

REPRESENTATIVENESS BIAS IN SYLVIA TOWNSEND WARNER'S *THE PHOENIX*

Rommel Utungga Pasopati^{1*}, Annisa Deby Aulia², Rindrah
Kartiningsih³, Devito Andharu⁴, Muhammad Reza Ishadi
Fadillah⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5}Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: rommel@unitomo.ac.id

URL: <https://jeell.upjb.ac.id/index.php/files/article/view/51/version/51>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32682/jeell.v12i2.51>

Abstract

This article investigates matters of representativeness bias in Sylvia Townsend Warner's short story in 1940 entitled *The Phoenix*. This story tells about a phoenix displayed to death to show amusement of fire. However, the phoenix died as the fire came out and burned the place including the owner and the spectators. Then, how is representative bias illustrated on Sylvia Townsend Warner's *The Phoenix*? Through qualitative methods on psychological and literary studies, this article asserts the owner's misconception of the phoenix. The bird's specialty was its rare exoticness and myth about being immortal. The owner was shadowed with greed by opposing the true state of nature. He then had to accept the bitter truth of death as the pyre burned all out including himself and other persons. In conclusion, the story shows how representative bias accompanied with greedy thought may ignore otherness by accentuating mere profit.

Keywords: Amos Tversky, Daniel Kahneman, Representativeness Bias, Sylvia Townsend Warner, *The Phoenix*

To cite this article: Pasopati, R.U., et al. (2025). Representativeness bias in Sylvia Townsend Warner's *The Phoenix*. *JEELL: Journal of English Education, Linguistics and Literature*, 12(2), 25-39. <https://doi.org/10.32682/jeell.v12i2.51>

Introduction

Modern perspectives are indicated through human's sole abilities to define everything. That indication then results in positivity in which people must enable themselves to reach certain things, to measure countable numbers, and to predict the outcome (Luo, 2012; Sina, 2014). Those three aspects psychologically are almost impossible. There will always be things out of human's grasp.



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. ©2025 by author(s).

However, people keep holding to total certainty that actually brings them into further fallacy. The fallacy is resulted from various biases among human perceptions (Annasai et al., 2023; Lien & Yuan, 2015; Tversky, 2005). One of them is representativeness bias that shows how people could predict everything but that is never predictable at all.

Published in 1940, *The Phoenix* is Sylvia Townsend Warner's short story about a phoenix that is inherited by a Lord (Warner, 2020). The next owner puts it in an amusement park but its existence is not good enough to make more profit. The new owner decides to kill the bird as it is believed that its death will burst fire that is really good for further amusement (Harman, 1989). The bird then died alongside the new owner and everyone who watched its death. It is due to the burst not merely fire, but flame and blaze that burns thousand people and their surroundings.

Then, how is representative bias illustrated on Sylvia Townsend Warner's *The Phoenix*? This paper would like to expose the deed by the owner is caused by the representativeness bias. He only thinks about being greedy to get more money from the bird. He even never cares if the bird dies. As the death of the phoenix comes, it brings everyone with it. The blaze of the flame burns everyone down without any hesitation. It is due to negligence of natural objects done by the new owner to the phoenix.

By asserting this article, there are some significances to be attained. The first is to focus on literary work as reflection of everyday life, including Warner's short fiction *The Phoenix*. The second is to intertwine the ideas between literary and psychological studies especially in the sense of short fiction and representativeness bias. The third one is bring forward the idea of ecocriticism in Warner's short story by underlining its psychological bias regarding human's greed towards environmental matters.

Research Method

By using a qualitative method, certain concepts and written data are analyzed to answer the question in this paper. Written through description, online and offline scripts are used to explain correlations between Sylvia Townsend Warner's *The Phoenix* and representativeness bias supported by Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman alongside literary concepts and psychological ideas. Representativeness bias happens when stereotypes cloud any kind of decision, especially driven by human desire. This concept is used in this research to underline how psychological bias is reflected in literary work as mirror of realities in everyday life. Online and offline scripts are derived from books and journals to understand shown matters. The data analysis includes obtaining sources, reading sources carefully, comparing with other issues, quoting into paper, and writing down in reference lists. The research data comes from both Warner's short story and Tversky and Kahneman's arguments. Each of them is read then broken down into its every particular element. The discourses of the short story are mainly included to pinpoint significance of representativeness bias through the premises and logics used in Tversky and Kahneman's ideas. The following analyses then include how the story illustrates greedy domination towards natural objects.

Here, Warner's short story is the object while Tversky and Kahneman's idea is a tool to analyze. More elaborations related to opposite analysis are also provided in addition furthermore.

