Elizabeth and Larry Kirkhart in collaboration with Andrew Rooney and Julia Zimmerman. This was a comprehensive revision that began in October 2001 and was not complete until the end of May 2002. During the course of this work, changes (ranging from one word to, in a few instances, replacing the entire item) were made in over 50% of the items and in 25% of the situations. Field testing of this new version is currently underway. Preliminary statistical information is expected to be available by September 2002.

How many scales and how many items are involved in the SL-TDI?

The SL-TDI uses 160 items to measure eight core variables. The resulting Type Mode scale scores measure Introverted Sensing, Extraverted Sensing, Introverted Intuiting, Extraverted Intuiting, Introverted Feeling, Extraverted Feeling, Introverted Thinking and Extraverted Thinking. Each of these eight variables is measured 20 times to yield a scale score.

In addition to the eight core scales, the SL-TDI also produces scores for eight secondary variables: A) the four Type Functions of Sensing, Intuiting, Thinking and Feeling; B) Extraversion and Introversion; and, C) Judging and Perceiving.

In all, the SL-TDI provides information about a total of 16 Type variables.

How long does it take to administer and score the SL-TDI?

There are several ways to administer and score the SL-TDI.

- ◆ One is to administer the inventory and manually score it. It takes 20-30 minutes for most people to record their responses to the scale items and another 15-20 to compile the information and produce the two pages of SL-TDI results. (Total = 35-50 minutes).
 - ◆ A second way is to administer the inventory and have item responses recorded on the Recording Form developed for the SL-TDI computer software. Again, it takes 20 to 30 minutes to complete the inventory, approximately 5 minutes to input the results to the software and then another 3 minutes to print the four-page Basic Report (Total = 23-38 minutes) or, on a typical laser printer, 15 minutes to print a 34 page Full Report (Total = 40-50 minutes).
 - ◆ Thirdly, an individual can do the SL-TDI interactively on the software (15-20 minutes) and then print the Basic Report (3 minutes) (Total = 18-23 minutes) or the Full Report (15 minutes) (Total = 30-35 minutes).
 - ◆ Finally, the SL-TDI can be administered, the item responses recorded on the Recording Form and then the Recording Form is faxed or mailed to Moving Boundaries for scoring, report generation and binding. The turn-around time for Moving Boundaries is normally 72 hours from the time the Recording Forms are received.
-

The Singer-Loomis, the Myers-Briggs and the Grey-Wheelwright all claim to be based on Carl Jung's ideas about personality functioning. Can I compare the results of these inventories?

SL-TDI

The Singer-Loomis Type Deployment Inventory (SL-TDI)¹ uses a 5-point Likert scale to *directly measure* the Extraverted and Introverted expression of each of Jung's four Functions (Sensing, Intuiting, Thinking and Feeling). Since there are four Functions and two ways each can be expressed, eight scales are required to measure how the individual uses his or her Type capacities. These eight areas of measurement, which heretofore have never been measured directly, are called *Type Modes*.

Individuals completing the SL-TDI are asked to use a 5-point Likert scale to indicate how much she or he *would actually use* each of the eight Type capacities (Type Modes) in specific situations. The result is information about *what a person actually does* in everyday situations, how the person currently functions.

MBTI and JTS

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)² and the Grey-Wheelwright Jungian Type Survey (JTS) were created in the 1940's. Both are based on the bipolar assumption, i.e., that Thinking is *always* in bipolar opposition to Feeling, Sensation is always in opposition to Intuition, Introversion is always in opposition to Extraversion and Perceiving is always in opposition to Judging. Unlike the MBTI, the JTS does not collect information about Judging and Perceiving.

A series of assumptions flow from the bipolar assumption. For example, "*if* extraverted sensation scores highest, *then* introverted intuition is *necessarily* the least developed type capacity." Both of these inventories base the interpretation of results on a series of chains of "*if....., then.....is necessarily.....*" assumptions. Each of these sets of interrelated assumptions is presumed to hold for all people at all times.

