

6-2: When you don't understand at all

So the Feynman technique is great but it requires you to think your own words. Sometimes you understand an idea which you understand so poorly that you can't even do that yet. This is what I used the modified version of the Feynman technique which I called the walk through method. This is where you go meticulously through the idea so you can deeply understand it. So let's see what it looks like.

In this example I'm going to explain how you can use the Feynman technique for understanding an idea that you don't understand at all, meaning that you have no idea what to do. And this is basically what I called the walk through method, where you take the actual explanation in the textbook or from a set of notes from someone else and you walk through it in detail. Really good with the textbook or even in the internet definition and what you do is you write down everything that they write but in addition to that you also expand this. So when they mention the complicated term or a word that sort of jargon. You going to simplify it, here they use the simplification $P(A|B)$. And this means the probability of A given that we know B has it. And by writing this out really fussing it out in a way more detail, you get a chance to notice what are the things you don't understand. So walking through this, this method is probably the best way of doing this. Now, sometimes you will not going to write in a passion that maybe makes the most concise the most beautiful explanation of the idea. That can come in later levels. For first pass with the Feynman technique, what you wanted to be doing is recopying an existing explanation but paraphrasing it so wherever you can write it on your own word, write it on your own words. And when you can't write it on your own words, you can't write it on a different way the name write it. Then what you want to do is take all of the jargon or complicated explanation that you used then you want to try to simplify that language as much as possible. So as you can see here I am walking through the idea and I'm copying elements and even copying some elements that aren't directly relevant. So the fact that they are multiple disjoint events isn't really got critical for base rule but I'm copying that anyways because that's how they introduce the topic and how they'd explain in text. Now as you get to higher level, you can synthesize multiple explanations and even add your own in creating an idea. But if you really struggling with an idea, you don't understand at all, this walkthrough method can really make it a lot easier to go through.

So another way to think about it is whenever turn something from the way their explaining to plain English, that's also a good step. Some text book did a very good job of explaining things in a way that's approachable but a lot of text book also expect you to have certain knowledge of concepts and maybe you are not really stronger. So in this textbook for example what I did is I took the based theory formula and I decided to write an exact definition of what all the components of the formula are. So I'm not trying to understand

the formula really at this point I'm just trying to describe what all the components are. So $P(A|B)$ is probably did it bent A I happened given that B happened. So if I wanted to know what that meant I could actually just put that term exactly into GOOGLE and it could tell me what that means, what that mathematically means. And I know it is, probably the A I happen times probably that B happen given that A I happen divided by the probably B happen. Now I haven't really reach the very deep understanding it but I got to a point where it's valuable for further reading