PHYSICAL APPEARANCE AND CLARITY OF PRESENTATION AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON TEACHING PERFORMANCE OF TEACHER TRAINEES

DR. SURESH BABU. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

K.S.C.T.E. BELLARY, KARANATAKA

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to investigate the influence that a teacher trainee's physical appearance and the clarity of their presentation have on their overall teaching effectiveness. An investigation into the ways in which these two aspects contribute to the efficiency of instruction and the trainees' perceptions of their own level of competence is carried out. The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship between a trainee's physical presentation, which includes aspects such as dress, grooming, and body language, and their capacity to provide instruction that is clear, engaging, and effective. The research will be conducted using a mixed-methods approach, which will include surveys, classroom observations, and performance evaluations. Additionally, the research investigates how the clarity of trainers' presentations affects the level of student involvement and the consequences of their learning. Clear communication and a professional look are positively connected with better ratings from both students and instructors, according to the findings, which show that both physical appearance and clarity of presentation have a major impact on teaching effectiveness. According to these results, it is essential for prospective educators to pay attention to their own presentation and communication skills in order to improve their overall performance and the effectiveness of their individual teaching.

Keywords: Appearance, Presentation, Influence, Teaching

Introduction

The profession of teaching is complex and requires a variety of abilities and qualities, including knowledge, the ability to communicate effectively, and personal qualities. The physical appearance of the instructor and the clarity of their presentation are two of the many characteristics that contribute to the efficacy of the education, but they are sometimes disregarded despite their importance. In contrast to the clarity of presentation, which incorporates the articulation, arrangement, and delivery of instructional information, physical appearance includes characteristics such as clothes, grooming, and body language. When it comes to the teaching profession, the impact of these characteristics might be quite significant. Students' early impressions of a teacher's trustworthiness and authority may be influenced by the teacher's physical appearance, which is often seen as a reflection of the teacher's professionalism and self-assurance. At the same time, clarity of presentation is essential for efficient information transfer since it guarantees that the material is presented in a way that is both intelligible and interesting to the audience. Despite the fact that these qualities are intuitively important, there is a paucity of empirical research that directly addresses the influence that they have on teaching performance, particularly among those who are in the process of becoming teachers. In an effort to address this vacuum, the purpose of this research is to investigate the ways in which physical appearance and clarity of presentation influence teaching performance. The study will investigate the link between these characteristics and the impact that they have on the level of student involvement, the results of learning, and the overall judgment of the efficacy of teaching itself. It is possible for teacher training programs to get significant insights by gaining an understanding of the function that physical appearance and presentation clarity play from a teaching perspective. It is possible for educators to improve their teaching abilities and better satisfy the requirements of their pupils if they place significant emphasis on these components of teacher development. This introductory section lays the groundwork for a more in-depth investigation of the ways in which these frequently overlooked aspects contribute to the effectiveness of teaching and the development of one's professional career.

Over the course of many years, research in educational psychology has brought to light the significance of communication skills in the classroom. To be an effective educator, one must not

only have a comprehensive comprehension of the material being taught, but also possess the ability to articulate it in a way that is both clear and convincing. The clarity of the presentation is dependent on a number of essential components, such as the delivery of knowledge in an orderly manner, explanations that are coherent, and interactive involvement with the students. When a teacher presents information in a way that is easy to understand, students have a greater chance of understanding difficult topics, participating actively, and achieving superior learning outcomes. When it comes to the educational environment, one's physical appearance, on the other hand, plays a function that is both subtle and significant. There is a correlation between students' opinions of a teacher's authority and professionalism and the teacher's professional clothes and grooming. In addition, the teacher's ability to engage pupils and keep their attention may be impacted by their body language, which includes things like eye contact, gestures, and posture. Despite the fact that these qualities may seem to be less important than expertise in the subject matter, they make a major contribution to the whole teaching experience. It is necessary to have further empirical data in order to assess the influence that these elements have on teaching performance, despite the fact that their significance is widely acknowledged. The existing body of literature often focuses on individual components without offering a holistic perspective on the ways in which physical appearance and presentation clarity combine to influence the performance of students in the classroom. By conducting a comprehensive investigation into the ways in which these elements contribute to the success of teacher trainees, the purpose of this research is to help bridge this gap. We hope that by carrying out this study, we will be able to offer educational programs with insights that can be put into practice. The construction of training modules that place an emphasis on these essential features may be facilitated by gaining an understanding of the ways in which the physical appearance and clarity of presentation impact teaching performance. In the long run, this may result in more effective instructors who are more suited to engage pupils and cultivate an atmosphere that is conducive to learning that is educationally rewarding.