Results and Discussion

Results

Greed and Domination over Natural Things

The short story of Warner tells about a phoenix, a mythical bird that has been treated differently by both of the owners. The former one is Lord Strawberry who had an aviary and the latter one is Mr. Poldero who has an amusement park (Harman, 1989). The difference is intact to the end of the story. In further matter, the treatments done by those two persons include how humans actually get involved with nature. While one admired and preserved it well, the other one gained profits out of it by dominating it in various matters to earn more money.

Lord Strawberry treated the bird in its best condition. He put it in a big cage where it could fly freely. The bird was his dream came true therefore after getting the bird, Lord Strawberry treated it well. Even though there were times when the phoenix no longer received attention from the public, there was no sense of domineering towards the phoenix even though he had earned it with great difficulties (Warner, 2020). This idea indicates how Lord Strawberry did not make the phoenix the object of gaining wealth or popularity. He could make the phoenix an object that can amuse the public so that creature will make him a lot of money, but he did not do it. It could be seen below;

Finally Lord Strawberry went himself to Arabia, where, after some months, he found a phoenix, won its confidence, caught it, and brought it home in perfect condition. It was a remarkably fine phoenix, with a charming character – affable to the other birds in the aviary and much attached to Lord Strawberry. On its arrival in England it made a greatest stir among ornithologists, journalists, poets, and milliners, and was constantly visited. But it was not puffed by these attentions, and when it was no longer in the news, and the visits fell off, it showed no pique or rancour. It ate well, and seemed perfectly contented. (Warner, 2020)

When Lord Strawberry died, he left nothing. His wealth has gone away to totally keep the phoenix in good health. The birdseed at that time was high in price since the war had just ended (Warner, 2020). The phoenix's destiny then must face turbulence. Many people suggest that it should go to the zoo, but then it was auctioned. When The London Times opened a fundraiser so that the phoenix could be at the London Zoo, students, naturalists, and schoolchildren donated to charity. Initially, Mr. Poldero won the phoenix at auction, indeed, because he felt that the bird would be useful for his circus troupe. Because of that, greed emerged from within Mr. Poldero. This is indicated below;

It costs a great deal of money to keep up an aviary. When Lord Strawberry died he died penniless. The aviary came on the market. ... as it happened Lord Strawberry died just after a world war, when both money and bird-seed were hard to come by (indeed the cost of bird-seed was one of the things which had ruined Lord Strawberry). The London Times urged in a leader that the phoenix be bought for the London Zoo ... Students, naturalists, and school-children contributed according to their means; but their means were small, and there were no large donations. So Lord Strawberry's executors ... closed with the higher offer of Mr. Tancred Poldero, owner and proprietor of Poldero's Wizard Wonderland. (Warner, 2020)

At first, when Mr. Poldero got the bird, he achieved much attention since he got much public support. He shows the bird to many people as he hopes to get more profit from it. However, the bird does nothing. He only flies from here to there without doing any interesting action. There is no uniqueness of the bird that people could see (Harman, 1989). It is true that the bird is mythical, but there it is doing nothing better. The bird slowly loses popularity since it does not shape further interests for many people. The ideas are noted below;

For quite a while Mr. Poldero considered his phoenix a bargain. It was a civil and obliging bird, and adapted itself readily to its new surroundings. It did not cost much to feed, it did not mind children; and though it had no tricks, Mr. Poldero supposed it would soon pick up some. The publicity of the Strawberry Phoenix Fund was now most helpful. Almost every contributor now saved up another half-crown in order to see the phoenix. ...

But then business slackened. The phoenix was as handsome as ever, and amiable; but, ... Even at popular prices the phoenix was not really popular. It was too quiet, too classical. So people went instead to watch the antics of the baboons, or to admire the crocodile who had eaten the woman. (Warner, 2020)

Mr. Poldero starts to get worried about the bird, especially since the phoenix does not give him much money because people no longer pay attention to it. The phoenix is just a graceful bird that does not do anything. His desire that the phoenix could soon give him wealth again, made him have the thought to make a life story for the phoenix. Then, he starts to plan something cruel with his manager, Mr. Ramkin. He would like to squeeze more profit out of the bird (Warner, 2020). The conversations between Mr. Poldero and Mr. Ramkin show that Mr. Poldero has a trick for the bird to create and to get the benefits he wants. He hatches a scheme so that the Phoenix could make money for him again. The path in realizing his desire to get back a lot seems very inappropriate.

There are three things that he does to the bird. First, he would make it as a collateral for the insurance. Second, he makes up a story about the bird that will bring out a big amusement for everyone but it has to stand above a

scented wood. Third, he forcefully ages the bird so that it could die to make better amusement that may gain more money in advance. Those are indicated below;

One day Mr. Poldero said to his manager, Mr. Ramkin:

"How long since any fool paid to look at the phoenix?"