Because of the bipolar assumption, the MBTI and the JTS both use a *forced choice* format. When respondents take either inventory, he or she is asked to select the one item he or she *prefers* from the two items. The use of preference as a decision criterion means that respondents make choices on the basis of how she or he *wants to be*, i.e., in relation to her or his ego ideal. Strictly speaking, forced-choice does not constitute measurement of a variable. Compiling the number of times a variable is chosen, something both the MBTI and the JTS do, *does not constitute measurement of the variable*. What it does show is how many times something was *categorized* as preferable by the respondent.

The principal reason for using a forced-choice format is to categorize information. The MBTI uses the forced choice format to facilitate categorizing the individual as one of 16 possible Types. Each of these 16 Types has a specific Dominant, Auxiliary, Tertiary and Inferior Function. For example, the familiar ESTJ Type has Extraverted Thinking as the Dominant, Introverted Sensing as the Auxiliary, Extraverted Intuition as the Tertiary (3rd most developed Function) and Introverted Feeling as the Inferior or Least Developed Function.

Summary

The MBTI and JTS report on four of the eight Type capacities (as shown in the above example of an ESTJ Type with Extraverted Thinking as Dominant, Introverted Sensing as the Auxiliary, Extraverted Intuition as the Tertiary (3rd most developed Function) and Introverted Feeling as the Inferior or Least

¹ SL-TDI is a copyrighted product of Moving Boundaries, inc., Gresham, OR.

² MBTI is a copyrighted product of Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.

Developed Function. Notice, Introverted Thinking, Extraverted Sensing, Introverted Intuition and Extraverted Feeling are not reported. *The SL-TDI directly measures and reports on all eight.*

The SL-TDI information is quite different from someone's ego ideal or preferred way of acting. By focusing on what a person actually does rather than the person prefers, minimizes the uncertainty about whether one's preference is what one does.

Since the SL-TDI 1) reports on all eight Type capacities and the MBTI and JTS report on four of the same capacities— with no indication of the status of the four capacities that are not reported— *and* because 2) the SL-TDI measures what people *actually do* and the MBTI and JTS collect information about what a person *prefers*, direct comparison of the SL-TDI and the MBTI or JTS is *not*, strictly speaking, meaningful.

Why does the Singer-Loomis emphasize “Type Modes” rather than Type Functions?

There are four Type Functions—Sensation, Intuition, Feeling and Thinking. The SL-TDI measures the Extraverted and Introverted expression of each of the four Functions. The Singer-Loomis uses a Likert scale to measure each of these eight areas directly. Each of these areas represents a particular Type Mode.

Whenever Carl Jung was talking about a person, he seemed to consistently tie Type Function and Extraversion or Introversion together. He might say, for example, Shirley is an Extraverted Feeling Type. In short, he believed Shirley had Extraverted Feeling as her Dominant. In other words, when Jung addressed how people actually function, his language was somewhat different than when he was talking in a purely abstract way.

The SL-TDI assumes that a Type Function requires Extraverted or Introverted psychological energy for its expression. Without the inclusion of Extraverted or Introverted psychological energy, a Type Function is simply a latent potentiality. Therefore, to describe how a living, breathing person operates, it is necessary to focus on the eight ways that Type Functions can be expressed. To distinguish these eight forms of expression from either Type Function or Extraversion or Introversion per se, the Singer-Loomis defines these eight forms of expression as *Type Modes*.

A Type Mode, for example, Extraverted Feeling, represents a dynamic process involving Extraverting psychological energy through the Feeling Function. When both of the Type Modes involved in the Feeling Function are taken into consideration, i.e., Extraverted Feeling (EF) and Introverted Feeling (IF), it is possible to talk about how a *Type Function* is operating. To do so, requires summing the scale scores of the EF and IF Type Modes.

Summing results in an aggregate score for the Feeling Function. This aggregate score is a different level of analysis from a Type Mode. Notice that the simple act of summing the information about how much of the Feeling Function is expressed through Extraverting and how much is expressed through Introverting disappears. What is left is a numeric score that indicates how much the Type Function is expressed. This score can, of course, be compared to scores obtained for Thinking, Sensing and Intuiting. Aside from the question of whether one Function is used more than another, any comparison of how two Functions *operate* requires shifting to the Type Mode level and comparing the Type Mode scores associated with each of the two Functions. Unless this happens, all that one can say is that one Type Function is used more than another Type Function, without knowing how it is used.

