Holstonia Bigfoot Investigations
Methods Series No. 10

Detection, Non-Detection, and the Conditions of Observability: A Methodological Framework for Rare Organism Research

Daniel H. Kegley
holstonia-investigations.org

Version of Record: This document constitutes the authoritative version of this work. Please cite the version available at holstonia-investigations.org. Revised editions, if issued, will be explicitly identified.

Abstract

Debates surrounding rare or disputed organisms frequently center on the absence of definitive detection. Such arguments often presume that presence and detectability are tightly coupled — that if an organism exists, it should be readily observed. This assumption is inconsistent with established principles in ecology, survey methodology, and detection theory. Detectability is not binary; it is probabilistic, environmentally mediated, observer-dependent, and technologically constrained.

This paper develops a methodological framework for interpreting both detection and non-detection under conditions of low encounter probability. Distinctions are drawn between presence, availability for detection, and realized observation. The concept of detection surfaces is introduced to describe spatial variability in perceptual opportunity, while observer effects are incorporated through signal detection theory. Persistent non-detection is examined not as definitive falsification but as a progressive constraint on plausible population structures.

By repositioning detection as the governing variable rather than an assumed outcome, rare-organism research can move beyond rhetorical stalemates toward analytically tractable inference.

---

1. Introduction

Arguments against the existence of rare organisms frequently rely on a seemingly straightforward proposition: if such organisms existed, they would have been detected. This reasoning reflects an intuitive but flawed model of observation — one that treats detection as the default consequence of presence.

Field biology offers a different view. Many confirmed species remain difficult to observe despite decades of targeted effort. Imperfect detection is not an anomaly within ecological research; it is a foundational constraint (MacKenzie et al., 2002).

The relevant scientific question is therefore not simply whether detection has occurred, but under what conditions detection should be expected.

This shift is methodological rather than rhetorical. Once detectability is recognized as variable, absence of observation becomes interpretable only within the context of search effort, environmental structure, observer capability, and technological reach.

---

2. Detectability as a Governing Variable

Detection occupies an intermediary position between organism presence and scientific inference. Treating it as automatic obscures the mechanisms that make observation possible.

Ecological survey research has repeatedly demonstrated that species may be present at sites where they go undetected, even during structured surveys (Kéry & Royle, 2016). Detection probability rarely approaches unity outside highly controlled conditions.

Three states must therefore be distinguished:

Presence — the organism exists within a defined spatial unit.
Availability — the organism is behaviorally and physically detectable at the time of observation.
Realized detection — an observer successfully perceives and interprets the stimulus.

Failure to separate these states produces a common inferential error: equating non-detection with absence.

Occupancy modeling emerged largely to correct this mistake by explicitly estimating detection probability rather than assuming it (MacKenzie et al., 2006).

---

3. Detection Is Probabilistic, Not Binary

Observation operates within a probabilistic framework shaped by multiple interacting variables:

- population density
- movement patterns
- habitat structure
- sensory range
- observer skill
- search effort
- technological augmentation

Even relatively large mammals can persist at densities low enough to produce infrequent encounters across expansive landscapes. Wolverines, snow leopards, and certain forest ungulates exemplify this dynamic, often requiring specialized survey techniques for reliable detection (Long et al., 2008).

The expectation of routine visibility reflects a cognitive bias toward overestimating encounter probability in complex environments.

Scientific inference demands the opposite posture: detection must be modeled before absence can be interpreted.

---

4. Detection Surfaces and the Geometry of Encounter

Landscapes are not perceptually uniform. Instead, they form heterogeneous detection fields — here termed **detection surfaces** — within which observational opportunity varies spatially.

Dense vegetation compresses sightlines. Elevation can expand them. Linear corridors such as roads, riverbanks, and utility clearings frequently enlarge perceptual range by reducing occlusion.

Distance sampling theory formalizes this geometry, demonstrating that detectability declines with increasing distance from a transect line (Buckland et al., 2001). Although assumptions of perfect detection at zero distance are rarely met in complex terrain, the broader insight remains: encounter probability is structured by spatial configuration.

Apparent clustering of observations along corridors may therefore reflect observational mechanics rather than organism preference.

Modeling these mechanics transforms anecdotal patterns into testable hypotheses.

---

5. Temporal Availability

Detection is not only spatially variable but temporally constrained.

Organisms cycle through periods of activity and concealment. Many large mammals exhibit crepuscular or nocturnal movement patterns that reduce daytime visibility. Seasonal behaviors — dispersal, breeding, migration — further modulate availability.