"Matter of three weeks," replied Mr. Ramkin.

"Eating his head off," said Mr. Poldero. "Let alone the insurance. Seven shillings a week it costs me to insure the Archbishop of Canterbury."

"The public don't like him. He's too quiet for them, that's the trouble. Won't mate nor nothing. And I've tried him with no end of pretty pollies, ospreys, and Cochinchinas, and the Lord knows what. But he won't look at them." ...

We'd advertise it beforehand, of course, work up interest. Then we'd have a new bird, and a bird with some romance about it, a bird with a life story. We could sell a bird like that."

"PANSY. Phoenix phoenixissima formosissima arabiana. This rare and fabulous bird is unique. The World's Old Bachelor. Has no mate and doesn't want one. When old, sets fire to itself and emerges miraculously reborn. Specially imported from the East." ...

"I've read about it in a book," he said. "You've got to give them scented woods and what not, and they build a nest and sit down on it and catch fire spontaneous. But they won't do it till they're old. That's the snag."

"Leave that to me, " said Mr. Poldero. "You get those scented woods, and I'll do the ageing." (Warner, 2020)

The plans are going well. The first one is to get money to advertise the news. The second one is to attract more people to come. The third is the ultimate yet the cruelest one as a plan. Mr. Poldero, helped by Mr. Ramkin, will kill the phoenix slowly to get the best show at the end. The phoenix is hoped to bring out a big fire that will make people amused. Indeed, it will result in more money for Mr. Poldero. To do the inhumane plan, Mr. Poldero reduces the food of the bird, and then he puts other birds and alley cats to attack the phoenix. However, none succeeds. Then, Mr. Poldero decides to not only age the bird, but also to torture it. Since the phoenix is from Arabia with a dry desert climate, he abuses the bird by putting a sprinkle of water above it. It is done to make it sick. Then, the bird starts to cough and Mr. Poldero gets ready for the next phase. Those cruel actions are seen below;

It was not easy to age the phoenix. Its allowance of food was halved, and halved again, but though it grew thinner its eyes were undimmed and its plumage glossy as ever. The heating was turned off; but it puffed out its feathers against the cold, and seemed none the worse. Other birds were put into its cage, birds of a peevish and quarrelsome nature. They pecked and chivied it; but the phoenix was so civil and amiable that after a day or two they lost their animosity.

Then Mr. Poldero tried alley cats. These could not be won by manners, but the phoenix darted above their heads and flapped its golden wings in their faces, and daunted them.

Mr. Poldero turned to a book on Arabia, and read that the climate was dry. "Aha!" said he. The phoenix was moved to a small cage that had a sprinkler in the ceiling. Every night the sprinkler was turned on. The phoenix began to cough. Mr. Poldero had another good idea. Daily he stationed himself in front of the cage to jeer at the bird and abuse it. (Warner, 2020)

Then, the day has come for the final show. The sickened bird has made Mr. Poldero succeeded in inviting thousands of people to come. Indeed, he smiles since he gets a lot of money and he will gain more fame by the bird that will make a great show afterwards. He does not care whether the bird will die. Mr. Poldero is willing to torture living beings who have no fault whatsoever for him. His attitude is so domineering because the Phoenix is a very elegant and defenseless bird. Mr. Poldero feels that he had bought the bird, so he would be free to do whatever he wanted with it. His greed continues to make him do even more terrible things in order to achieve his goal of making the Phoenix grow old quickly. He only regards the money, as it is what he hopes ultimately by owning the phoenix. This is seen below;

When spring was come, Mr. Poldero felt justified in beginning a publicity campaign about the ageing phoenix. The old public favorite, he said, was nearing its end. Meanwhile he tested the bird's reactions every few days by putting a few tufts of foul-smelling straw and some strands of rusty barbed wire into the cage, to see if it were interested in nesting yet. One day the phoenix began turning over the straw. Mr. Poldero signed a contract for the film rights. At last the hour seemed ripe. It was a fine Saturday evening in May. For some weeks the public interest in the ageing phoenix had been working up, and the admission charge had risen to five shillings. The enclosure was thronged. (Warner, 2020)

Mr. Poldero is very confident that the bird will show great amusement by growing fire from its near-death condition. The death is the main show that will shape a big fire. Many people watch the cage enthusiastically. Even some directors of documentary films come to record the historical event. Those are included below;

"The phoenix," said the loud-speaker, "is the aristocrat of bird-life. Only the rarest and most expensive specimens of oriental wood, drenched in exotic perfumes, will tempt him to construct his strange love-nest." ...

