













Figure 1 above shows a positive relationship between meeting management (independent variable) and decision making(dependent variable). The scatter plot shows at  $R^2$  linear value of (0.919) depicting a positive relationship between the two constructs. The implication is that understanding how best to manage meetings simultaneously brings about an increase in the level of decision making success.

**Presentation of Results on the Tests of Hypotheses**

The Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient is calculated using the SPSS 21.0 version to establish the relationship among the empirical referents of the predictor variable and the measures of the criterion variable. Correlation coefficients can range from -1.00 to +1.00. The value of -1.00 represents a perfect negative correlation while the value of +1.00 represents a perfect positive correlation. A value of 0.00 represents a lack of correlation. In testing hypotheses one to nine, the following rules were upheld in accepting or rejecting our alternate hypotheses: all the coefficient values that indicate levels of significance (\* or \*\*) as calculated using SPSS were accepted and therefore our alternate hypotheses rejected; when no significance is indicated in the coefficient r value, we reject our alternate hypotheses. Our confidence interval was set at the 0.05 (two tailed) level of significance to test the statistical significance of the data in this study.

**Table 1: Correlation Matrix For Agenda And Decision Making**

			Agenda	Problem Resolution	Growth
Spearman's rho	Agenda	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.878**	.679**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	98	98	98
	Problem Resolution	Correlation Coefficient	.878**	1.000	.872**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	98	98	98
	Growth	Correlation Coefficient	.679**	.872**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	98	98	98

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Research Data , 2018

From the result in the table 1 above, the correlation coefficient (rho) shows that there is a significant positive relationship between agenda and problem resolution. The correlation coefficient 0.878 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at  $p\ 0.000 < 0.01$ . The correlation coefficient represents a very high correlation between the variables. Therefore, based on empirical findings, the null hypothesis earlier stated is rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, it is

restated that there is a significant relationship between agenda and problem resolution. From the result in the table, the correlation coefficient (rho) shows that there is a significant positive relationship between agenda and growth. The *correlation coefficient* 0.679 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at  $p\ 0.000 < 0.01$ . The correlation coefficient represents a very high correlation between the variables. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between agenda and problem resolution.

**Table 2: Correlation For Scheduling And Decision Making**

			Scheduling	Problem Resolution	Growth
Spearman's rho	Scheduling	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.933**	.829**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	98	98	98
	Problem Resolution	Correlation Coefficient	.933**	1.000	.872**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	98	98	98
	Growth	Correlation Coefficient	.929**	.872**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	98	98	98

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: *Research Data, 2018 (SPSS output, version 21.0)*

The *correlation coefficient* 0.933 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at  $p\ 0.000 < 0.01$ . The correlation coefficient represents a very high correlation also indicative of a very strong relationship between the variables. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between scheduling and problem resolution. From the result in the table above, the correlation coefficient (rho) shows that there is a significant and positive relationship between scheduling and growth. The *correlation coefficient* 0.829 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at  $p\ 0.000 < 0.01$ . The correlation coefficient represents a high correlation and also indicates a strong relationship between the variables. Therefore, based on the findings, the null hypothesis earlier stated is therefore rejected and the alternate restated that there is a significant relationship between scheduling and growth.



**Table 3: Correlation Matrix For Cost Involvement And Decision Making**

			Cost Involvement	Problem Resolution	Growth
Spearman's rho	Cost Involvement	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.852**	.712**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	98	98	98
	Problem Resolution	Correlation Coefficient	.852**	1.000	.872**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	98	98	98
	Growth	Correlation Coefficient	.712**	.872**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	98	98	98

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Research Data , 2018

From the result in table 3 above, the correlation coefficient (rho) shows that there is a significant positive relationship between cost involvement and problem resolution. The high correlation coefficient of 0.852 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at  $p\ 0.000 < 0.01$ . Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate upheld. It is also evident that the correlation coefficient of 0.712 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and its significant at  $p\ 0.000 < 0.01$ . The correlation coefficient represents a high correlation indicative also of a strong relationship between the variables. Therefore, based on the findings, the null hypothesis earlier stated is rejected and the alternate upheld.

**Table 4: Correlation Matrix For Decision Strategy And Decision Making Success**

			Decision Strategy	Problem Resolution	Growth
Spearman's rho	Decision Strategy	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.796**	.656**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	98	98	98
	Problem Resolution	Correlation Coefficient	.796**	1.000	.872**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	98	98	98
	Growth	Correlation Coefficient	.656**	.872**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	98	98	98

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Research Data , 2018 (SPSS output, version 21.0)

From the result in the table 4 above, the correlation coefficient (rho) shows that there is a significant and positive relationship between decision strategy and problem resolution. The high *correlation* coefficient of 0.712 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at  $p < 0.000 < 0.01$ . Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between strategy and problem resolution. The result in the table also The *correlation* coefficient of 0.656 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is significant at  $p < 0.000 < 0.01$ . The correlation coefficient represents a high correlation indicative also of a strong relationship between the variables. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between strategy and growth. For the multivariate analysis, the partial correlation technique was used in testing the moderating effects of organizational culture and leadership styles.

