My Understanding of Git

Git, as it seems through text, is an impressive tool for constructing a roadmap of isolated data that is secure, fluent, flexible, and able to be actively collaborated on without hurting another’s work. As I have not physically used it yet, my understanding is unable to give the clearest definitive work-cycle of the DVCS (Distributed Version Control System), but I still have an inkling of how the control system benefits those who use it. For instance, I have no idea directly what a DVCS and a SVN (Subversion) are, but I know that one carries a centralized trunk of data whilst the other isolates everything created by developers locally that is to be added to the main branch later. That might mean nothing much to me, but it is the first imperative step in cognitively understanding the tool. To showcase this, a description of project to command to workflow is in order.

One benchmark of Git’s use is within its independent securities. Not as in just the SHA1 hashing that protects the data, but the way how Git carries out “safe” commands between your own local storage and the remote storage. But commands should be spoken of later, as the point of mentioning them is to identify that everything done by them within Git is traceable. Every single action to each remote repository and to the local repository is documented step by step so a person can return to a previous step if they wish to do so. Repositories of course being the digital storage of input data with one main, and a local for every developer who wishes to have an editable copy. This main storage can appear to be any coding language, whether it be Java, Python, C Sharp or even wired in Git itself. When creating a repository, Git will automatically tag any files you input and identify what kind of data type is held within. As Git does not sort files solely by name, instead using the content within them as a means to gentrify data to make it clear what each repository contains to the developer. After processing this information, it is important to circle the topic back to the “safe” commands referenced earlier on how they are used to customize the data.

Lifeblood of Git project appears to be captured most often by “commits”. Which are better known as local snapshots of remote data to be edited and processed locally in a buffer. Git commits will not affect the main remote repository unless you allow it to; changes to the data are all saved locally to the independent copy. This snapshot can be pushed or merged with the main repository through other independent commands that can either add or override data within the main project. Pushing directly adds any new changes to the data as it uploads any local repository content to the main repository to be added, whilst a merge combines a forked history together by two different means. One, “Git merge” combines multiple commits created overtime into a single branch of data. The other, “git merge” combines each branch to a common base between them. The direct opposite, of which does not affect the main repository, is “git pull” which grabs the main repository and merges it directly with the local copy. It is like a reverse merge of data. However, it should be noted that with each passing command a conflict within data may arise.

Most concerned to group projects, “merge conflicts” occur most often when a line that was being modified was deleted or when two have changed the same lines independently. If this occurs, Git has no idea what the “correct” data is. It halts all further processes until the conflict is resolved, which can be infuriating, but is intelligently designed to make sure a larger problem will not occur further down the projects line. If it’s a solo project, the problem can easily be resolved by the one developer’s own hands. In the case of multiple developers working on a project, it is imperative to discuss the possible conflict beforehand as to not impede workflow.

On the topic of workflow, Git offers plenty of leeway to group projects as to not impede on their potential. Whereas solo workflow is entirely based on the one person’s ability to work, group Git workflow is dependent on the team’s ability to divvy the work efficiently. To divide each person into their own specialty, and work independently on their own local repository of the project. Often requesting pushes, instead of being able to directly add them, as to receive further clearance if their idea is worth pursuing by other team members. Team members who, as mentioned previously, need to communicate efficiently as to not create merging conflicts within the main repository. Team scaling and efficient understanding of the mental effort the project requires are key to successful workflow.

Concluding my written understanding of Git, I will end with more personal menta; note of why you want us to learn this tool. It’s open source, puts absolutely no limits to one’s creativity, makes everything able to be traced in case someone dislikes the direction the data is going, and is most likely what we may use for group projects in the future. Whether it would be for school, or a future paid project.
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