"The phoenix," the loud-speaker continued, "is as capricious as Cleopatra, as luxurious as la du Barry, as heady as a strain of wild gypsy music. All the fantastic pomp and passion of the ancient East, its languorous magic, its subtle cruelties..."

The cameras clicked, the lights blazed full on the cage. Rushing to the loud-speaker Mr. Poldero exclaimed:

"Ladies and gentlemen, this is the thrilling moment the world has breathlessly awaited. The legend of centuries is materializing before our modern eyes. The phoenix..." (Warner, 2020)

At last, the phoenix dies. Indeed, it brings amusement. Its death triggers fire. However, it is not a usual fire in its bigger form. It is a flame, such a pyre that is so big that burns all things around the phoenix. All of the people including Mr. Poldero and Mr. Ramkin are burned. They all perished on the fire alongside all of the spectators. The ending is indicated below;

A quiver stirred the dulled plumage. The phoenix turned its head from side to side. It descended, staggering, from its perch. Then wearily it began to pull about the twigs and shavings.

The phoenix settled on its pyre and appeared to fall asleep.

At that moment the phoenix and the pyre burst into flames. The flames streamed upwards, leaped out on every side. In a minute or two everything was burned to ashes, and some thousand people, including Mr. Poldero, perished in the blaze. (Warner, 2020)

In the short story of *The Phoenix*, there are several points that show how greed and a domineering attitude toward something can really happen, as what Mr. Poldero did against the phoenix that he got. The situation from the start to the end shows how the phoenix is only seen as a tool to squeeze more money for Mr. Poldero after Lord Strawberry died. The story done brilliantly by Warner indicates how the natural thing is being dominated by humans (Warner, 2020). The domination is also accompanied by matters of greed to reach more wealth. This is indeed a matter of exploitation of natural aspects in its worst condition. That condition is the destruction or death itself. Nature that should be preserved then is destroyed unequivocally by human beings (Tversky, 2005). Humans show themselves as the owners of this world. They think that they are the only ones that could gain more advantages by doing anything including bringing havoc to natural beings. Mr. Poldero is in such a condition of bias. It is such prejudice done to something. Later, prejudice becomes the dominant aspect that affects all decisions. In this story, his intention to gain more profit has blinded his mind to kill the mythical bird.

Discussion

Representative Bias and Its Continuation

Formerly, representative bias is a matter related to economic aspects. Often in financial matters, people cannot think rationally, and most of them want a snappy way to get immense results (Irshad et al., 2016; Sina, 2014). This shows that the representative bias relates to money and thoughts that are gambling or not knowing what the final result will be. In business, investment and decisions often show how a person behaves irrationally as a result of frequent representativeness bias (Azhari & Damingun, 2021; Luo, 2012).

The situation then is quite related to psychological matters in which people used to think based on what has happened before. People tend to be careless of what will happen in the future (Papachristou, 2004; Xu & Harvey, 2014). Their ideas are stated only in present times by thinking that the future one may be similar to the present condition. Indeed, this is not wrong since people used to think in consistent condition. They also need such consistency in deeper conditions, for example identities (Djanarko & Pasopati, 2019; Smarandreetha et al., 2023). By being consistent, they may also conform to whatever may come in the future.

However, that psychological idea is about a bias. The rationality behind that idea is quite forceful to be applied in everyday life. If many things are coined as so, another one or the other may become so as well (Papachristou, 2004; Tyran, 2011). If this and that have the same rules, another will follow the same. That idea applies to almost anything, from economic to social and political decisions. There is such inevitability built based on relative condition (Ruslim, 2021; Tyran, 2011). In fact, being relative is ignored since the doers have prioritized the matter of things being inevitable to them. This is such a fallacy that may see that one aspect is quite related to the other in whatsoever. Even if it is not totally related, only an aspect about it could bring such biased trust that may start another action to be realized (Kovic & Kristiansen, 2017; Lien & Yuan, 2015).

Therefore, this bias is also named as gambler's fallacy. In this case, even if someone never wins, he/she will always bet since he/she believes that winning is such certainty (Tyran, 2011; Xu & Harvey, 2014). Actually, it is not a matter of certainty, but such a chance that will never contain any sureness in advance. Besides, whenever a gambler sees another person win, it brings him for definition to keep doing such gambling. Then, it becomes an addiction, not because he/she is always winning, but because he/she is waiting for the right time to win (Ayton & Fischer, 2004; Kovic & Kristiansen, 2017). Moreover, that win is believed to be bombastic with a lot of profits. Nevertheless, any profit that someone gets will never be in a similar amount of what he/she has ever gambled with. It is only a matter of satisfaction that is illusionary since it is based on unstable bias (Ayton & Fischer, 2004; Ruslim, 2021).

