

Lucas Gobaco

Ramona M. Silver

ENGL-101C-05

27 March 2024

EXTRA CREDIT Self-Editing Assignment

Body paragraph:

When describing these everyday *illusions*, the **authors** present various *times* in the *past* where *people* have experienced these *illusions* and it had drastic *effects* on *their lives*, often becoming major *stories* on the *news*. The main **intent** of these *stories* is to demonstrate *times* *people* experienced these *illusions* and it had serious *repercussions*, effectively proving *their existence* and appealing to the *readers' logos*. But some of these **stories** include *consequences* and *elements* that are way more gruesome than the *others*, heightening the *readers' emotions* and appealing to the *readers' pathos*. For *example*, just like how the *Invisible Gorilla experiment* that the *authors* conducted to demonstrate the *illusion of blindness* or *inattentional blindness*, the *authors* tell a **story** of how a *captain* of an *American nuclear submarine* experienced the *illusion of attention*, causing the *submarine* to pierce a *Japanese fishing boat's hull*, resulting in many of the *fishing boat's crew* dead. Another **story** that the *authors* presented that contains gruesome *details* also about the *illusion of attention* is the *story* of *NFL quarterback Ben Roethlisberger's*, nicknamed "*Big Ben*", *motorcycle accident*. **Ben** was struck by a *driver* who was not under any *influence* but actually experienced the *illusion of attention* because of the *infrequency* of seeing *motorcycles* on the *road*. The **extremeness** of these *stories* captivates the *reader*, making it more likely that the *reader* is actively thinking about *what* the *authors* are saying and is becoming

convinced that these *illusions* are real if the *reader* wasn't already. The **authors** often present *stories* with dire *circumstances* like these throughout the *book* to make *their points* persuasive.

Conclusion paragraph:

The all-encompassing **argument** of the *book* is that *our intuition* leads *us* to experience *illusions* daily and *they* affect *us* more than *we* think. For *example*, **we** experience the *illusion* of *attention* when performing *tasks* that require a *lot* of *attention*. **We** feel that *we* are focused, but *we* are actually oblivious to *sights* and *sounds* that would otherwise be glaringly obvious. The **book** uses *testimonies* from *people* who experienced these *illusions* first-hand. For *topics* like daily *illusions*, first-hand **experiences** are the strongest *form* of *evidence* that *you* can present to prove *its validity*. Using other **forms** of *evidence* like *statistical evidence* is not as strong as first-hand *testimony* because the *reader* can choose to doubt the *methods* used to obtain the *data*. The *experiments* the **authors** presented clearly support their *findings*. The **anecdotes** and **stories** all describe *times* when *people* experienced an *illusion* and it impacted their *lives* severely. While maybe not as severe as the other *stories* in the *book*, the **Invisible Gorilla experiment** clearly proved the *validity* of the *illusion* of *attention*. More than *half* of the **subjects** clearly experienced the *illusion*. Something the **book** does well is that it reiterates *its stories* of *people* experiencing these *illusions* over and over again. By doing so, the **illusions** the **authors** describe seem more real. The large *amount* of **anecdotes** and **stories** the **authors** present provide strong *evidence* that the *illusions* the **authors** are describing are real and can have drastic *effects* on your *life*. The **evidence** that the **authors** used was not diverse enough. Even though first-hand **experiences** are the strongest *form* of *evidence* for demonstrating if daily *illusions* are present, it would have been nice to see other *forms* of *evidence* as well. Just using short *anecdotes* and *stories* throughout the

whole *book* is very repetitive and using other *forms* of *evidence* would make the *author's* ***argument*** stronger. ***The Invisible Gorilla*** was a very useful *read*. ***I*** have distinct *memories* of experiencing some of the *illusions* the *authors* presented, but ***I*** couldn't accurately describe *them* at all. But the *authors' descriptions* of the *illusions* and *stories* of other *people* who also experienced these *illusions* helped *me* understand what *I* was experiencing at the *time*, why *I* experienced *it*, and how to prevent the *illusions'* harmful *effects* from happening in the *future*.