

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING VISUAL MEDIA ON WRITING SKILL OF THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS OF STATE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL 1 DEPOK YOGYAKARTA IN ACADEMIC YEAR 2013/ 2014

SUPARMAN

STKIP Paracendekia NW Sumbawa
e-mail: mansupar52@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper is aimed to find out the effect of using visual media on writing skill. The participants of this research were the eleventh grade students of state senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta in academic year 2013/ 2014 which consisted of 31 students in experimental class and 31 in control class. This research is a quasi experimental research. The instrument used in collecting data is test. The tests are given twice, pre test and post test. The aim of administering the test is to know the students' writing ability before and after visual media is applied. *ANCOVA* tests are used to analyze the student's writing ability between experimental and control class after visual media is applied. Based on the data analysis, it was found that there was a significant difference between writing ability of the students taught by using visual media and those who were not. After proving the hypothesis by *ANCOVA* test, at 5% level, the table value of F for $d1 = 1$ and $F2 = 60$ was 4.00 and at 1% level of the table value of F was 7.08. Both of these values were small than calculated value of 171.161 was greater than table value, and accordingly this research infer that F-ratio was significant at both levels which means the difference in group means was significant. It was found that the significance value was $0.000 < 0.05$, then the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. So, there is a significant difference between writing ability of teaching English using visual media on writing skill of students taught by using visual media and those taught without using visual. It means that alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted.

Key words: *The Effect, Visual Media and Writing Skill.*

INTRODUCTION

Language is primarily a system of communication among human being in their community. Pei and Gaynor (in Alwasilah, 2011: 4) state that language is system of communication by sound, i.e., through the organs of speech and hearing, among human beings of a certain group or community, using vocal symbols possessing arbitrary conventional meaning. Furthermore, communication can be divided into two; verbal communication and written communication, for examples English exists in two forms, spoken and written.

Furthermore, English classified into four important skills that must be possessed by students to master English well. The skills are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In Indonesia, English as a compulsory subject, there is no reason for students not to master those skills. According to Brown (2001: 232), in teaching languages skills, to teach the many aspects of one skill, where teachers deal with skills; say reading, then, they will also deal with related listening, speaking, and writing skills.

This research conducted the writing skill, and it focused on writing skill. Writing is one of four skills in language learning. Harmer (2007: 112) explains that writing is one of the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

It is seen as the most difficult and complex and it is the important competences that must be mastered by students. It is not an easy process to write correctly, because it is obviously a complex process. The problems faced in writing are various. The mistakes made by students in writing skill include grammar, vocabulary, mechanics (spelling or punctuation), fluency (style and ease of communication), language use and form or organization (Hughes, 2003: 101). According to Harmer (2003: 255-257), the difficulties that faced by students in writing are not only in grammar and vocabulary but there are also matters of letter, word, text formation shown by handwriting, spelling, layout and punctuation.

When a teacher wants to teach writing skills, they needs media to help their students to write well, such as visual media that can help to improve students' writing ability. According to Sudjana and Rivai (2002: 11), visual media appropriate to improve students' writing ability. Garson (2012: 54) adds that visual media in teaching can improve classroom instruction and student understanding.

Visual media is kinds of media that can be seen and can be touched by the teacher on the students related to the subject of the study. Using various visual media in the classroom has always been a challenge, and how to bring these media in the classroom is more than a challenge. Students and teachers should be able to use them in their classrooms. Media provide teachers and students with creative and practical ideas. They enable teachers to meet various needs and interests of their students. In this study, researcher would be applied Visual Media to teach writing skill on eleventh grade students of state senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta.

The eleventh grade students are demanded to write. However, they have difficulties in writing. Students do not know appropriate strategies how to write and comprehend writing texts well. Students have limited vocabularies and bad grammatical competence. Students get difficulties to comprehend either short sentences or long sentences and longer words. If students do not know half the words in the text, students will have great difficulty in comprehending the text as a whole.

In order to solve the students' writing problems, this research only focused on teaching narrative text by using visual media. The visual media used only cartoons and pictures to teach narrative text to the eleventh grade students of state senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta. There were two reason of choosing narrative text as the topic in this research. The first, narrative text was appropriate with cartoons and pictures media to improve students' writing ability. The second, the syllabus of the eleventh grade students in second semester consists of three topics. Those were narrative text, hortatory expositions and spoofs, then this research must be match with the syllabus, and narrative text was only appropriate to cartoons and pictures media. Based on the problem above, the problems of this research are formulated as follows:

1. How is the writing ability of the students taught by using visual media of the eleventh grade students of state senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta?
2. How is the writing ability of the students taught by using conventional media of the eleventh grade students of state senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta?
3. Is there any significant difference between the writing ability of students taught by using visual media and that of students taught by using conventional media of the eleventh grade students of state senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta?