Observers operate within their own temporal constraints, often concentrating effort during periods perceived as optimal. Without deliberate temporal design, surveys risk reflecting investigator preference more than ecological reality.

Treating time as a sampling variable aligns rare-organism research with established survey practice, where repeated visits across temporal strata improve inferential reliability (Royle & Dorazio, 2008).

---

6. Observer Effects and Signal Detection

Observation is mediated not only by environment but by cognition.

Signal detection theory demonstrates that perception involves threshold decisions under uncertainty, balancing false positives against missed detections (Green & Swets, 1966). Expectation, experience, and attentional state all influence where that threshold is set.

These dynamics do not invalidate observation; they characterize it.

Structured training, calibration against known stimuli, and precommitted classification criteria help stabilize interpretive thresholds. Such measures are standard in fields ranging from radiology to wildlife survey work, where observer variability is a recognized source of measurement error.

The observing mind is therefore not a contaminant to be excluded, but an instrument whose properties must be understood.

---

7. Technology as Detection Multiplier — and Constraint

Technological tools extend sensory reach but do not eliminate uncertainty.

Camera traps, acoustic recorders, environmental DNA sampling, and thermal imaging have dramatically expanded detection capabilities across ecological research. Yet each introduces its own failure modes: restricted fields of view, algorithmic bias, environmental interference, and interpretive ambiguity (Burton et al., 2015).

Technological absence should therefore be interpreted cautiously. Non-detection may reflect sensor placement, coverage limitations, or behavioral avoidance rather than organism absence.

Instrumentation increases the probability of encounter; it does not guarantee it.

---

8. Interpreting Persistent Non-Detection

While single instances of non-detection carry limited inferential weight, sustained absence across structured surveys progressively constrains plausible explanations.

If detection probability is reasonably estimated and survey effort accumulates without encounter, models requiring high population density or broad distribution become less tenable.

This is not falsification in the strict sense. It is parameter narrowing — the gradual reduction of viable ecological space.

Scientific maturity lies in recognizing both sides of this dynamic:

Non-detection does not automatically negate presence.
Neither does it permit unlimited possibility.

Constraint is the natural outcome of disciplined observation.

---

9. From Detection to Inference

Rare-organism research stabilizes when the primary question shifts from existential debate to observational conditions:

Not *Does the organism exist?*
but
What would detection look like if it did?

This reframing relocates inquiry within the logic of scientific methodology rather than rhetorical dispute.

Programs that model detectability gain several advantages:

- clearer survey design
- interpretable null results
- defensible inference boundaries
- resistance to both premature acceptance and premature dismissal

In this sense, detection is not merely a technical concern. It is the bridge between observation and knowledge.

---

10. Conclusion

Scientific progress often begins with a conceptual realignment. In rare-organism research, that realignment occurs when detection is recognized as the governing variable rather than an assumed outcome.

Presence without detection is common in ecology. Detection without careful interpretation is equally hazardous. Between them lies the methodological space in which disciplined inference becomes possible.

By distinguishing presence from availability, modeling detection surfaces, incorporating observer effects, and treating non-detection as structured information, researchers can move beyond polarized debates toward cumulative understanding.

Certainty may remain distant. But observations organized under explicit detection logic acquire a property more valuable to science than premature resolution:

They become capable of withstanding doubt.

References

Buckland, S. T., Anderson, D. R., Burnham, K. P., & Laake, J. L. (2001). *Introduction to Distance Sampling.* Oxford University Press.

Burton, A. C., et al. (2015). Wildlife camera trapping: a review and recommendations for linking surveys to ecological processes. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 52, 675–685.

Green, D. M., & Swets, J. A. (1966). *Signal Detection Theory and Psychophysics.* Wiley.

Kéry, M., & Royle, J. A. (2016). *Applied Hierarchical Modeling in Ecology.* Academic Press.

Long, R. A., MacKay, P., Zielinski, W. J., & Ray, J. C. (2008). *Noninvasive Survey Methods for Carnivores.* Island Press.

MacKenzie, D. I., Nichols, J. D., Lachman, G. B., et al. (2002). Estimating site occupancy rates when detection probabilities are less than one. *Ecology*, 83, 2248–2255.

MacKenzie, D. I., Nichols, J. D., Royle, J. A., et al. (2006). *Occupancy Estimation and Modeling.* Academic Press.

Royle, J. A., & Dorazio, R. M. (2008). *Hierarchical Modeling and Inference in Ecology.* Academic Press.