**WeRateDogs-Udacity-Nanodegree-Project**

***Wrangling & Analyzing WeRateDogs from Twitter Data***

This directory contains the files for the project- Wrangling & Analyzing a Twitter data of WeRateDogs.

**Project Goal:**

Gathering and combining multiple datasets of WeRateDogs from Twitter to create interesting and trustworthy analyses and visualizations. The Twitter archive is great, but it only contains very basic tweet information. Additional gathering using the Twitter API, then programmatically assessing and cleaning was required for great analyses and visualizations.

Based on the data analysis I found that better dogs are twitted recently. The question is why? Maybe more good dogs pictures are coming to Twitter or good dogs are more breeding, or the WeDogRates might be more generous those years.

# Introduction

Data wrangling is a core skill that everyone who works with data should be familiar with since so much of the world's data isn't clean. We need to wrangle our data for good outcomes, otherwise there could be consequences. If we analyze, visualize, or model our data before we wrangle it, our consequences could be making mistakes, missing out on cool insights, and wasting time. So best practices say wrangle. Always. Through this project could made:

* Data wrangling, which consists of:
  + Gathering data
  + Assessing data
  + Cleaning data
* Storing, analyzing, and visualizing our wrangled data
* Reporting on 1) our data wrangling efforts and 2) our data analyses and visualizations

## Gathering

Gathering Data for this Project composed from three pieces of data as described below:

* The WeRateDogs Twitter archive. We manually downloaded this file manually by clicking the following link: [twitter\_archive\_enhanced.csv](https://d17h27t6h515a5.cloudfront.net/topher/2017/August/59a4e958_twitter-archive-enhanced/twitter-archive-enhanced.csv)
* The tweet image predictions, i.e., what breed of dog (or other object, animal, etc.) is present in each tweet according to a neural network. This file (image\_predictions.tsv) hosted on Udacity's servers and we downloaded it programmatically using python Requests library on the following (URL of the file: <https://d17h27t6h515a5.cloudfront.net/topher/2017/August/599fd2ad_image-predictions/image-predictions.tsv>)
* Each tweet's retweet count and favorite (i.e. "like") count and any additional data we found interesting. Using the tweet IDs in the WeRateDogs Twitter archive, we could query the Twitter API for each tweet's JSON data using Python's Tweepy library and store each tweet's entire set of JSON data in a file called tweet\_json.txt file. Each tweet's JSON data stored in a line.

### Gather: Summary

Gathering was the first step in the data wrangling process. We could finish the high-level gathering process:

* Obtaining data
  + Getting data from an existing file (twitter-archive-enhanced.csv) Reading from csv file using pandas
  + Downloading a file from the internet (image-predictions.tsv) Downloading file using requests
  + Querying an API (tweet\_json.txt) Get JSON object of all the tweet\_ids using Tweepy
* Importing that data into our programming environment (Jupyter Notebook)

## Assessing

After gathering each of the above pieces of data, assess them visually and programmatically for quality and tidiness issues was our next step. We could detect and document the following quality issues and tidiness issues.

### Quality

Completeness, Validity, Accuracy, Consistency -**archive dataset**

* retweeted\_status\_timestamp, timestamp should be datetime instead of object (string)
* The numerator and denominator columns have invalid values
* In several columns null objects are non-null (None to NaN)
* Name column have invalid names i.e 'None', 'a', 'an'
* We only want original ratings (no retweets) that have images
* We may want to change this columns type (in\_reply\_to\_status\_id, in\_reply\_to\_user\_id, retweeted\_status\_id, retweeted\_status\_user\_id and tweet\_id) to string because We don't want any operations on them **images dataset**
* Missing values from images dataset (2075 rows instead of 2356)
* Some tweet\_ids have the same jpg\_url
* Some tweets are have 2 different tweet\_id one redirect to the other **json\_tweeets dataset**
* This tweet\_id (666020888022790149) duplicated 8 times

### Tidiness

Untidy data - structural issues

* No need to all the information in images dataset, (tweet\_id and jpg\_url what matters)
* Various stages of dogs in columns instead of rows archives dataset
* We may want to add a gender column from the text columns in archives dataset
* All tables should be part of one dataset

## Cleaning

Cleaning our data is the third step in data wrangling. It is where we fixed the quality and tidiness issues that we identified in the assess step.

We used the two types of cleaning, the manual and programmatic even the manual not recommended but the issues were one-off occurrences. Our process was Define, Code and Test and we were always making a copy of the dataset even we made the copy in file to test the change before applying to the main dataset. We did not spot all the quality and tidiness assessments at the assessing data section, so we have been iterating and revisiting assessing to add these assessments to our notes.

# Conclusion

Data wrangling indeed is a core skill that everyone who works with data should be familiar with since so much of the world's data are not clean. If we analyze, visualize, or model our data before we wrangle it, our consequences could be making mistakes, missing out on cool insights, and wasting time. We won’t be able to make some of the visualization without wrangling (i.e dog gender partition) **So best practices includes ‘Wrangling Always’.**

Software and Libraries used:

* Pandas
* Numpy
* Seaborn
* Matplotlib
* Os
* Datetime
* Requests
* Tweepy
* Json