**Table 5: Partial Correlation for the moderating influence of Leadership**

Control Variables			Meetings Management	Decision Making	Leadership
none <sup>a</sup>	Meetings Management	Correlation	1.000	.959	.916
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		Df	0	96	96
	Decision Making	Correlation	.959	1.000	.795
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		Df	96	0	96
	Leadership	Correlation	.916	.795	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		Df	96	96	0
Leadership	Meetings Management	Correlation	1.000	.946	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	
		Df	0	95	
	Decision Making	Correlation	.946	1.000	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	
		Df	95	0	

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

Source: Research Data , 2018 (SPSS output, version 21.0)

In table 5, the zero-order partial correlation between meetings management and decision making shows the correlation coefficient where leadership is not moderating the relationship; and this is,

indeed, both high (0.959) and statistically significant (p-value (=0.000) < 0.05). The partial correlation controlling for leadership, however is (0.946) and statistically significant (p-value (= 0.000) < 0.05). The observed positive "relationship" between meetings management and decision making is due to underlying relationships between each of those variables and leadership. Looking at the zero correlation, we find that both meetings management and decision making are highly positively correlated with leadership, the control variable. Removing the effect of this control variable reduces the correlation between the other two variables to be 0.946 and it is significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$ , therefore we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that: Leadership significantly moderates the influence of meetings management and decision making.

**Table 6: Partial Correlation for the moderating role of Technology**

Control Variables			Meetings Management	Decision Making	Technology
-none <sup>a</sup>	Meetings Management	Correlation	1.000	.959	.900
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		Df	0	96	96
	Decision Making	Correlation	.959	1.000	.769
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		Df	96	0	96
	Technology	Correlation	.900	.769	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		Df	96	96	0
Technology	Meetings Management	Correlation	1.000	.956	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	
		Df	0	95	
	Decision Making	Correlation	.956	1.000	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	
		Df	95	0	

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

Result from table 6 testing the zero-order partial correlation between meetings management and decision making shows the correlation coefficient where organizational culture is not moderating the relationship; and this is, indeed, both high (0.959) and statistically significant (p-value (=0.000) < 0.05). The partial correlation controlling for organizational structure, however is (0.956) and statistically significant (p-value (= 0.000) < 0.05.). The observed positive "relationship" between meetings management and decision making is due to underlying relationships between each of those variables and organizational culture. Looking at the zero correlation, we find that both meetings management and decision making are highly positively correlated with organizational culture, the

control variable. Removing the effect of this control variable reduces the correlation between the other two variables to be 0.956 and it is significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$ , therefore we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that: organizational culture significantly moderates the relationship between meetings management and decision making.

#### **4. Recommendations**

Findings from the results presented and conclusion above lead to the following recommendations:

1. The brewery organisations in Rivers State should ensure that Agenda for meetings are prepared and made available to members so that their discussions are better coordinated. This approach enhances better discussion and easy decision making at meetings.
2. Scheduling meetings is a critical management approach for successful meetings. Unscheduled meetings takes participants unawares and thus, inhibit better preparations for decision making. It is therefore very pertinent to schedule meetings so as to enhance effective decision making.
3. The cost involvement for organizational meetings must be kept at optimum level in order to keep low the percentage of operational costs. Some meetings are not necessary and thus, they constitute cost to organisations. Meetings should be hld only when they become realy important and decisions are seen to be critical for the success of the sector. Unnecessary meetings come with unnecessary costs.
4. The success of any meeting depends on the strategies adopted in arriving at decisions at meetings. It is very important that result oriented strategies involving prioritization and trade-offs etc should be factored in decision strategies during meetings.
5. The leadership of the organisations in the sector should be committed to ensuring that meetings are better managed so as to encourage better decision making given the nature of the sector and its threats.
6. The study recommends that organizations should employ the best state of the art technology in the management of meetings. Some meetings may not necessarily be held physically in a hall or room, conferencing and virtual meetings are time and cost efficient. Contributions are impersonal and fear of physical contacts during deliberations are avoided.

## Reference

Anatasia & Martin, (2014). Cleverism former management consultant, former banker and venture capitalist.

Boris, E., Massimo, G., Daniele, M., Federica M., (2016). Meeting and Journey of strategy and management, 9(1);15-38. Department of international Business, university of Sydney, Sydney Australia).

Castillo, L., & Dorao, C. A. (2013). Decision making in the oil and gas projects based on game theory: Conceptual process design. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 66, 48-55. doi:10.1016

Corbin Ball (2014). "Tech Tools" Event planning software and links page, high – content meetings technology Newsletter.

Gigerenzer, G., & Gaissmaier, W. (2011). Heuristic decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62, 451-482. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-120709-145346 Hanbury et All. Licensed Biomed central ltd. Author responded, author comments, Anfrial Hanbury

Langley, A, Mintzberg, H, Pitcher, P, Posada E, & Jan, S. (1995). 'Opening up Decision Making: The view from the Black Stool.' *Organizational Science*, 6(3), 260-279.

Martijn Aurik (2017), Product owner at Minute Amsterdam Area, Netherlands. 459 . online median university vs Amsterdan develop idea on minute ( meetings management)

Neider, L. L., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2011). Authentic Leadership Inventory (ALI): Development and empirical tests. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1146-1164. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.008.

Polasky, S., Carpenter, S. R., Folke, C., & Keeler, B. (2011). Decision making under great uncertainty: Environmental management in an era of global change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 26, 398-404. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.04.007

Schwartzman, H. B. (1989). *The Meeting Gatherings in Organizations and Communities*. London: Plenum Press.

Selart, M., & Johnson, S. T. (2011). Ethical decision making in organizations: The role of leadership stress. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99, 129-143. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0649-0  
Sharon Moriwaki. Co-chair Hawai energy policy forum

Vincent B, Bryarugaba, J & kyogbiirwe, J (2005), Organizational meetings management and benefits, *Journal of management Development*, vol 34 (iss8):pp march 2015.

VanVree, W. (1999). *Meetings, Manners and Civilization. The Development of Modern Meeting Behaviour*. London: Leicester University Press.