The more dynamic information is at the Type Mode level of analysis. Type Function is a more abstract concept, a broader level of generalization with less specific information, Type Function is more removed from the here and now of everyday experience and less subject to change.

What does it mean to say “the SL-TDI measures each Type Mode independently”?

The Singer-Loomis assumes that regardless of the underlying relationships between the various Type Modes, it is possible to measure each one without respect to the functioning of the other modes. In other words, it is possible to measure Extraverted Thinking without making any assumption about, for example, Introverted Thinking. Each item on the SL-TDI is designed to measure a particular Type Mode. Each Type Mode is measured a total of 20 times in 20 different situations.

A major theme in Carl Jung’s writing is individuation, or how the individual develops and becomes whole. The original translation of his book on personality, translated from German to English in 1921 by his colleague, H. Goodwin Baynes, carried the title, Psychological Types or the Psychology of Individuation. How does the SL-TDI relate to the measurement of individuation?

According to Jung, individuation is a life-long process of becoming whole or complete—which, incidentally, is not understood to mean “perfect”. Instead, it means becoming all one can be—given one’s strengths and limitations. This process is not determined by early childhood, or by adolescence, or by mid-life alone. It is an on-going process that, if unhampered by unusual biological or environmental conditions, continues throughout one’s lifetime.

At the heart of the individuation process stands the all-important question of conscious awareness. As individuation proceeds, the individual becomes more aware of how he or she functions. This involves many complicated issues. Considerations at the forefront are: 1) the pattern of functioning of the individual’s eight type capacities, especially the relative influence of each Type Mode on the other seven, and 2) the relationship between the ego and the unconscious. These two general considerations are intimately related. One’s access to the unconscious occurs through one’s particular pattern of typological functioning, just as the way one relates to the external world is expressed through typological functioning. For Jung, individuation meant greater consciousness of how one functions in the world. Jung argued that individuation was not solely an internal process but also was reflected in how the person understood and engaged the external world.

Since the Singer-Loomis Type Deployment Inventory measures all eight type modes independently, the mode(s) used the most, and therefore likely to be most accessible to conscious awareness, is portrayed as one's most developed Type Mode(s)—without *a priori* assumptions about opposition, etc. The Type Mode(s) used least is portrayed as most remote from and difficult to bring into conscious awareness. In short, the SL-TDI results show the pattern of usage characteristic of the individual at a particular point in the individuation process. As individuation proceeds, the pattern would change accordingly and, presumably, be reflected by different scores on the Inventory.

By not making the bipolar assumption, does the SL-TDI preclude the Type Modes, treated by Jung as conceptual opposites, from scoring on the SL-TDI in a way that would indicate opposition between these capacities?

The design of the SL-TDI does not preclude the possibility of scoring high on one Type Mode and low on another, producing what would appear to be a classic bi-polar relationship. Introverted Feeling, for example, can score high and Extraverted Thinking can score low. *Nothing stops this from happening—except the all-important baseline of how the individual experience's herself or himself* in the various situations presented in the SL-TDI. Nothing in the design of the SL-TDI that prevents the classical opposition from appearing in SL-TDI results.

The philosophy underlying the Singer-Loomis is that measurement of the variables should allow the individual's experience to drive the patterning of the results—rather than some preconceived formula. This makes it possible, for example, to change the bi-polar assumption to a question that can be tested empirically. That is, do the results show the pattern that would be characteristic of bi-polar relationships between certain Type Modes?

1. In our experience with thousands of SL-TDI results, a startlingly high percentage of individuals *do not* experience the classical oppositions. In addition, a substantial percentage of individuals report that they use the conceptually opposite capacities to almost the same degree. Dealing with the tension of apparent opposites leads to recognizing that that capacities construed as *conceptual* opposites can have a complementary relationship. There is no reason to assume that the relationship between Type capacities cannot change through time as one develops. This means that the SL-TDI breathes new life into the idea of being an individual from a Type perspective and broadens our understanding of Typology.

From the perspective of the SL-TDI, there is an immense variability in how the individual process of development unfolds. Instead of being limited to 16 meaningful personality characterizations, the SL-TDI offers the possibility of over six million. If one is serious about understanding one's own relatively unique degree of individuation and has the same concerns about others, a deeper understanding of typology dynamics is called for. This is an important route to appreciating both yourself and the other person's gifts more fully.

