Evaluating Bear Misidentification as a Competing Explanatory Model for Bigfoot Reports: Performance, Limits, and Testable Predictions

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

One of the most common skeptical explanations for reported Bigfoot encounters is the misidentification of bears, particularly American black bears (*Ursus americanus*), which are capable of brief bipedal posture and inhabit many regions with high report densities. This paper evaluates the bear-misidentification hypothesis as a competing explanatory model for Bigfoot reports. Rather than treating the hypothesis as either a universal debunking mechanism or a strawman, this analysis examines where the bear model plausibly accounts for reported encounters, where it performs weakly, and what statistical and observational patterns would be expected if bears were the primary cause of such reports. The goal is not to validate an alternative hypothesis by default, but to assess whether the bear model is sufficient to explain the observed corpus of reports and to clarify where further investigation is warranted.

1. Introduction

Reports of large, bipedal, hair-covered beings in North America have persisted for decades and are often framed either as evidence of an unknown hominin or as the result of misidentification, hoaxing, or psychological error. Among skeptical explanations, the misidentification of bears—especially black bears—is frequently advanced as the most parsimonious account. Bears are widespread, capable of standing upright, and often encountered in low-visibility conditions that may degrade perceptual accuracy (Herrero, 2002; Garshelis, 2009).

The presence of repeated references to primate morphology in Bigfoot research has led some critics to infer theoretical bias. One way to address this concern is not to minimize competing explanations, but to evaluate them explicitly. If the bear hypothesis can adequately explain the majority of Bigfoot reports, then more complex biological explanations become unnecessary. Conversely, if the bear model explains only a subset of reports, this limitation should be clearly articulated without assuming an alternative explanation by default.

2. Why the Bear Hypothesis Is Reasonable

From a skeptical standpoint, bears present a compelling candidate for misidentification. Black bears are capable of standing and walking briefly on their hind limbs, particularly during threat displays, foraging, or play behavior (Herrero, 2002). Under conditions of stress, distance, low light, or partial occlusion, human observers may misjudge size, posture, and anatomical detail (Loftus, 2005).

Human perception is also subject to expectation and pattern completion, particularly when observers encounter ambiguous stimuli that suggest agency or threat (Kahneman, 2011). In regions where folklore or cultural narratives about Bigfoot are known, such priors may influence interpretation. Given these factors, it would be surprising if bears were *not* responsible for a portion of reported encounters.

3. Report Classes Well Explained by Bear Misidentification

A rigorous evaluation requires identifying report categories that are plausibly explained by bears rather than treating all reports as equivalent. Several classes of encounters align well with known ursid behavior:

- **Short-duration sightings**, often lasting only seconds
- **Rear-leg standing or brief bipedal movement**, especially during bluff charges
- **Encounters involving juveniles or subadults**, which may appear proportionally unusual
- **Reports lacking detailed anatomical description**, particularly of hands, shoulders, or facial features
- **Sightings occurring at dawn, dusk, or nighttime**, when visual acuity is reduced

In such cases, bear misidentification offers a parsimonious explanation consistent with both animal behavior and perceptual psychology (Garshelis, 2009; Proctor et al., 2012).

---

4. Points of Strain in the Bear Model

While bears plausibly explain many reports, certain recurrent features in the broader corpus introduce friction into the bear hypothesis. These features do not constitute proof of an alternative explanation but represent areas where the model performs less effectively.

4.1 Extended Bipedal Locomotion

Bears can stand and walk bipedally for short distances, but sustained bipedal locomotion over tens or hundreds of meters is biomechanically inefficient and rarely documented in wild bears (Alexander, 2004). Reports describing prolonged, smooth, upright walking warrant scrutiny when attributed solely to ursids.

4.2 Limb Proportions and Shoulder Morphology

Witnesses frequently describe arms that appear disproportionately long relative to the torso and shoulders described as broad and laterally oriented. Bear forelimb articulation and scapular orientation differ markedly from primates and typically produce a hunched silhouette even when upright (Napier, 1967; Taylor, 1989).

