

Cowboy, Cataloguer, Methodist, Magician, and Master: Gestalts of Analysis and Design

Ilona Box

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Computing Sciences

Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology
University of Technology, Sydney

October 2012

Certificate of Originality

I certify that I have not previously submitted the work in this thesis neither for a degree nor as part of the requirements for a degree.

I certify that I have written this thesis. I have acknowledged any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself. In addition, I certify that I have indicated all information sources and literature used in the thesis.

I certify that I have received ethics clearance from the UTS Ethics committee in accordance with the UTS policies and human and animal research.

Signature of Student

Acknowledgments

Thank you, Connie (1988–2005), Sam (1997–2008), and Lulu (unknown–2012) my constant companions and all the foster dogs and those who walked with us: Polly, Curly, Coco (cattle dog), Phantom, Walter, Coco (Labrador), Socks, Roy, Missy (Border collie), Missy (malamute), Charlie, Minnie, Rosie, and Nala. Your insistence that I take a break and that I must go “walkies” reminded me to be-in-the-world.

Thank you, Raymond for the support, financial and moral, that allowed me to keep going. Thank you also for being that critical friend every PhD student needs. I hope I have shown that I took your advice on writing for the reader.

Thank you, Mum and Dad for providing the moral support to finish and helping me by doing the household chores I did not do.

Thank you, Tony, Jane, and Abraham for doing the yard work, bushfire preparation, and packing.

I greatly appreciate the interviewees for giving your time and sharing part of your consciousness.

Thank you, John, Jo, and Jenny for supervising in your qualitatively different ways. In particular, I acknowledge John Leaney for starting me off, introducing me to Crotty, and those brief but encouraging e-mails of the near final drafts. I acknowledge Jo McKenzie for the encouragement to keep going during the middle years, your tolerance, and patience while I struggled with my health issues, and the discussions about the initial analysis and results. I acknowledge Jenny Edwards, for getting me through the final year to near completion, for the numerous times you read and commented on complete drafts of chapters, and acknowledging each milestone as I neared completion. I make special mention of the day in July 2011 when Jo and Jenny gave me their time for a whole day and set me on the path to completing.

Thank you to Blue Mountains Secretarial Solutions for your efficient and accurate transcribing services.

Thank you to the residents in my neighbourhood who encouraged me to keep going.

Thank you to the Hampton Hounds of Vancouver, Canada for including me in your dog-walking group.

Thank you to the numerous health professionals that have kept me in one piece, mentally and physically.

Thank you to the UTS librarians for fulfilling so many interlibrary loans. Thank you for providing the Harvard_UTS citation and referencing output style for Endnote upon which I based the citation and referencing style for this thesis. The Harvard_UTS referencing style is based on the Australian Government's Style Guide for Authors, Editors, and Publishers, 2002, 6th edition, which was my chief style guide.

Thank you to the Faculty and University Graduate School for administering my PhD.

Thank you to Sonja and others at the Resource Centre for printing support and services.

Thank you to the computer technicians who helped with advice and service to keep my PCs and laptops operational.

Thank you to the many authors and researchers on whose shoulders I stand.

Table of Contents

List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xv
Abstract	xvii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 What is Analysis/Design.....	2
1.2 Who are Analyst/Designers	5
1.3 What is Phenomenography	6
1.3.1 <i>Philosophy of Phenomenography</i>	9
1.3.2 <i>Epistemology of Phenomenography</i>	10
1.3.3 <i>Theoretical Perspective of Phenomenography</i>	10
1.3.4 <i>Phenomenographic Research Methods</i>	11
1.3.5 <i>Phenomenographic Research Techniques</i>	11
1.3.6 <i>My Non-dualistic–Experiential–Interpretivist/Descriptivist Research Position</i>	12
1.4 Study Process and Thesis Structure	13
1.5 What this Study Contributes	17
2 Analyst/Designers’ Perceptions	21
2.1 Perceptions of Project Failure	21
2.2 Performance Linked to Project Failure	25
2.3 Descriptions of Analyst/Designers	27
2.3.1 <i>Understanding of the System and the Application Domain</i>	31
2.3.2 <i>Communication, Documentation, and Modelling</i>	32
2.3.3 <i>System Development Process</i>	32
2.3.4 <i>Requirements</i>	33
2.3.5 <i>Ability to Abstract</i>	33
2.3.6 <i>Attitude</i>	33
2.3.7 <i>Quantitative Research</i>	35
2.4 Conclusion	38

