

Tessa Vu

Dr. Wan

GEOG 4140-001

03 March 2021

### Lab 5 Deliverable 2

In the regression analyses using both explanatory variables, why do you think that prediction accuracy in King County was so low?

**Table 1: OLS Forest and Population**

<b>OBJECTID</b>	7
<b>GEOID</b>	53033
<b>Sight Normalized by POLY_AREA</b>	0.019174
<b>Percent_Forest</b>	55.641899
<b>Population</b>	1931249
<b>Shape_Length</b>	489553.553965
<b>Shape_Area</b>	5673216659.168814
<b>Estimated</b>	0.028021
<b>Residual</b>	-0.008847
<b>StdResid</b>	-1.432169

Looking at the data for King County above, the prediction accuracy is low because there is a negative residual at -0.008847, and according to the legend, it is a little over one standard deviation away from being accurate. When the OLS was run, the Sight Normalized by POLY\_AREA was recorded at 0.019174 whereas the system calculated the Estimated value at 0.028021, the residual is the difference between the two. King County's population approaches

two-million with the value 1,931,249 citizens because Seattle, a metropolitan city, is located within the county. So, that large population made the OLS model predict a higher number of Bigfoot sightings than what actually occurred and this is the reason behind the low prediction accuracy.