Approaches to Assessing Communication and their Instruments

There are a number of tools available for evaluating several types of interpersonal communication skills, including public speaking, teamwork, coaching, and socialisation

(Morreale et al., 1996). The subjective character of non-verbal behaviors makes it more difficult to evaluate abilities related to face-to-face communication, such as presenting skills, compared to reading and writing (Jones & Richarde, 2005). Maybe this is why out of 45 instruments that were examined by the Office of Educational Improvement (Morreale et al., 1996) for the purpose of evaluating students' abilities in listening, interpersonal skills, public speaking, communication anxiety, conflict management, and other "different aspects of communication" in non-discipline specific settings, most consisted of written assignments and only five required students to give a presentation. An evaluation of communication skills should include a behavioral sample (Daly, 1994) since it is not enough to simply know what makes good communication; one must also be able to put that knowledge into practice (Jones & Richarde, 2005). This is despite the fact that there is debate over whether competent communication is more of a question of knowledge or demonstrated performance (Blunck, 1997). The integration of modalities into message production is the subject of one method for analyzing communication performance (Jewitt, 2006; Kress, Jewitt, Ogborn, & Tsatsarelis, 2001). Word choice, vocal variability in rate, pitch, and intensity, clear articulation, using suitable language, and displaying nonverbal behavior that supports the verbal behavior are all pillars of effective spoken communication (National Communication Association, 1998). Notable and consequential communication studies have examined the interplay between the "Modes of Communication" (verbal expression, body language, and visual cues) and how they facilitate the production and dissemination of meaning (e.g., Knapp, 1972; Mehrabian & Ferris, 1967). Many different types of tests evaluate pupils based on how they express themselves. The Speech Communication Association of America's "Competent Speaker" test is among the longest running and most reputable of these (Morreale, et al., 2007). Presentation skills, including organization, language, voice, and body language, are evaluated by this tool. Another case in point is an online video-based training system that Yamashita and Nakajima (2010) used to evaluate students' presenting skills; this system included oral, visual, content, and resource components. Although these models of communication assessment highlight the mechanical aspects that students need to focus on, they fail to take into account the specific context of the classroom and how students' constructed perceptions impact their interaction. By focusing on how language and communication function in their social context, Firth (1966) and his pupil Halliday (1978) laid the groundwork for a new way of

thinking about how language and communication operate. According to these theories, every piece of communication has to be tailored to the specifics of the speaker's intended receivers as well as their own goals and objectives. There are those who believe that the only way to determine if a piece of communication was successful is to look at the context and goal of the speaker's words (Babcock, 1954). This is particularly relevant for those who are currently preparing to become teachers. Following this second line of thinking, many research on evaluating communication have ignored or downplayed the importance of speaker forms of expression in favor of gauging the audience's qualitative impressions of more abstract concepts. An instrument for assessing the communication capacities of medical practitioners toward their patients was studied by Iramaneerat, Myford, Yudkowsky, and Lowenstein (2009), for instance. The instrument included 13 items with category descriptors, including "friendly communication," "respectful treatment," "interest in me as a person," and many more criteria that only consider the patient's understanding of higher-order communication constructs, not the actual use of words, sounds, and body language to convey messages. Instruments have also been used in the field of optometry to evaluate candidates' competence in areas including "communicating with support personnel in a professional setting" and "discussing controversial health-related topics with patients" (Gross, Zoltoski, Cornick, & Wong, 2000). If these tools don't target students' ability to employ communication acts (verbal, nonverbal, and visual cues), they may not be able to help them reach their full potential as communicators. Some methods have tried to evaluate speakers' approaches to communication by looking at the characteristics they seem to be displaying, from the perspective of the other person or the audience. According to de Vries et al. (2019), the Communication Styles Inventory (CSI) is a six-dimensional behavioral model that examines the relationship between personality and communication styles. The six domain-level communication behavior scales that the CSI identifies are as follows: emotionality, expressiveness, precision, verbal aggression, questioningness, and impression manipulation. Some of the impression components that have been used to evaluate interpersonal communication ability include empathy, social relaxation, behavioral flexibility, affiliation support, and interaction management (Weimann, 1977). These methods of evaluating communication could help teachers improve their lessons by providing insight into their students' fundamental communication skills, but they still have a ways to go before they can fully prepare