Representativeness bias is decision-making based on stereotypical or analogy thinking (Ruslim, 2021; Sina, 2014). It will cause people to make wrong financial decisions, namely decisions in which something does not increase wealth. There is also a study where people tend to carry out representative bias due to a past trend, so they have the desire to do the same thing even though in reality they will not know what results they will get later (Ayton & Fischer, 2004; Luo, 2012). It arises because one's belief in something that has happened is expected to happen again, a thought that is actually based solely on a desire established on greed.

Greed is well-known since it concerns humans. Humans are believed to have the basic nature to continue to desire more results than what they have achieved. The thinking of representative bias grounds greed dominating people's minds (Stöckl et al., 2015; Tversky, 2005). People do want immense

results for what they do, which will make people do greedy things to execute their will considering that human desires are boundless. In many aspects, the matter of greed is quite natural in humans' minds since they are destined to always want anything (Ayton & Fischer, 2004; Stöckl et al., 2015). However, what they want is quite different from what they need. Then, greed is a matter of satisfying desire rather than fulfilling need, especially every day.

Instance for greed is this one. Someone may be full in eating a fish by taking it from the sea. However, that someone wants more than a fish though he is already fulfilled. Then, he/she takes more fish to be sold. From the money, he/she could buy a car. That car is the greedy point of fishing a fish. It has transformed the matter of an object into an object of desire. It is not seen as it is but how it has become such a tool to satisfy the subject. However, the subject him/herself is not as a whole either since he/she will always have lacks that may procreate another greed in the following (Kovic & Kristiansen, 2017; Tversky, 2005).

Needs and wants are different things. Moreover, today, modern industry is working hard to successfully translate desire into needed motivation (Bougheas et al., 2015; Lien & Yuan, 2015). Nevertheless, come to think of it, a mere second is enough to realize that cravings are abnormal, urgent, and need immediate gratification. There is still a limit to the magnitude of human needs, but endless desires are not. Ultimately, maximum satisfaction can even be achieved with limited production results (Irshad et al., 2016; Tversky, 2005). Greed is often considered negative, which is because greed arises from negative behavior that often harms others. This is because to attain the goal of greed, humans usually tend to do bad deeds. Being controlled by greed also creates a feeling of being more dominant over something; naturally, humans will feel the most in authority and can justify various methods as long as they can achieve their goals (Annasai et al., 2023; Kovic & Kristiansen, 2017; Lien & Yuan, 2015).

Matter of representative bias could not be separated from greed. Moreover, its shift from economical to psychological points also expand understanding of it into matters of cultural studies (Bougheas et al., 2015; Clegg et al., 2015). That extension also touches on matters of literature in which its characters are a reflection of how people think, act, and deny in everyday life. Therefore, such bias is not a separate matter from everyday life (Adiputra, 2021; Sudani & Pertiwi, 2022).

The bias matters of humans' life so it is possible also to be found in literature. In literature, matters of cultural studies enrich the idea of element of surprise (Pasopati, 2016; Tversky, 2005). In many literature, it is commonly understood as a twist. Somehow, that twist is not without any precedent, but due to any ignorance done from former doings. In this case, ignorance is not a matter of being passive, but such an active one that is seen as a result or consequence of such action beforehand.

In other words, being ignorant is also rational since it is a matter of choice. If someone chooses this and leaves the others, he/she is doing ignorant action toward the other. It becomes worse if it is simultaneously

joined with greed (Salman et al., 2020; Wood & Griffiths, 2009). He/she as the doer will continue to ignore anything and prefer this one than the other. The reason behind it is no longer a matter of choice in the case of freewill, but a dominating desire that has controlled the person in certain actions (Azhari & Damingun, 2021; Barron & Leider, 2010). The reason could be the winning of id in unconscious matter. Matter of the supersized ego that comes out easily as reflection of id also enables that idea to be realized. Even the failure of superego in indication of written and unwritten regulations and habits to deter the id to be satisfied anytime could also be the main source of such ignorance (Listyaningsih et al., 2023; Sarmi et al., 2023).

The Bias and Fallacy of Unprecedented Outcome

The short story of the phoenix indeed indicates such representativeness bias inside. The main indication is seen in unequivocal relation between the bird and Mr. Poldero (Warner, 2020). Many times, he would like to squeeze more money out of it. He even did not care if his deed would slowly kill the bird. What he desired was merely fame and money. Those two aspects then at the end dominated him in reverse and brought him to horrible death.

In the story, Mr. Poldero is seen as a gambler who would like to give something to gain more profit. He knew that it was uncertain, but he believed it blindly that it would be exact in this true time (Luo, 2012; Stöckl et al., 2015). This is such a bias that plays merely on representation of the former condition. He thought he could predict everything. Later, what he really got is not fame but such bad results as a consequence of his own action in the past (Aulia et al., 2022; Warner, 2020). He imagined he could predict more outcomes, but he could not even predict his own ending.