METHOD

Quantitative Method

This research used a quasi-experimental research. It used the pre test and post test design. The principle of a quasi experimental design that if two groups were selected, one group (the experimental class) was given a special treatment, while the other (the control class) was not.

This research belongs to quantitative research. Quasi experimental researches did not random assignment participants to groups. Similarly, Creswell (2008: 313) explains quasi experimental include assignment, but not random assignment of participants to groups. It is because the experimenter cannot create groups for the experiment. The number of groups/individual compared into two or more. Therefore, the number of interventions that use one or more interventions, while the number of times the dependent variable is measured is just one. This research involved two groups; those groups received different teaching treatment, i.e. different technique. Then, the difference was at the use of visual media on the teaching of writing. The experimental group was taught by using visual media on writing skill. Meanwhile, the control group was taught without visual media

The population of the research includes all of the eleventh grade students of senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta in the academic year of 2013/2014. The eleventh grade students of state senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta which were consists of six classes. Those were *XI IPS 1*, *XI IPS 2*, *XI IPS 3*, *XI IPA 1*, *XI IPA 2* and *XI IPA 3*. There were 31-33 students in each class. The total number of the population was 193 students.

Sample in this research was *XI IPS 1* which has 31 students as experimental class and *XI IPS 2* has 31 students as control class. According to Arikunto (2010: 174), sample is representative of population that will be observed. Sample technique is the selection, it should be done in such a way that every member of the original set has an equal chance of becoming a member of the smaller set (Srinagesh, 2006: 294). In this research used *cluster random sampling technique*. It took two classes as sample, those were *XI IPS 2* as the experimental class and *XI IPS 1* as the control class.

Techniques for Collecting Data

There were four steps in conducting it, namely pre-test, treatment, and post test.

Research Instrument, Validity and Reliability

The instrument in this research was tested its validity and reliability to make sure that the instrument was valid and reliable before presenting it to the students.

Table 1. The Result of Reliability
Pre test Experimental class and Control class
Correlations

		Researcher	Teacher
Researcher	Pearson Correlation	1	.730**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	62	62
Teacher	Pearson Correlation	.730**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	62	62

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

The significant $0.000 < 0.01$, then the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected. So this research was reliable.

Post test Experimental class and Control class
Correlations

		Researcher	Teacher
Researcher	Pearson Correlation	1	.836**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	62	62
Teacher	Pearson Correlation	.836**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	62	62

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

The significant $0.000 < 0.01$, then the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected. So this research was *reliable*.

1. Scoring

In scoring, the researcher used the scoring form to grade the pre test, and post test. The theory from Nurgiyantoro (2010: 441- 442) will be used. The scoring system is as follows:

Content	: 13-30
Organization	: 7-20
Vocabulary	: 7-20
Language Use or Grammar	: 5-25
Total	: 100

Techniques for Analyzing Data

1. Descriptive Statistics

McMillan (2001: 206) states that descriptive statistics transforms a set of number or observation into indices that describe or characterize the data. The serving data including to descriptive statistics according to Sugiyono (2013: 207) is by using table, graphic, circle diagram, pictogram, the calculating of modus, median, mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum score of both experimental and control class. In this research would be find out the mean, minimum, maximum and the standard deviation. Those were analyzed by using computer program SPSS 16.0. Furthermore, the parameter to analyze the interval of students scores in writing ability categorized such as; very good, good, fair, and poor. The following table describes of conversion category of four scales in Nurgiyantoro (2010: 253).

2. Inferential Statistics

a. Test of Normality

Test of normality was used to know whether the research data were normal or not. A good data are the data which have normal distribution. To analyze the normality used SPSS 16.0 to know the significance value, if significance > 0.05, then the distribution of data was normal and it was able to prove the hypothesis and if the significance < 0.05, then the distribution of the data are not normal. The normality test used *Kolmogrov Smirnov test*.

b. Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity test used to know whether sample taken has the same variance and did not show the significant different among data. Johnson and Christensen (in Khotimah, 2013: 43) states that homogeneity refers to how well the different items in a test measure the same construct or trait. To know whether the variance of the samples was homogenous or not, it necessary to test the homogeneity. The formula of homogeneity testing applied the *Levene testing*. If $F_{calculated} < F_{table}$ to the standard error 5% and 1%, the variance is homogenous. If the $F_{calculated} > F_{table}$ the variance is not homogeneous.

c. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis test to prove whether there is a significant different writing ability between the students are taught by using visual media and those are taught without visual media can be conducted by seeing the value of probability (*P*) and the value of F-test.