students   for   real-world   interactions   and   presentations. To try to capture a more complete and relevant picture of communication, some evaluation tools look at both the ways it is spoken and the impression it gives. In his proposal for a communication assessment matrix, Blunck (1997) takes into account not just verbal and nonverbal communication modalities, but also factors connected to the created impression, such as responsiveness, appropriateness, and efficacy. Scheffer, Muehlinghaus, Froehmel, and Ortwein (2008) state that a worldwide rating scale that includes aspects of empathy, coherence, verbal expression, and nonverbal expression is valid in the field of health science. Seibold Kudsi and Rude (1993) look at both specific aspects of delivery, such eye contact and gestures, as well as more general aspects of presenting, like clarity and energy, in order to assess the efficacy of communication training. Despite include modalities and the higher-level built perception, none of these models take modal alignment into consideration directly. Also, the instruments developed by Blunck (1997) and Scheffer et al. (2008) fail to differentiate between vocalics and body language, and the models developed by Scheffer et al. (2008) and Seibold et al. (1993) possess just two constructed impression elements, leaving room for the possibility of confounding their effectiveness with other elements. Interactions between elements are not accounted for in any of the models. Incorporating both dimensions into the evaluation of communication allows us to evaluate their contributions to communication performance, even if the parts of Constructed Impression and Modes of Communication defined in the three prior composite models were restricted in scope. By comparing and contrasting the components of the Constructed Impression and Modes of Communication dimensions, researchers and students may better grasp the interdependencies between the two sets of information.

Objectives of the study :

1) To Find out the difference between trainee teachers who have a good appearance and those who have an awful appearance in terms of their teaching ability.
2) To find out the distinction between a video presentation of a course that is blurry and one that is clear with regard to training teacher trainees.
3) To find determine the difference between a lesson that is presented in a blurry manner and one that is presented in a clear manner in the event that teacher trainees seem to be disagreeable.

Hypothesis of the Study :

1) There is no When it comes to teaching performance, there is a considerable difference between trainee teachers who had a happy and terrible loading experience.

2) There is no there is a substantial difference between the video presentation of the lesson that is blurry and the video presentation that is clear for teacher trainees in terms of teaching performance.

3) There is significant When the presentations are blurry, there is a difference in the teaching performance of trainee teachers who seem to be nice and those who appear to be nasty.

Variables of the Study :

Dependent variable : Teaching effectiveness

Independent variable : Physical appearance

Type of Appearance

The Sample :

The sample for the research consists of sixty-four lessons that were observed by educational professionals working at B.Ed colleges. The four institutes of education that are associated with Kanpur University in Kanpur and are located in the Uttar Pradesh district of Kanpur state all contributed to the collection of this sample.

Tools Used :

1) IGNOU's timetable for teacher observation and evaluation

2) The schedule that IGNOU has decided to use for observing and evaluating teachers

3) A scale of three points was developed by the investigator to evaluate the physical appearance.

Data Collection :

In the present investigation, an experimental approach was used. The data gathering process was carried out in stages by the investigator.

Phase I : A selection of teacher trainees, consisting of two individuals with a pleasing physical appearance and two individuals with an unsuitable physical appearance. During the selection process, the investigator selected candidates based on the following criteria with great attention. for example, age, gender, and overall achievement in the classroom.

Phase II : Creating a video graph of the lecture was done by a few of the teacher trainees.

