Project 2: Wrangle and Analyze Data

Data Wrangling Report

Prepared By: Suzan Hamza

Introduction

This report briefly describes the efforts used to wrangle *WeRateDogs* Twitter data to create interesting and trustworthy analyses and visualizations.

The following packages (libraries) were installed and imported at the beginning of the wrangle_act.ipynb notebook.

- pandas
- NumPy
- requests
- tweepy
- json
- matplotlib
- seaborn

Gathering Data for this Project

Each of the **three pieces of data** as described below were gathered in a Jupyter Notebook titled wrangle act.ipynb:

1) The WeRateDogs Twitter archive.

This file named twitter_archive_enhanced.csv was downloaded manually and read into a dataframe using pandas read_csv().

```
# Import the WeRateDogs Twitter Archive into a DataFrame
archive_df = pd.read_csv('twitter_archive_enhanced.csv')
```

2) Tweet Image Predictions File

This file (image_predictions.tsv) is hosted on Udacity's servers and was *downloaded programmatically* using the <u>Requests</u> library and the following URL: https://d17h27t6h515a5.cloudfront.net/topher/2017/August/599fd2ad image-predictions/image-predictions.tsv

Then the file was read into a dataframe using pandas read_csv().

```
# Read the tweet image predictions TSV file into a DataFrame
img_pred_df = pd.read_csv(file_name, sep='\t')
# Check to see if the file was imported correctly
img_pred_df.head()
```

3) Additional Data via the Twitter API

First, a Twitter developer account was created, then it was used to generate the *Consumer* API keys, and the Access Token and Access Token Secret needed.

Those secret credentials were stored in a separate .env file, and were loaded using Python's dotenv library.

Each tweet's **retweet count** and **favorite** ("like") **count** was gathered using the **tweet IDs** in the WeRateDogs Twitter archive, by querying the Twitter API for each tweet's JSON data using Python's **Tweepy** library.

Querying Tweepy API to get the retweet count and favorite count

Then each tweet's entire set of JSON data was stored in a file called tweet_json.txt file. Each tweet's JSON data was written to its own line.

Then this .txt file was read line by line into a pandas *DataFrame* with tweet ID, retweet count, and favorite count.

Read tweet_json.txt into a pandas DataFrame

```
: # Initialize empty list to store tweet data
  tweet list = []
  with open('tweet json.txt', mode='r') as file:
      # Read file line by line
     filecontent = file.readlines()
     for line in filecontent:
       tweet = file.readline()[:-1]
         tweet = line
         # Convert string into a Dictionary
         tweet_dic = json.loads(tweet)
       print(tweet_dic['id'])
          tweet_list.append({'tweet_id': tweet_dic['id'],
                             'retweet_count': tweet_dic['retweet_count'],
                             'favorite count': tweet dic['favorite count']})
  tweepy df = pd.DataFrame(tweet list, columns = ['tweet id', 'retweet count', 'favorite count'])
  tweepy_df.head()
```

Assessing Data for this Project

After gathering each of the above pieces of data and loading them into a separate pandas dataframe, first they were assessed *visually* by displaying each dataframe in the notebook and investigating its contents for **quality** and **tidiness** issues.

Then a *programmatic assessment* was conducted using pandas methods, like info, head, describe and value_counts.

The following **quality** and **tidiness** issues were detected, including several issues that did not satisfy the Project Motivation:

Quality Issues

archive_df table

- 1. **78** entries are **replies** and not original tweets (in_reply_to_status_id and in_reply_to_user_id has values).
- 2. **181** entries are **retweets** and not original tweets (retweeted_status_id, retweeted_status_user_id and retweeted_status_timestamp has values).
- 3. in_reply_to_status_id, in_reply_to_user_id, retweeted_status_i d, retweeted_status_user_id and retweeted_status_timestamp colu mns are not useful for analysis and should be removed.
- 4. **59** entries do not contain images (expanded_urls is null).
- 5. tweet_id is integer instead of string (object).
- 6. **timestamp** is a string and not datetime.
- 7. **55** dog names incorrectly extracted as a, because the tweet was in the format *'This is a ...'* instead of *'This is (Dog Name) ...'*.
- 8. **745** dog names incorrectly extracted as None, because the tweet was not in the format *'This is (Dog Name) ...'*.
- 9. tweet_id = 810984652412424192 does not include a dog rating, the text= 'Meet Sam. She smiles 24/7 & secretly aspires to be a reindeer.' and the rating was incorrectly extracted as 24/7.
- 10. tweet_id = 666287406224695296 rating was incorrectly extracted as 1/2 while it should be 9/10. text = 'This is an Albanian 3 1/2 legged Episcopalian. Loves well-polished hardwood flooring. 9/10'.

img_pred_df table

1. tweet_id is integer instead of string (object).

2. Only **2075** image predictions are available, which indicates that another **281** tweets have no images and should be excluded from the archive_df table.

tweepy_df table

1. tweet_id is integer instead of string (object).

Tidiness Issues

archive_df table

- 1. Dog Stages variables split into four columns (doggo, floofer, pupper and puppo) instead of one.
- 2. A single observational unit (Tweet information) is stored in multiple tables (archive_df and tweepy_df).

Cleaning Data for this Project

Each of the issues documented in the assessment phase were cleaned as follows:

1) Missing Data

Missing data or data that does not satisfy the Project Motivation was cleaned first.

- Removed all replies from archive table; entries where in_reply_to_status_id and in_reply_to_user_id are not null.
- Removed all Retweets from archive table; entries where retweeted_status_id, retweeted_status_user_id and retweeted_status_timestamp are not null.
- Dropped in_reply_to_status_id, in_reply_to_user_id, retweeted_status_id, retweeted_status_user_id and retweeted_status_timestamp columns from archive table, because they will not be useful to our analysis.
- Dropped entries where expanded_urls is null from archive table, because that means that these tweets do not contain any images.
- Removed entries from archive table with tweet_id that did not exist in img_pred table, because that means that these tweets do not contain any images.

2) Tidiness Issues

- Combined the four Dog Stages columns (doggo, floofer, pupper and puppo) into one column named dog_stages.
- Merged the retweet_count and favorite_count columns with the archive dataframe.

3) Remaining Quality Issues

- Converted tweet_id data type from integer to string in both archive and img_pred tables.
- Converted **timestamp** from string data type to datetime in **archive** table.
- Corrected some of the dog names that were incorrectly extracted as a or an or None programmatically.
- Replaced the remaining a, an and None name values with NaN.
- Replaced the None values in the dog_stages column with NaN.
- Inspected the tweet's text for tweet_id = 666287406224695296 and corrected the rating from 1/2 to 9/10 manually, since it is a one off occurrence.

Note: The rating for tweet_id = 810984652412424192 was not found and could not be corrected, but that issue will not affect our analysis.

The result was stored in two high quality and tidy master pandas DataFrames, archive_clean and img_pred_clean.

Storing Data for this Project

Finally, the two clean DataFrame(s) were stored in a **CSV file** with the main one named twitter_archive_master.csv and the other named image_predictions_clean.csv for image predictions data.

Storing the Data

```
# Save 'archive_clean' dataframe to a CSV file named 'twitter_archive_master.csv'
archive_clean.to_csv('twitter_archive_master.csv', header=True, index=False)

# Save 'img_pred_clean' dataframe to a CSV file named 'image_predictions_clean.csv'
img_pred_clean.to_csv('image_predictions_clean.csv', header=True, index=False)
```