There are four proofs in Warner's short story that contain matters of representative bias. In this story, the bias is the result of dominative desire alongside with the greedy action done by Mr. Poldero. First proof is that Mr. Poldero bought the bird at the auction since he wanted the fame inherited from the popularity of Lord Strawberry when he had that phoenix. Mr. Poldero thought that the fame will be gotten easily without considering why and how Lord Strawberry has treated the bird before (Warner, 2020). He also assumed that the bird is expensive since it is a matter of treasure. Moreover, the phoenix for him is only a thing or even a tool to enhance more popularity.

In this case, Mr. Poldero is dictated by the representativeness bias. He saw that other things auctioned could gain more popularity that is so instant and constant to the owner. However, consistency of fame is not endless (Tversky, 2005; Wood & Griffiths, 2009). Lord Strawberry could preserve the popularity since he treated the bird very well. He bought the best seed and built a big cage for the bird. In reverse, Mr. Poldero only put the bird in a small cage with bad treatment (Warner, 2020). Even he later hurt the bird so much until finally it faced its death severely.

Mr. Poldero's action also represented greed since he did not want to do much but would like many returns in advance. He did not want to struggle

more since what he wanted is instant fame with a long lasting situation. He assumed that he had sacrificed his money to buy that bird. However, he did not win the bird like what Lord Strawberry did before (Warner, 2020). He only saw the bird as such a complementary animal. He even did not know the origin of the bird before he checked about it later. This is why he never got satisfied with the existence of the bird. It is due to his final wish is not the bird itself, but the attributes coming out from it, especially fame and wealth.

Second, Mr. Poldero presumed that the phoenix is so great in its own existence. He did not care about the historical background of the bird. It is in line with his job as owner of wonder world or amusement park. This is very contrast with what Lord Strawberry did. The Lord has a big cage like a zoo for the phoenix, while Mr. Poldero only had a small place designed for the public to pay, to come, to see, and to satisfy any curiosity within people's mind (Warner, 2020). The Lord found the bird as his dream came true, but Mr. Poldero only saw the phoenix as an instrument to collect more funds.

Moreover, the idea of a wonder world also shaped Mr. Poldero's mind about the bird. He misunderstood the bird to do acrobatic or bizarre action like what other animals do in a circus. That is why he was quite surprised that the phoenix did nothing besides flying around with no particular intention. The bird's intention to live did not match with Mr. Poldero's purpose to have more money. This is out of his presumed prediction. He is lost in the bias of having representation of other things (Kovic & Kristiansen, 2017; Tversky, 2005). He did not treat the phoenix in its mythical context. Even he defined the bird only as a pet that could be exhibited to sell more tickets.

The idea of ignoring the phoenix as a mythical creature indicates that Mr. Poldero did not care about natural things. He looked at the phoenix like other animals with the same exoticness. However, the matter of being exotic is not because the animals are rare, but due to the idea that those could do unpredicted actions for example eating a whole woman (Warner, 2020). He did not consider the animal as it is but only to what kind of profitable predicate that may be attached to the creature.

The deed of Mr. Poldero is the exploitation of natural creatures. He did not see the phoenix as it is. Nevertheless, he dictated the values of the bird according to his sole purpose. He thought that he could define anything, yet nature is always going out of any definition. Humans' minds will never catch the wholeness of nature (Fadiyah et al., 2023; Harman, 1989). Not only because humans are part of it, nature is related to any wilderness of life that could never be totally tamed. In this case, how the phoenix created a blaze is a reflection of the winning of nature against humans' greed over it.

Third proof is a crucial indication of Mr. Poldero's action in making the bird a source of money. He did not win the auction to sell the bird afterwards. He would like to squeeze more out of it by selling the suffering of the bird. He quite understood that the bird itself did not contain money. Therefore, he needed to make up stories about it mating then dying instantly (Warner, 2020). This is the true involvement of Mr. Poldero in killing animals. He only

used the phoenix as a tool to gain more profit. If it does not give enough funds, he will find another way to exploit the animal furthermore. At any cost, he must not face loss and has to find more profit afterwards.

The moment people predict something to have an outcome usually results in treating the others unfairly. It is also seen in a tendency to believe that some people or ideas are better than the others (Barron & Leider, 2010; Yuliastuti & Pasopati, 2021). The instance of bias in the story can be seen when Mr. Poldero predicted that most people liked to see the exaggerated life of some creatures. His thoughts were so biased because he used ferocious acts to embody his biased behavior. Later, Mr. Poldero's strategy was executed perfectly. He sold many tickets because many people came to see the dying phoenix. Mr. Poldero only thought about the amount of the money that he could get.