To know the differences students' writing ability between experimental class using visual media and control class without visual media. This study the hypothesis testing was measured by using the *ANCOVA test*.

FINDING

The finding of this research are descriptive statistics, inferential statistics and discussion.

Descriptive Statistics

1. The Pre test of Control Class

Table 2. The Frequency Distribution Pre test Score of the Control Class

No	Classification	Score	Pre test of the Control Class
			Frequency
1	Very good	86-100	
2	Good	76-85	
3	Fair	56-74	5
4	Poor	10-55	26
	Total		31

The table above shows that students' ability in writing skill were poor to pair. There were five students who got score 56-74. There were twenty six students who got score 10-55.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics Pre test Score of the Control Class

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Test	31	44	63	50.16	4.776
Group	31	1	1	1.00	.000

From the table above, it can be seen the mean score of control class pre test was 50.16. The minimum score of control class pre test was 44. The maximum score of control class pre test was 63. The standard deviation was 4.776.

2. The Pre test of Experimental Class

Table 4. The Frequency Distribution Pre test Score of the Experimental Class

No	Classification	Score	Pre test of the Experimental Class
			Frequency
1	Very good	86-100	
2	Good	76-85	
3	Fair	56-74	7
4	Poor	10-55	24
	Total		31

The table above shows that the capability of experimental class was also poor to fair. There were twenty four students who got 10-55 and there were seven students got score 56-74.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics Pre test Score of the Experimental Class

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
test	31	44	76	52.84	6.435
group	31	1	1	1.00	.000

From the table above, it can be seen the mean score of experimental class pre test was 52.84. The minimum score of experimental class pre test was 44. The maximum score of experimental class pre test was 76. The standard deviation was 6.435.

3. Post test of Control Class

Table 6. The Frequency Distribution Post test Score of the Control Class

No	Classification	Score	Post test of the Control Class
			Frequency
1	Very good	86-100	
2	Good	76-85	
3	Fair	56-74	12
4	Poor	10-55	19
	Total		31

The table above shows that the capability of control class was poor to pair. There were nineteen students who got 10-55 and twelve students got score 56-74.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics Post test Score of the Control Class

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
test	31	46	66	55.16	4.236
group	31	1	1	1.00	.000

From the table above, it can be seen the mean score of control class post test was 55.16. The minimum score of control class post test was 46. The maximum score of control class post test was 66. The standard deviation was 4.236.

4. Post test of Experimental Class

Table 8. Frequency Distribution Post test Score of the Experimental Class

No	Classification	Score	Post test of the Experimental Class
			Frequency
1	Very good	86-100	1
2	Good	76-85	13
3	Fair	56-74	17
4	Poor	10-55	
	Total		31

The table above shows that the capability of experimental class students is fair to very good. There were seventeen students who got 56-75, thirteen students were got score 76-85 and there were only one student who got 86-100

Table 9, Descriptive Statistics Post test Score of the Experimental Class

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
test	31	63	88	70.94	4.864
group	31	1	1	1.00	.000

From the table above, it can be seen the mean score of experimental class post test was 70.94. The minimum score of experimental class post test was 63. The maximum score of experimental class post test was 88. The standard deviation was 4.864.

A. Inferential Statistics

1. Normality testing

To measure whether the distribution was normal or not, *Kolmogorov Smirnov* was used. It was found that the distributions of pre test and post test in control class and experimental class were normal when it was measured based on the level of significance of 0.05. The result of pre test and post test in experimental class and control class is displayed as follows:

Table 10. The Result of the Normality test of writing Ability.

Variables	P Value	A	Statement
Pre Experimental	0.369	0.05	Normal
Post Experimental	0.592	0.05	Normal
Pre Control	0.288	0.05	Normal
Post Control	0.379	0.05	Normal

From the table above it was found that *Kolmogorov Smirnov* calculation both of pre test in experimental class and control class were higher than 0.05, while pre test in experimental class was $0.369 > 0.05$ and pre test in control class was $0.288 > 0.05$. It means that the distribution was normal.

In the post test, the result of post test in experimental class and control class were higher than 0.05, while post test in experimental class was $0.592 > 0.05$ and post test in control class was $0.379 > 0.05$. It means that the distribution was normal.

1. Homogeneity testing

Table 11. Pre test Control Class and Experimental Class

Levene Statistic	df 1	df 2	Sig.(P)	Interpretation
1.398	1	60	.242	Homogeneous

Tabel 12. Post test Control Class and Experimental Class

Levene Statistic	df 1	df 2	Sig.(P)	Interpretation
.828	1	60	.366	Homogeneous

Based on the calculation above, the pre test of control and experimental class, it was found that the significance value $0.242 > 0.05$. It means that the samples were homogeneous.

