Of the eight approaches to management mentioned in the first chapter off the Evans and Alire text, there are certainly two which catch my attention. If I had to pick one style out of all eight, it would probably be the Management Science or Quantitative Approach. This style, founded by Herbert A. Simon in the 40s and improved by Richard Cyert and James G. March, asserts that people working within an organization use logic and reason to make decisions which impact the organization. Simon founded the Management Science approach with his background in computing and the earliest works on artificial intelligence. Where Cyert and March changed this was realizing that people are not machines and sometimes make decisions based in illogic.

In challenging the rationality of organizations and the actions of people within them, Cyert and March were able to better predict what problems might arise within a system due to various internal and external events. They were correct in their assumption that you cannot trust people to react rationally in every instance; we are animals, not calculators. This measurement of response is why I like this approach. Most people seek out advice or a written policy when they come up against a problem they don't know how to solve or address. Some, however, simply plow ahead despite their or the organization's best interests, and the Quantitative approach seeks to address those problems. By modeling the proper solutions to various problems throughout the organization, these "brute force" style employees will be more likely to power through their confusion in the right direction or performing the correct action.

My second choice would be Contingency Theory. I like this approach because it deals with every situation in isolation. When employees deal with the same thing day in and day out, it can be hard to perform that task or service with the same attentiveness and personal touch that really makes library services attractive to a patron. Contingency Theory draws a lot from the

work of Mary Parker Follett who believed that too much emphasis was put on authority and/or control in the field of scientific management (which I agree is still true even today).

The situation-by-situation view of Contingency Theory takes the focus away from the structure as a whole and focuses on the employee dealing with the situation. It puts and emphasis on diagnosis. This is best in a library because there are many situations where a one-size-fits-all approach is not helpful nor successful. A librarian has to have to know what their options are, and which are appropriate for which situations. Written policy in many cases (reference, collections management, etc.) is broad and vague to create space for patrons and librarians to explore and express themselves. This means that the individuals in charge of these decisions become the authority and should be given that freedom to operate.

Both approaches are interesting and used best in tandem I think. When it comes to management from an organizational viewpoint, I think that the Quantitative approach is the best. When it comes to individual employees, Contingency Theory is the best idea. It allows the employee to function as an individual without fear of punishment for minor, clerical errors and allows them to give each patron a full, personal experience with library services. They may seem a bit contradictory, but it's just a matter of balance. Employees need guidance, not commands. They need inspiration, not just a plan. By using both approaches for different aspects of management, I feel like library leadership would be able to walk that fine line between undermanagement and micromanagement we like to call "management".

I took the Color Code Personality Science test at https://www.colorcode.com/ . After about 45 questions and scenarios, my result was 'Blue'. According to the site, blues are motivated by intimacy and quality. They are loyal and happy to serve. The site also refers to blues as "sainted pit-bulls" for their ability to hold a grudge. I've taken a number of these

personality and management quizzes for various jobs and this is the first time I felt the quiz got

me. I disagree with very little that it states about my dominant personality type. I dislike that

you have to give them money to see what your other categories are and what they mean. I feel

like the writers of this test really get what drives people at least in their concerns and the issues

they may have with other people. One of the major things the 'blue' personality type values is

honesty and there's no quicker way onto my grudge list than to lie to me. I am most certainly

worry-prone and moody. I feel like my personality profile matches up more with my second

choice of approaches, Contingency Theory. I feel like the Quantitative approach is more useful

as an organization wide strategy, but I do prefer the use of Contingency Theory in interacting

with employees or for use in their everyday work.

As I already stated above, I can be moody and I am definitely worry-prone. The

moodiness comes mostly when I am afflicted by my allergies or if I feel wronged. I have been

working on this for almost two decades now, practicing mindfulness and similar coping

mechanisms. The sense of worry is harder to combat. It mostly comes from the logical part of

my brain that wants to be ready for the worst, but there is a part of it that comes from unrealistic

expectations I have sometimes. I have a lot of trouble with roommates because I expect them to

keep the house at least as clean as I do and it's been about 8 or 9 years since I've had roommates

that do that. I do need to work on giving people an easier time about certain things, specifically

tasks which have no due date.

My strengths are harder for me to tack down personally, so I'm glad I took this

personality quiz. I know that I am creative. I've often described myself as an "ideas guy". I

didn't really think of myself as loyal, but I can see it, looking back, now that I've been attributed

a personality type. That type of bonding comes from my search for intimacy in my relationships

and can be very helpful both in leadership positions and as a follower. I do live to serve. I feel at my happiest and my most useful when I know that I am being helpful or providing a quality service to someone. I've quit jobs because they don't meet my personal standards of quality or allow me to provide a helpful service. I've also experienced this call to service as a leader. When I was in Boy Scouts, I was often elected to the Senior Patrol Leader position because I saw it not just as authority, but a position to help my fellow scouts, especially the less experienced, to do the things they wanted and to learn the skills or earn the badges they wanted. We took our first float trip, week long hiking trip, and created fun and interesting fundraisers to make those dreams happen.

I think I've learned a lot about myself through this assignment. I honestly haven't thought much about how my personality affects my leadership and management abilities, at least not in the context of management. I now know which pitfalls to avoid and problems I have to work on as a potential leader and manager. It's not just balancing that strictness or authority with respect for your employees and comradery, it's figuring out how you and others are affected by your personality and making efforts to improve and not to react to the things which may set you off. I'm going to keep thinking about this and continue improving my management skills and personality flaws.