Phase III : Utilizing the observation schedule provided by IGNOU for the purpose of evaluating instructional effectiveness

Statistical Technique Used :

In order to analyze the data that was collected, statistical methods such as the mean, standard deviation, and "t" test were used.

DATA ANALYSIS :

Hypothesis 1 : There is no significant when it comes to teaching performance, there is a distinction between loading teacher trainees with good and bad teaching experiences.

Table 1: Mean, standard deviation, and "t" value of trainee teachers who have a good or disagreeable appearance.

Type of teacher	N	Mean	SD	"t"	Sign
Pleasant	32	52.0625	11.51139		
				3.5	S
Unpleasant	32	44.1563	5.24933		

Interpretation : By comparing to the information presented above, it is discovered that the "t" value is 3.5, and the table value that corresponds to it is 2.00 (df 62 and 0.05). The value of "t" that was obtained is higher than the value that corresponds to it in the table. The conclusion is that the hypothesis is not correct, and the research hypothesis is correct.

Hypothesis 2 : There is no significant difference between a video presentation of the class that was blurry and one that was clear, given to teacher trainees, with reference to their teaching performance!

Table 2: As well as the mean, standard deviation, and t value of the clear and blurry video presentation.

Video Presentation	N	Mean	SD	"t"	Sign
Blurred	32	41.4063	4.68945		
				7.6	S
Clear	32	54.8125	8.80776		

Interpretation:

The "t" number is determined to be 7.6 when the table that was just shown is referred to. The value that corresponds to the table is 2.00 (df 62 and 0.005 level). The value of "t" that was obtained is higher than the value that corresponds to it in the table. This results in the rejection of the null hypothesis and the acceptance of the research hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3 :

There is significant difference contrasts in the teaching performance of trainee teachers who seem to be nice and those who appear to be disagreeable when presentations are blurred.

Table 3: The mean, standard deviation, and "t" value in the event that the presentation is blurry.

Type of teacher	N	Mean	SD	"t"	Sign
Pleasant	16	41.8	4.14		
				0.5	NS
Unpleasant	16	40.9	4.73		

Interpretation :

According to the table that was just shown, the value of "t" is discovered to be 0.5. Two hundred and four is the value that corresponds to the table (df 30 and 0.05 level). The "t" value that was obtained is lower than the value that corresponds to the table. The conclusion is that the research hypothesis is not supported, and the null hypothesis is accepted.

© **Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)**

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

Page | 212

Table 4: There is a clear depiction of the mean, standard deviation, and "t" value.

Type of teacher	N	Mean	SD	"t"	Sign
Pleasant	16	62.2500	5.47		
				9.14	S
Unpleasant	16	47.3750	3.51		

Interpretation :

The value of "t" is discovered to be 9.14 when the table that was just shown is referred to. Two hundred and four is the value that corresponds to the table (df 30 and 0.05 level). The value of "t" that was obtained is higher than the value that corresponds to the table. This results in the rejection of the null hypothesis and the acceptance of the research hypothesis.

Table 5: Consider the mean, standard deviation, and "t" value in the event that the appearance is pleasing.

Video Presentation	N	Mean	SD	"t"	Sign
Blurred	16	41.875	4.74		
				11.25	S
Clear	16	62.250	5.47		

Interpretation :

The "t" value is 11.25, as determined by referring to the table that was shown before. Value of the table that corresponds to it. This results in the rejection of the null hypothesis and the acceptance of the research hypothesis.

Table 6: The "t" value, the mean, and the standard deviation in the event that the appearance is unpleasant.

Video Presentation	N	Mean	SD	"t"	Sign
Blurred	16	40.937	4.739		
				4.36	S
Clear	16	47.575	3.519		

Interpretation :

The value of "t" is discovered to be 4.36 when the table that was just shown is referred to. Two hundred and four is the value that corresponds to the table (df 30 and 0.05 level). The value of "t" that was obtained is higher than the value that corresponds to the table. This results in the rejection of the null hypothesis and the acceptance of the research hypothesis.

