INTERNATIONAL GRADUATE COLLOQUIUM

i-SPEAK 2026

SPORTS AND PHYSICAL EXERCISE ASSEMBLY OF KNOWLEDGE SHARING



SERIES 1. 2026

COLLOQUIUM PROCEEDINGS

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Malaysia, 10 February 2026

eISBN 978-629-7989-01-3

The Relationship of Coach Leadership Style on Athletes' Performance Among Student Athletes KARISMA UiTM Seremban 3

Firdaus Zulkifli[1], & Azman Ahmad Tajri[1*]
[1]*Faculty of Sports Science and Recreation, University Technology MARA, Seremban Campus, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia*
[*]*Corresponding author: azmantajri@uitm.edu.my*

Keywords: *Coach Leadership Style, Athletes' Performance, Student-Athletes*

I. Introduction

Athletes need technical instruction, tactical advice, and emotional support from coaching leadership to motivate, perform, and grow. Research shows that democratic leadership, training and instruction, positive feedback, and social support improve athletes. Negative leadership may decrease motivation and achievement. Coaching effectiveness is crucial in Malaysia's competitive university sports environment, especially for student-athletes competing in KARISMA, MASUM, SUKMA, and the SEA Games. This study uses the Revised Leadership Scale for Sport to examine how KARISMA student-athletes at UiTM Seremban 3 perform in relation to their coach's leadership style.

II. Methods

This quantitative study utilised a correlational research design. A total of 158 KARISMA student-athletes from UiTM Seremban 3 were chosen to be respondents. The Revised Leadership Scale for Sport (RLSS) was used to collect data on how athletes thought their coaches led them. The scale looked at things like democratic behaviour, autocratic behaviour, training and instruction, positive feedback, and social support. The Athlete's Subjective Performance Scale (ASPS) was used to measure how well the athletes did. Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation analysis were used to look at the data that had been gathered to find out how coach leadership style and athlete performance were related.

III. Result and Discussion

A. *Coach Leadership Style*

Table I showed that Autocratic Behaviour had the highest mean (2.81), followed by Democratic Behaviour (2.45). The mean scores for Social Support (2.04), Positive Feedback (1.73), and Training & Instruction (1.59) were lower. This shows that coaches generally utilise an autocratic style of leadership, which puts more emphasis on control and authority than on support and teaching. The lower grades in feedback and training instructions show that less attention is being paid to athlete involvement and motivational assistance.

Table I
Descriptive of Coaching Leadership Style

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation (SD)	Rank
Autocratic Behavior	2.81	0.953	1
Democratic Behavior	2.45	0.895	2
Social Support	2.04	0.670	3
Positive Feedback	1.73	0.599	4
Training & Instruction	1.59	0.437	5

B. *Athletes' Performance*

According to Table II, the level of success of the athletes is moderate with a mean score of 7.93 and a standard deviation of 1.51. Given this number, the athletes' performance is quite good, but not quite at a high or excellent level. In terms of physical training, psychological support, or the way the coach leads, this means that there is time for improvement.

Table II
Descriptive of Athletes Performance

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation (SD)	Level
Athletes Performance	7.93	1.51	Moderate

C. *Relationship between Coach Leadership Style and Athletes' Performance*

Table III shows a strong association (r = -0.200, p = 0.012, $p < 0.05$) between coach leadership style and athlete performance. Though small, the relationship is negative. Growing leadership style scores reduce performance. Our correlation is weak yet statistically significant. This implies that coach leadership affects more than athlete performance. Personal motivation, discipline, academic pressure, and environment may also matter. This shows that a bad leadership style can hinder performance.

TABLE III
CORRELATION BETWEEN COACH LEADERSHIP STYLE AND ATHLETES' PERFORMANCE

Variable		Athletes' Performance
Coach's Leadership Style	Pearson's r	-0.200*
	df	156
	p-value	0.012
	N	158

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This study accomplished its goals. The majority of UiTM Seremban 3 coaches used autocratic leadership. Moderate athletic performance. This study also indicated a weak negative link between coach leadership style and athlete performance. This suggests that leadership affects performance but is not the primary factor. This suggests that university athletes require a more balanced and responsive leadership style to improve performance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my family and friends for their constant moral support, understanding, and motivation throughout my academic journey. Their encouragement has been my source of strength in completing this research successfully. Thank you to everyone who has directly or indirectly contributed to this study.

REFERENCES

[1] Zhang, J., Jensen, B. E., & Mann, B. L. (1997). Development and validation of the Revised Leadership Scale for Sport. Journal of Sport Behavior, 20(3), 304–321.
[2] Zemikael, K. (2022). Coach leadership behaviour and athlete achievement.
[3] Yemiru, M. (2022). Coaching leadership styles and athlete performance at Defence Athletic Club, Addis Ababa.
[4] Samson, A., Bakinde, B., & Sciences, S. (2021). Coaching leadership and athlete performance.
[5] Heil, J. (2018). Psychology of sport performance.