Fourth proof is seen in how Mr. Poldero falsely assumes that the phoenix will die instantly in an interesting fire. This is the ultimate representative bias in this story that is also totally a consequence of uncontrolled greed. He only thought that the phoenix would die and then emerged miraculously reborn after setting fire to itself. He never knew what would happen to the phoenix when it died (Warner, 2020). He could only predict. However, that prediction was not based on mysteries of unknown natural creatures. It is merely based on greed to attain more money in advance.

It turned out that the phoenix would explode into flames that no one could imagine how grand the fire was. Indeed, it is enormous and amazing as well, but it also burned all people who watched the event. The bias is also shown in people who came to see the aging phoenix. They only wanted to see how the phoenix died. Actually, they also enjoyed the suffering of the phoenix. They have the same idea as Mr. Poldero's. The bird was only an amusement to them (Warner, 2020). It was never appreciated as a mythical creature nor in its original situation as a natural creature.

The fallacy arose when Mr. Poldero and the people in the audience used their biased behavior to see or to get something that never existed before. All of them gambled to see something that was never real in usual life (Barron & Leider, 2010; Salman et al., 2020). They wanted to see the abnormality of life while considering that they were all normal people. For sure, the deviated understanding of Mr. Poldero and the audience got them something that they had never really thought of before. They indeed got the best amusement at the end of their lives.

CONCLUSION

The story of the phoenix indicates representativeness bias done by Mr. Poldero to the bird. What he did is very dissimilar to Lord Strawberry's, as the former owner, treatment to the phoenix. The bias is exposed in this story since Mr. Poldero showed abundant proof of greed and domination over mythical creatures that are also a reflection of natural beings. The proofs are first, Mr. Poldero won the auction of the bird since he wanted the fame that is not really constant at the end. Second, Mr. Poldero presumed that

the phoenix is so great in its own existence that he ignored that it is only a bird that needs to live freely in the wild. Third proof is a crucial indication of Mr. Poldero's action in making the bird a source of money. The fourth proof as the ultimate one is in how Mr. Poldero falsely assumed that the phoenix would die instantly in an interesting fire. The fire is not usual or even normal at all. Such pyre, flame, or blaze came out and easily burned all surrounding people down.

REFERENCES

- Adiputra, I. G. (2021). The Influence of Overconfidence , Representative Bias , and Risk Tolerance in Investment Decision Making : Evidence on Stock Investors in Indonesia. *Journal of Hunan University*, 48(April), 195–205.
- Annasai, A. A., Wijaya, K., & Pasopati, R. U. (2023). Matter of Superiority Complex as Depicted on Leo Tolstoy's The Three Hermits. *Proceeding International Conference on Religion, Science and Education*, 727–734.
- Aulia, A. D., Annasai, A. A., & Pasopati, R. U. (2022). The Implementation of Conspicuous Consumption on Gender as Indicated on Jax's Victoria's Secret. *Proceeding of International Seminar Enrichment of Career by Knowledge of Language and Literature*, 42–55.
- Ayton, P., & Fischer, I. (2004). The hot hand fallacy and the gambler's fallacy: Two faces of subjective randomness? *Memory and Cognition*, 32(8), 1369–1378. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03206327>
- Azhari, R., & Damingun. (2021). Pengaruh Bias Representative terhadap Keputusan Investasi di Pasar Modal. *Borneo Student Research*, 2(2), 1424–1430.
- Barron, G., & Leider, S. (2010). The role of experience in the gambler's fallacy. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 23(1), 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.676>
- Bougheas, S., Nieboer, J., & Sefton, M. (2015). Risk taking and information aggregation in groups. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 51, 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2015.08.001>
- Clegg, B. A., McKernan, B., Martey, R. M., Taylor, S. M., Stromer-Galley, J., Kenski, K., Saulnier, E. T., Rhodes, M. G., Folkestad, J. E., McLaren, E., Shaw, A., & Strzalkowski, T. (2015). Effective Mitigation of Anchoring Bias, Projection Bias, and Representativeness Bias from Serious Game-based Training. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 3(Ahfe), 1558–1565. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2015.07.438>
- Djanarko, I., & Pasopati, R. U. (2019). Parergon and Indonesian Modern Aesthetics. *Proceeding of International Seminar Enrichment of Career by Knowledge of Language and Literature*, 68–74.
- Fadiyah, L., Wulandari, L., Pujimahanani, C., & Pasopati, R. U. (2023). The Emprises of Gaia Hypothesis as Shown on the Film Maleficent. *Jurnal Multidisiplin Dehasen*, 2(2), 215–224.
- Harman, C. (1989). *Sylvia Townsend Warner: A Biography*. Penguin Books.
- Irshad, S., Badshah, W., Ali, Z., Mighri, S., Badshah, M., & Hakam, U. (2016). Management and Administrative Sciences Review Effect of