4.3 Head–Neck Articulation

Bear anatomy produces limited neck visibility due to muscle mass and posture. Reports describing a distinct head set atop visible shoulders introduce ambiguity that is not easily reconciled with ursid morphology under all conditions.

4.4 Vocalizations

Many reported vocalizations attributed to Bigfoot include long-duration, modulated howls, whoops, or complex call sequences. While bears vocalize, their known vocal repertoire differs substantially in duration, harmonic structure, and contextual use (Peters & Peters, 1983; Stoeger et al., 2012).

4.5 Track Morphology

Some reported trackways include midtarsal flexibility, toe alignment, or pressure patterns inconsistent with plantigrade ursid feet. Track misinterpretation is common, but recurring morphological claims merit careful comparison rather than dismissal (Meldrum, 2004).

---

5. Statistical Expectations If Bears Are the Primary Cause

If misidentified bears account for the majority of Bigfoot reports, several testable expectations follow:

- **Seasonality**: Reports should peak during periods of heightened bear activity, such as spring emergence and autumn hyperphagia
- **Geographic correlation**: Report density should closely track known bear population density
- **Encounter duration**: Most sightings should be brief and lack detailed anatomical observation
- **Track distributions**: Reported tracks should cluster around known bear gait and pressure patterns
- **Acoustic features**: Vocalizations should fall within known ursid frequency ranges

Comparisons between these expectations and observed report patterns provide a means of evaluating the adequacy of the bear hypothesis without presupposing alternative explanations.

---

6. Observer Expertise and Error Rates

Misidentification risk is not uniformly distributed across observers. Hunters, foresters, wildlife officers, and rural residents often possess extensive experience with local fauna. While expertise does not eliminate error, it reduces its probability and shapes the nature of mistakes made (Ericsson & Smith, 1991).

Analyses that treat all witnesses as equally unreliable obscure important gradients in observational credibility. A graded approach allows for more nuanced evaluation without appealing to authority or dismissing lay observers outright.

---

7. Synthesis: Bears as a Partial but Insufficient Model

The bear-misidentification hypothesis explains a meaningful subset of Bigfoot reports and should be regarded as a necessary component of any serious evaluative framework. However, the hypothesis encounters limitations when applied universally across the full range of reported behaviors, morphologies, and encounter contexts.

The failure of the bear hypothesis to explain all reports does not, by itself, validate a primate or relict hominin explanation. It does, however, justify continued investigation and the development of analytical frameworks capable of distinguishing between overlapping explanatory models.

In this sense, bears function as a **filtering hypothesis** rather than a terminating one: where they explain reports well, further inference is unnecessary; where they do not, the residual category remains an open empirical question rather than a settled conclusion.

References

Alexander, R. M. (2004). *Principles of animal locomotion*. Princeton University Press.

Ericsson, K. A., & Smith, J. (1991). *Toward a general theory of expertise*. Cambridge University Press.

Garshelis, D. L. (2009). Family Ursidae (bears). In D. E. Wilson & R. A. Mittermeier (Eds.), *Handbook of the mammals of the world* (Vol. 1). Lynx Edicions.

Herrero, S. (2002). *Bear attacks: Their causes and avoidance*. Lyons Press.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Loftus, E. F. (2005). Planting misinformation in the human mind. *Learning & Memory*, 12(4), 361–366.

Meldrum, J. (2004). *Sasquatch: Legend meets science*. Tom Doherty Associates.

Napier, J. R. (1967). *The antiquity of man*. Smithsonian Institution Press.

Peters, G., & Peters, M. K. (1983). Vocal communication in bears. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie*, 61, 321–340.

Proctor, M. F., et al. (2012). Population fragmentation and inter-ecosystem movements of grizzly bears. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 76(3), 472–484.

Stoeger, A. S., et al. (2012). Vocal communication and the evolution of mammalian calls. *Mammal Review*, 42(3), 215–231.

Taylor, M. E. (1989). Locomotor adaptations by carnivores. In J. L. Gittleman (Ed.), *Carnivore behavior, ecology, and evolution*. Cornell University Press.