While the post test of control and experimental class, it was found that the significance value $.366 > 0.05$. It means that the samples were homogeneous.

2. Hypothesis testing

To prove whether visual media is effective to teach writing skill or not, ANCOVA test was used.

Table 13. Test of Between-Subject Effects

Dependent Variable : After

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Method	1.299	1	1.299	.066	.799
Before	44.479	1	44.479	2.245	.139
Method*before	26.239	1	26.239	1.324	.255

The table shows in the method*before line, while it was found that the significant $0.255 > 0.05$, then the null hypothesis (H_0) was accepted. It means that there was not interaction between method variable and before variable..

Table 14. Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: After

Method	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Non visual	55.16	4.236	31
Visual	70.94	4.864	31
Total	63.05	9.148	62

The table above shows the descriptive statistics from dependent variable. There were two groups to measure the mean, the standard deviation, and the number of samples.

Table 15. Test of Between-Subject Effects

Dependent Variable: After

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	3929.351 ^a	2	1964.675	98.609	.000
Before	72.560	1	72.560	3.642	.061
Method	3410.179	1	3410.179	171.161	.000
Total	251561.000	62			
Corrected Total	5104.855	61			

R Squared+,770 (Adjusted R Square+,762)

The table shows in the method line, at 5% level, the table value of F for $d1 = 1$ and $F2 = 60$ was 4.00 and at 1% level of the table value of F was 7.08. Both of this value were less than calculated value of 171.161 was greater than table value, and accordingly the researcher infer that F -ratio was significant at both levels which means the difference in group means was significant. It was found that the significant of value was $0.000 < 0.05$, then the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. So, there is a significant difference between writing ability of teaching English using visual media on writing skill of students and those were without taught by using visual. It means that alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted.

Table 16. Adjusted General Mean

Dependent Variable: After

Method	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Non visual	55.421 ^a	.813	53.794	57.048
Visual	70.676 ^a	.813	69.049	72.303

Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: before = 51,50

The table above shows the adjusted mean of groups in experimental class and control class, hence the adjusted mean for visual media in experimental class was 70.676 and the adjusted mean for non visual media in control class was 55.421.

DISCUSSION

This research was done at state senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta, after conducting this research, it was found that visual media was appropriate as a good media to be employed in teaching writing for the level senior high school, because visual media could be help the students to be fun, enthusiastic and enjoy in writing activity. It was given good effect to the students' scores, it can be seen the students' scores before giving visual media and after administrating it.

It was proven from the result of the ANCOVA test, it was found that at 5% level, the table value of F for $d1 = 1$ and $F2 = 60$ was 4.00 and at 1% level of the table value of F was 7.08. Both of these values were less than calculated value of 171.161 was greater than table value, and accordingly the researcher infer that F_ratio was significant at both levels which means the difference in group means was significant. It was found that the significant of value was $0.000 < 0.05$, then the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. So, there is a significant difference between writing ability of teaching English using visual media on writing skill of students and those were without taught by using visual. It means that alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted.

Furthermore, the mean score of the writing ability of the students after taught by using visual media was 70.94. It was significantly higher than that of writing ability of the students before taught by using visual media 52.84. While the mean score of the writing ability of the students after taught by using conventional media was 55.16. It was slightly higher than that of writing ability of the students before taught by using conventional media 50.16.

It was found that *Kolmogorov Smirnov* calculation both of pre test in experimental class and control class were higher than 0.05, while pre test in experimental class was $0.369 > 0.05$ and pre test in control class was $0.288 > 0.05$. It means that the distribution was normal. In the post test, the result of post test in experimental class and control class were higher than 0.05, while post test in experimental class was $0.592 > 0.05$ and post test in control class was $0.379 > 0.05$. It means that the distribution was normal.

Homogeneity testing is a test to measure whether the samples are homogeneous or not. To measure the homogeneity of the sample, *Levene Statistic* was applied. The calculation is as follows: Based on the calculation, the pre test of control and experimental class, it was found that the significance value $0.242 > 0.05$. It means that the samples were homogeneous. While the post test of control and experimental class, it was found that the significance value $0.366 > 0.05$. It means that the samples were homogeneous.