- Representativeness Bias on Investment Decision Making Factors Affecting Short-Term Investment Intentions of Stock Investors in Pakistan Effect of Representativeness Bias on Investment Decision. *Management and Administrative Sciences Review*, 5(1), 26–30. www.absronline.org/journals
- Kovic, M., & Kristiansen, S. (2017). The gambler ' s fallacy fallacy (fallacy). *Journal of Risk Research*, 9877 (October), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2017.1378248>
- Lien, J. W., & Yuan, J. (2015). The cross-sectional “Gambler’s Fallacy”: Set representativeness in lottery number choices. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 109, 163–172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2014.10.011>
- Listyaningsih, L., Wulandari, S., & Pasopati, R. U. (2023). The Rational Ignorance as Illustrated on Mushanokoji Saneatsu’s Daruma. *Kiryoku*, 7(1), 20–34.
- Luo, G. Y. (2012). *Asset Price Response to New Information: The Effects of Conservatism Bias and Representativeness Heuristic*. Springer.
- Papachristou, G. (2004). The British gambler’s fallacy. *Applied Economics*, 36(18), 2073–2077. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0003684042000295629>
- Pasopati, R. U. (2016). Beyond Linguistic: Narrative View on Wong Alasan Term in Lingkar Tanah Lingkar Air by Ahmad Tohari. *ICON LATERALS Proceeding*, 639–654.
- Ruslim, N. I. (2021). Overconfidence dan Representativeness Bias Dalam Personal Finance. *Jmbi Unstrat*, 8(3), 735–752.
- Salman, M., Khan, B., & Javed, A. (2020). Moderated Mediation: The Impact of Heuristic Representativeness Bias on Investment Decision-Making. *Academic Journal of Social Sciences (AJSS)*, 4(2), 354–363. <https://doi.org/10.54692/ajss.2020.04021052>
- Sarmi, N. N., Kirana, K. S., Wijaya, K., & Pasopati, R. U. (2023). Authenticity and Its Discontent as Reflected on Heinrich Böll’s The Laugher. *LET: Linguistics, Literature and English Teaching Journal*, 13(1), 68–84.
- Sina, P. G. (2014). Representativeness Bias dan Demografi dalam Membuat Keputusan Keuangan. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 14(1), 425–443. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93224-8_24
- Smarandreetha, F. G., Attamimi, F. N., Wijaya, K., & Pasopati, R. U. (2023). The Representations of Inferiority Complex as Depicted on Virginia Woolf’s’ The Duchess and The Jeweller’. *Jurnal Adijaya Multidisplin*, 1(1), 240–247.
- Stöckl, T., Huber, J., Kirchler, M., & Lindner, F. (2015). Hot hand and gambler’s fallacy in teams: Evidence from investment experiments. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 117, 327–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2015.07.004>
- Sudani, F. S., & Pertiwi, I. F. P. (2022). Financial Information Analysis to Minimize Availability Bias, Representative Bias, Anchoring Bias and Adjustment Bias, and Overconfidence Bias in Investment Decision Making (Study on Investors at the Sharia Investment Gallery of UIN

- Raden Mas Said. *Social Science Studies*, 2(5), 446–460.
<https://doi.org/10.47153/sss25.3852022>
- Tversky, A. (2005). *Preference, belief and similarity: Selected writings*. Bradford Books. <http://www.ingentaselect.com/rpsv/cgi-bin/cgi?ini=xref&body=linker&reqdoi=10.1348/000711005X38690>
- Tyran, J. (2011). The Gambler's Fallacy and Gender. *CentER Discussion Paper*, 11.
- Warner, S. T. (2020). *The Phoenix*. <https://www.poeticous.com/sylvia-townsend-warner/the-phoenix-many-authorities-on-bird-life-had-assured-lord-strawberry-t>
- Wood, R., & Griffiths, M. (2009). The psychology of lottery gambling. *International Gambling Studies*, 1, *The psychology of lottery gambling*. 2001.
- Xu, J., & Harvey, N. (2014). Carry on winning: The gamblers' fallacy creates hot hand effects in online gambling. *Cognition*, 131(2), 173–180.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.01.002>
- Yuliastuti, A., & Pasopati, R. U. (2021). The Emprises of Clustering Illusion as Depicted in Guy de Maupassant's The Christening. *TANDA: Jurnal Kajian Budaya, Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 1(3), 1–10.