

***News stories on TV and in newspapers are very often accompanied by pictures. Some people say that these pictures are more effective than words. What is your opinion about this?***

These days, the use of pictures ~~in on~~ press and on the screen has become more widespread ~~rather~~ than words in ~~a~~ news broadcasts. Yet there remains some disagreement as to whether such a trend should be considered in an optimistic or pessimistic ~~light~~ approach. While there are certainly valid arguments to the contrary, I personally believe that the advantages of this factor far outweigh its drawbacks.

First of all, it is an indisputable fact that the effect of colours on viewers is significant in terms of psychology. Images are colourful and are able to draw spectators' attention more than merely some text. Although affecting literacy positively, writings ~~does-do~~ not possess the ability to absorb people as such due to lack of beauty. Admittedly, sporting newspapers in which several pictures are set for firing the enthusiasm of interested individuals are particular examples in this regard even though their content ~~are-is~~ superficial such as tabloids.

Equally importantly, ~~though~~ however, pictures are more likely to be comprehensive compared with words. Not only does an impressive photo affect individuals readily and completely, but also it possesses the ability to be long-lasting. Despite consequences of some movies and pictures on children in terms of violence and unacceptable content in some cases, I contend that the role of images in conveying the information easily is recommended to be highlighted while humankind lives in a hectic-paced life and the necessity of fast news is undeniable.

~~In~~ any way of conclusion, I endorse the idea that the more pictures are used in news, the more influential the reports could be while these kinds of press are highly tied to people's visual sense and consequently, their comprehension.

**Vahid**