CONCLUSION

After conducting the research on investigating the influence of teaching English through visual media in relation to students writing ability, it was proved that visual media was useful to improve students on learning writing. By using visual media, the students can easily arrange or write sentences through imaging the visual media. In addition, visual media could attract the students' interest because basically they like seeing the visual media. Based on the formulation of the research findings can be concluded as follows:

1. The mean score of the writing ability of the students taught by visual media of the eleventh grade students of state senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta was 70.94.
2. The mean score of the writing ability of the students taught by using conventional media of the eleventh grade students of state senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta was 55.16.
3. There was a significant difference between the writing ability of the students taught by using visual media and that of the students taught by using conventional media of the eleventh grade students of state senior high school 1 Depok Yogyakarta. It was proven that the calculation result of the ANCOVA test, it was found that at 5% level, the table value of F for $d1 = 1$ and $F2 = 60$ was 4.00 and at 1% level of the table value of F was 7.08. Both of these values were less than calculated value of 171.161 was greater than table value, and accordingly the researcher infer that F_ratio was significant at both levels which means the difference in group means was significant. It was found that the significant of value was $0.000 < 0.05$, then the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. So, there is a significant difference between writing ability of teaching English using visual media on writing skill of students and those were without taught by using visual. It means that alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted.

SUGGESTIONS

Based on the conclusions, some suggestions which were addressed to the teachers, students, and other researchers.

1. For teachers
 - a. In order to improve the students' writing ability at senior high school, English teachers are suggested to apply visual media in writing activities.
 - b. Teachers are suggested to be more creative and innovative in using various kinds of interesting teaching media which accompany the materials, so that the students will be more active and encouraged to learn and students do not get difficulty in writing.
2. For students
 - a. Students are suggested to apply visual media in writing.
 - b. Students are suggested to write more by applying the visual media so they will be more skillful in writing.
3. For the other researchers

For the researches who intend to conduct the research more detail about the effect of using visual media for teaching writing, it hopes that the research findings can be used as a starting point of the future

REFERENCES

- Burhan Nurgiyantoro. 2010. *Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Berbasis Kompetensi*. Yogyakarta: BPFE-Yogyakarta.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Chaedar Alwasilah. 2011. *Beberapa Mahzhab dan Dikotomi Teori Linguistik*. Penerbit Angkasa. Bandung
- Creswell, J. W. 2008. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research: Third Edition*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Gall, D. M., P. Gall, J. & R. Borg. W. et. al. 2003. *Educational Research: An Introduction (Seventh Edition)*. United State of American: Pearson Education.
- Garson, P. 2012. *The Impact of the Audiovisual Aids in the Teaching Learning Process at the Technical University of Cotopaxi during the Academy Period 2011-2012*. Technical University of Cotopaxi: Unpublished.
- Gurman, P. J. 2009. *Strategies for Successful Writing*. USA: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Harmer, J. 2007. *How to teach Writing*. Malaysia: Stento Associates.
- Heinich, R., M. Molenda, J. D. Russel & S. E. Smalind. et. al 1996. *Instructional Media and Technologies for Learning*. United States of American: Prentice-Hall. Inc.
- Hughes, A. 2003. *Testing for Language Teachers*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Johnson, A. P. 2008. *Teaching Reading and Writing*. USA: Rowman and Littlefield Education.
- Kane, T. 2000. *The Oxford Essential Guide to Write*. New York: Barkley Publishing Group.
- Kothari, C. R. 2004. *Research Methodology; Method and Techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited, Publisher.
- McMillan, J. H. 2001. *Research in Education*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Millrood, R. 2001. *Modular Course in English Teaching Methodology*. China: Teacher Development Series.
- Muschla, G. R. 2011. *Exploring Writing*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Nunan, D. 2000. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.Inc.
- Richard, J. C & Renandya, W. A. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, J. C. 2003. *Second Language Writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, J. 2004. *25 Prewriting Graphic Organizers and Planning Sheets*, New York: Scholastic Teaching Resources.
- Nana Sudjan and Ahmad Rivai. 2002. *Designing and Using Media for Teaching*. Sinar Baru Algensindo. Bandung
- Sugiyono. 2013a. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta, CV. Bandung
- _____. 2012. *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi: Mixed Methods*. Alfabeta, CV. Bandung
- Suharsimi Arikunto. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. PT. Rineka Cipta. Jakarta
- Srinagesh, K. 2006. *The Principles of Experimental Research*. United State of America: Elsvier, Inc.
- Wallace, T., Stariha, W. E & Walberg, H. J. et. al. 2004. *Teaching Speaking, Listening, and Writing*. Switzerland: IAE.
- Wileman, R. E. 1993. *Visual Communicating. Englewood Cliffs*, N. J: Educational Technology Publications
- The Effectiveness of Using Visual Media.....Suparman .*