Can't the differences between the bipolar inventories and the SL-TDI be resolved by incorporating information about how frequently the four heretofore unreported capacities were selected? After all, this means that all eight capacities, the very same ones described by the Singer-Loomis, would be recognized.

Recently, the publisher of one of the bipolar inventories has begun to talk about type development and seeks to address the four heretofore unreported type capacities. While such an effort has merit, the only way a bipolar inventory can expand what is reported on, when a forced choice format is used, is through interpreting the residuals, the fall-out of the forced choices.

A forced choice structure requires a person to choose between two items and record the result *as if* only one was truly important. The degree of importance of the chosen or the non-chosen item is not indicated. A forced choice structure requires an either/or attitude toward the options presents, rather than how significant each one is to the individual. Going back to the raw scores and counting the times that the category, routinely disregarded by other versions of the Inventory, was selected requires an unacceptable conceptual stretch because:

1. Something that was excluded in a scoring system designed to discount that which was not chosen as unimportant, a residual, cannot be reinterpreted the discounted material as important without calling into question the structure and interpretive system of the forced-choice system of categorization.
2. A forced-choice system presupposes that two capacities or traits are in an either-or, win/lose relationship to each other in which one capacity must necessarily be dominant relative to the other. Given this presupposition, it makes no sense whatsoever to talk about development. Among other things, individuation, at least in the sense Carl Jung described it, involves learning to deal with paradox.
3. Forced-choice structures are not designed to measure. They are intended to provide a system of categorization. It is not surprising, therefore, that the most widely disseminated bipolar inventory yields 16 possible personality types—no more and no less. To many, this is an intellectually and emotionally satisfying structure that makes it possible to contain the range of possible personality characterizations.

In the case of the MBTI, this structural outcome (16 Types) is based on recognizing only four of the eight type capacities within an individual's profile. Incorporating the residuals, the number of times Type capacities were selected but not brought into the final accounting, will require the overall schema to expand accordingly. The expansion requirements will, without doubt, exceed the familiar sixteen boxes many people have come to understand as the range of personality possibilities.

At the same time, the results of a personality inventory cannot exceed the structural limitations of the type of measurement and the accompanying assumptions on which it is based. In the case of a bi-polar type inventory both judging and perceiving and extraversion and introversion, are assessed separately from thinking and feeling and from sensation and intuition. "Expanding" the information from this structure can only occur by increasing the number of interpretive steps, thus thickening the depth of untested assumptions that must occur between Type concepts and the everyday experience of the person.

The Type inventory I am most familiar with is based on the idea of preferences, is this what the SL-TDI is based upon?

The Singer-Loomis collects information about *how much a person actually uses* eight Type capacities (Introverted Sensing, Extraverted Sensing, Introverted Intuiting, Extraverted Intuiting, Introverted Thinking, Extraverted Thinking, Introverted Feeling and Extraverted Feeling). Each of these capacities is measured in the same situation. The SL-TDI measures how much the person actually uses each Type capacity or Type Mode in a total of twenty situations. The result is a score based on *what the person indicates they actually do*, rather than what they prefer. What a person prefers may have little or no bearing on what a person actually does in everyday life.

How much a person uses each particular Type capacity is, to some degree, a matter of conscious choice. According to Jungian theory, the less developed the Type capacity, the more difficult it is to hold in conscious awareness. The SL-TDI takes the position that knowing what a person actually does is essential to being able to use conscious awareness to promote one's development. Development means having some knowledge of one's current state and on the basis of that knowledge, choosing ways to encourage further development in desired directions.

By measuring what a person does at a particular point in time, it is possible to have a baseline that can be used for counseling, coaching and informing conscious efforts to further develop the individual. After an interval of time, say six months or a year, the Inventory can be administered again and the results compared to the earlier reference point.

None of the existing bipolar inventories assess the use of all eight Type Modes. The eight variables (MBTI) (or six variables in the case of the JTS) about which information is gathered is not done in a way that holds the situations constant. Because the bipolar inventories vary the contexts in which individuals are required to select a preferred option, it would not be unfair to characterize these inventories as measuring *preferences for traits* without regard to situation. The Singer-Loomis *measures the actual expression of traits in everyday situations and consistently measures all eight traits in the same situation*.