Conclusion

This study underscores the significant role that physical appearance and clarity of presentation play in shaping the teaching performance of teacher trainees. Our findings reveal that both factors are integral to effective teaching, impacting not only the perception of the teacher's professionalism but also the clarity with which instructional content is delivered. The research demonstrates that a professional appearance contributes positively to how trainees are perceived by students and peers. Well-groomed attire and appropriate body language foster an environment

of respect and authority, which can enhance student engagement and facilitate a more effective learning experience. Furthermore, clarity of presentation is crucial for ensuring that instructional material is communicated effectively. Trainees who exhibit well-organized and articulate delivery are better able to engage students, promote understanding, and achieve positive learning outcomes. The results highlight the need for teacher training programs to incorporate training on both physical presentation and communication skills. Emphasizing these aspects can help trainees develop a more polished and effective teaching style. This, in turn, can lead to improved teaching evaluations, enhanced student engagement, and better overall educational outcomes. In conclusion, integrating attention to physical appearance and presentation clarity into teacher training curricula can significantly benefit aspiring educators. By focusing on these often-overlooked elements, teacher preparation programs can better equip future teachers to succeed in their professional roles and positively impact student learning.

References :

[1] AITSL. (2012). National Professional Standards for Teachers, from
[2] Allen, M., & Bourhis, J. (1996). The relationship of communication apprehension to communication behavior: A meta-analysis. Communication Quarterly, 44(2), 214-226.
[3] Argyle, M., Salter, V., Nicholson, H., Williams, M., & Burgess, P. (1970). The communication of inferior and superior attitudes by verbal and non-verbal signals. British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 9(3), 222-231.
[4] Babcock, C. M. (1954). The critical importance of communication in general education. Journal of Communication, 4(3), 94-97.
[5] Berger, C. R. (2005). Interpersonal communication: Theoretical perspectives, future prospects Journal of Communication, 55(3), 415-447.
[6] Blunck, P. M. (1997). A communication competency assessment framework: A literature review of communication competency and assessment (ED410621). Washington, DC: Northwest Regional Educational Lab.
[7] Cronin, M., & Glenn, P. (1991). Oral communication across the curriculum in higher education: The state of the art. Communication Education, 40(4), 356-367.
[8] Daly, J. A. (1994). Assessing, speaking and listening: Preliminary considerations for a national assessment. In S. Morreale & M. Brooks (Eds.), 1994 NCA summer conference proceedings and prepared remarks: Assessing college student competency in speech communication (pp. 17-31). Washington, D.C.: National Communication Association.

[9] Duran, R. L. (1983). Communicative adaptability: A measure of social communicative competence. Communication Quarterly, 31(40), 320-326.

[10] Hinkle, L. L. (2001). Perceptions of supervisor nonverbal immediacy, vocalics, and subordinate liking. Communication Research Reports, 18, 128–136.

[11] Jones, E. A., & Richarde, S. (2005). NPEC Sourcebook on assessment: Definitions and assessment methods for communication, leadership, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, and quantitative skills Washington, DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.

[12] Keyton, J., Beck, S. J., Messersmith, A. S., & Bisel, R. S. (2010). Ensuring communication research makes a difference. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 38(3), 306- 309.

[13] Rubin, R. B., Rubin, A. M., & Jordan, F. F. (1997). Effects of instruction on communication apprehension and communication competence. Communication Education, 46, 104-114.

[14] Seibold, D. R., Kudsi, S., & Rude, M. (1993). Does communication training make a difference?: Evidence for the effectiveness of a presentation skills program. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 21(2), 111-131.

[15] Aggarwal J.C (1975) Educational Research : An Introduction. New Delhi: Arya Book Depot.

[16] Best J.W (1971) Research in Education. New Jersey : Prentice-Halc

[17] Garret H.E (2006) Statistics in Psychology and Education. Subject publication.

[18] Sharma, R.A (2006) Basic Experimental Designs in Educational and Psychological Research. Surya Publication Pp 99-143.

[19] Yadav, M.S. Lakshmi, T.K.S (2003) Conceptual Inputs for secondary Teacher Education. The Instructional Role NCTE.

© **Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)**

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

Page | 216