About the ball of knowledge and competencies with colleagues

Python homework help

One of the readers recently asked a question, think about which, IMHO, it will be useful to many: how useful / appropriate to share your knowledge with colleagues at work?Not just with colleagues in the workshop through blogs / performances, namely with teammates.After all, such actions can reduce the specific value of the rower, which may affect its promotion.

For me personally, the question of sharing knowledge or not at all.I share technical knowledge as the knowledge of the project is not because I want or do not want to advance.I do it because it is an integral part of me and my workflow.It was always important for me to help the younger colleague, to give the Council to a member of another team, if it is appropriate, or talk to the head that the team is moving in some strange direction.

For me

Share knowledge, even scarce, it means to recognize something better.When you have to tell about the architecture or used patterns to your colleague, you automatically play all the solution in your head and evaluate its validity / correctness.If the colleague is experienced, then it will easily force your understanding of the problem.If he is a novice, then its glass eyes will be an excellent indicator of the curvature of architecture or the indicator of the complete absence of your skills on the consecration of complex things to the listener.

A similar attitude always justified itself, regardless of the kind of tasks, people and even the culture of the team, in which I had to work.

Well, OK, I do it, because it is important for me.But how far is this attitude / is not profitable from the point of view of a career of any other person?Let's think that it is more profitable to be a shit in the team, or openly share knowledge.

There is such an interesting problem, called the prisoner's dilemma.She sounds like this:

Two criminals

A and B.

We fell about the same time at similar crimes. There is reason to believe that they acted in a collusion, and the police, isolated them from each other, offers them the same transaction: if one testifies to the other, and he keeps silence, then the first is released for the help of the investigation, and the second receives the maximum time imprisonment (10 years). If both are silent, their act takes place along a more easy article, and each of them is sentenced to semi-year prison. If both

testify to each other, they receive a minimum time (for 2 years). Each prisoner chooses, silence or testify against the other. However, none of them knows exactly what another will do. What will happen?

From this dilemma, the most effective strategy of the accused is easily flowing: to take accomplices. If the accomplice does the same, each of them will receive 2 years. If the accoser will be silent, the accused will be released, and the accomplice will receive in full. If we feed the parallel between the classical dilemma of the prisoner and the workflow, it may seem that the most effective tacty of behavior in the working team is also a scounding strategy. If I share info with your colleague, and he will share with me, then we will both in the ladies! But if I share info with him, and he will score it, he will receive a competitive advantage in front of me! So I have to be silent to minimize my losses in a miracle game called Career.

And although such logic is quite rational, in fact, the efficiency of tactics strongly depends on how often a person will face this dilemma and how much communication between the accused is possible.If we are talking about a disposable session of communication, then be a shit

This is the most efficient tactic.But this is not the case when communication is possible between prisoners, and when these people are confronted with such a dilemma constantly.The last AI championships (yes, the prisoner's dilemma is one of the problems in the theory of games and there are championships in which different AIs compete in this case) showed that the shit is not the most efficient tactic (*).

(*) The most effective is the eye tactics for the eyes with the possibility of forgiveness. This means that it is most effectively starting from the result that will be mutually beneficial, after which the opponent's move is to repeat. This means that if the opponent supports a sane behavior, players get a mutually beneficial good result (notorious Win-Win). If the opponent begins to pour, then you need to do. But, occasionally, it is necessary to respond to dullness to meanness, since the sneaky of the opponent could arise in the investigation of ministry, and the kindness can break the vicious circle of negative moves.

You do not need to be seven spans in shorts in order to understand that the tactics of information hiding will not be effective in any sane group.Singles and Zassdaock do not like colleagues, their code is usually distinguished by extremely complex solutions (this is the notorious Job Security), and joint work with them is fraught with substances and other troubles.

But such valuable employees do not like not only colleagues, but also managers.No matter how unique knowledge does not have a person, his negative attitude towards other colleagues does not affect overall effectiveness.In addition, it is a single point of failure, which is very bad from the point of view of the risk management of the project.

Similarly, the picture is also with the manager / Tim Lid, which will decide to hide information from its subordinates for the sake of holding itself on the top of the food chain.But it also rarely ends well, because sooner or later, information about the wrongness of the comrade leaning above, and

measures to eliminate it will be accepted very soon.

Be or not to be shit

This is a matter of personal preferences.I know a lot of examples when the candidate was eager during an interview due to suspicion of star or arrogance.In a good team, a similar attitude to his own value will be stopped (informally) by the team, and if not, it is worthwhile to ask yourself a question as far as you with such a team along the way.

From my own experience I can say that I have not met a good specialist who would be afraid to share information about the project, task, technology.After all, information

This is the top of the iceberg.Moreover, most experts are easily spent their time on others, even to the detriment of the decision of their immediate tasks.Most of them are easily divided by their secrets, tricks, approaches, perfectly realizing that this process is bilateral.