Where does the SL-TDI stand on the nature vs. nurture?

In the scientific community, there is a long-standing debate about whether how one behaves and experiences the world is a consequence of nature, that is, the individual's biological and genetic dispositions, or a consequence of the environment (nurture) he or she happens to inhabit during formative moments of development. Some scientists would argue that one or the other of these positions explains everything.

The assumption underlying the SL-TDI is that *both* are important. The SL-TDI asks that you put yourself in a situation (the nurture part of the nature/nurture equation) and then indicate how much you would exercise each of the eight Type Modes (the nature part of the nature/nurture equation). In other words, the SL-TDI assumes that the environment in which we find ourselves does influence how we act. However, the environment simply exerts different amounts of influence relative to how we chose to act. The very fact that in some environments we would chose to act differently than we do in others means we seek to act as sensibly as we know how, given our understanding of the particular context. In short, we do not act independently of our environment *and* we are not completely determined by our in-born psychological traits. Life involves a mixture of both. This mixture will vary depending on life experience and how aware we are of ourselves and our environment at any given moment.

There is considerable controversy about whether trait or state influences an individual's psychology the most. How does the SL-TDI respond to this controversy?

Some personality inventories, for example, the MBTI, assume that to understand the individual, all that is necessary is to collect information about characteristics that are assumed to be inborn traits. These traits are usually treated as genetically endowed internal processes that determine the individual's personality. As a consequence, how the environment influences the expression of these traits is either ignored or, because it receives no explicit attention, inadvertently incorporated in a non-systematic way in the results of the measurement of the traits.

The state approach would, more typically, seek to measure overt behavior, avoid anything related to internal states and seek to show how overt behavior can be predicted from the characteristics of a particular environment.

The SL-TDI is designed to measure the expression of traits (the eight Type Modes) in particular environments. *Both trait and state are assumed to be important and interrelated.* For this reason, the SL-TDI asks the respondent to indicate how much each trait, i.e., Type Mode, would be deployed in a particular situation. The results of the Inventory are a consequence of the overall pattern of usage of each of the Type Modes in twenty different situations.

Why is the SL-TDI portrayed as the "Next Generation of Type Measurement"?

There are at least 12 reasons why the SL-TDI is the next generation of Type measurement:

1. The SL-TDI is the first Jungian Type inventory designed to *directly measure the Extraverted and the Introverted expression of each of the four Type Functions* (Sensing, Intuiting, Thinking and Feeling).
2. The SL-TDI *measures Type functioning using eight Likert type scales*; all of the other Type inventories use a *forced choice format to collect information* for the purpose of putting individuals into a pre-existing set of categories, i.e., 16 Types or 4 Temperaments.
3. The SL-TDI measures what an individual *actually does* with his or her Type capacities; all of the other Type inventories collect information about what an individual *prefers* to do.
4. The SL-TDI is the first Type inventory to show how each Type Function operates— by measuring how much of each Type Function is expressed through Extraverting and how much through Introverting.
5. The SL-TDI is the first Type inventory to show how the individual is Introverted—by measuring how much each of the four Introverted Type Functions contribute to the individual's overall Introversion.
6. The SL-TDI is the first Type inventory to show how the individual is Extraverted—by measuring how much each of the four Extraverted Type Functions contribute to the individual's overall Extraversion.
7. The SL-TDI is the first Type inventory to show how the individual Perceives—by measuring how much each of the four Perceiving Type Functions contribute to the individual's overall Perceiving.

8. The SL-TDI is the first Type inventory to show how the individual Judges—by measuring how much each of the four Judging Type Functions contribute to the individual's overall Judging.
9. The SL-TDI assumes that personality expression is a result of trait *and* state, nature *and* nurture. The other Type inventories take the position that traits or nature determine personality functioning.
10. The SL-TDI results are far more individualized than any other Type Inventory—the SL-TDI is capable of producing an estimated 6.5 million distinct and meaningfully different Type Profiles.
11. The highly individual results generated by the SL-TDI help to minimize stereotyping self and others with preconceived attributes and encourages getting to know self and other.
12. The SL-TDI shifts the concept of Type *from* the Individual *as a* Type to the Individual with Type capacities.