3	Phenomenographic Studies of Computing Phenomena.....	41
3.1	An Overview of Phenomenographic Studies in Computing Education Research.....	42
3.2	An Overview of Phenomenographic Studies of Professionals and Computing Phenomena.....	44
3.3	Phenomenographic Studies of Professionals, Students, and IS and ISD Phenomena Relevant to this Study	45
3.3.1	<i>Systems Designers and Humans as Users of IS</i>	<i>46</i>
3.3.2	<i>Consultants and Requirements Elicitation Interviews</i>	<i>48</i>
3.3.3	<i>Business Analysts and Business Process Management.....</i>	<i>50</i>
3.3.4	<i>Students and Software Development</i>	<i>52</i>
3.3.5	<i>Students and IS Design.....</i>	<i>54</i>
3.3.6	<i>Students and Information Systems.....</i>	<i>57</i>
3.3.7	<i>Potential Overlap</i>	<i>59</i>
3.3.8	<i>Profiling Analyst/Designers</i>	<i>62</i>
3.4	Conclusion	67
4	Research Method	69
4.1	Sampling	70
4.2	Interviewing	73
4.3	Transcribing Interviews	76
4.4	In Data Analysis the First Move is a Guess.....	77
4.5	Analysing and Interpreting the Data	78
4.5.1	<i>My Phenomenographic Constant Comparison Method.....</i>	<i>80</i>
4.5.2	<i>Analytical Frameworks</i>	<i>85</i>
4.6	The Nature of Phenomenographic Results	90
4.7	Validity and Reliability.....	91
5	Research Process (1): Initial Analysis and Results.....	97
5.1	The Sample	97
5.2	The Interviews	101
5.3	The Transcripts	106
5.4	The Data Analysis and Interpretation	106

5.4.1	<i>Data Analysis and Interpretation Part (A): Initial Interpretation of Salient Constituents</i>	108
5.4.2	<i>Data Analysis and Interpretation Part (B): The Awareness of Analysis/Design Categories</i>	111
5.4.3	<i>Data Analysis and Interpretation Part (C): The Initial Approach Categories</i>	115
5.4.4	<i>Data Analysis and Interpretation Part (D): The Initial Conception Categories</i>	118
5.4.5	<i>Data Analysis and Interpretation Part (E): The Initial Conceptions and Approaches Relationships</i>	127
5.5	A Critique of the Initial Data Analysis and Results	129
5.5.1	<i>An Evaluation of Analytical Frameworks</i>	131
5.5.2	<i>Theories Used to Support Phenomenographic Research</i>	138
6	Research Process (2): Theoretical Underpinnings and GIFTed Data Analysis	143
6.1	Being-in-the-World Ontology	146
6.2	The Internal Relation	148
6.3	Intentionality	151
6.3.1	<i>Intentionality as a Theory of Mind</i>	152
6.3.2	<i>Intention as a Theory of Action</i>	156
6.3.3	<i>Folk Concept of Intentionality</i>	159
6.3.4	<i>Intentionality in Phenomenography</i>	160
6.4	The Nature of Experience	165
6.4.1	<i>Experience as a Stream of Consciousness</i>	166
6.4.2	<i>The Temporal Nature of Discourse</i>	167
6.4.3	<i>Gestalt Theory</i>	167
6.4.4	<i>Gurwitsch's Field Theory of Consciousness</i>	170
6.5	GIFTed Data Analysis	175
6.6	Phenomenography and GIFTed Data Analysis	177
6.6.1	<i>The Field and the Structure of Awareness</i>	177
6.6.2	<i>Constituent or Aspect</i>	178
6.6.3	<i>Variation</i>	179
6.6.4	<i>The Limited Number of Ways</i>	180

6.6.5	<i>The Second-Order Perspective</i>	181
6.6.6	<i>Collective Level</i>	182
6.6.7	<i>Phenomenographic Outcomes</i>	183
6.7	Summary.....	184
7	Conceptions of Analysis/Design Categories of Description	187
7.1	Conception Category 1: Differentiate analysis/design as something other than programming.....	191
7.2	Conception Category 2: Catalogue separate analysis/design tasks into a sequential and orderly activity.....	194
7.3	Conception Category 3: Idealise analysis/design as how to deliver what the client wants	198
7.4	Conception Category 4: Contrast actual and ideal analysis—what and design—how	204
7.5	Conception Category 5: Integrate exploring the organisation and problem with creating an abstract solution	210
7.6	The Conception Categories Outcome Space	215
8	Approaches to Analysis/Design Categories of Description	221
8.1	Approach Category 1: An ad hoc process that as quickly as possible delivers something to the client and solves the problem	225
8.2	Approach Category 2: An atomistic process that produces artefacts to show that some analysis and design took place.....	233
8.3	Approach Category 3: A circumscribed process that produces the best artefacts and solution	238
8.4	Approach Category 4: An adjustable process that shares an understanding of the problem and a vision of the solution to satisfy stakeholders	246
8.5	The Approach Categories Outcome Space	254
9	The Relationships between Conception and Approach Categories	259
9.1	Research Process.....	260
9.1.1	<i>Aligning Gestalts</i>	260
9.1.2	<i>Synthesising Development Life Cycles</i>	267
9.2	The Set of Conception–Approach Relationships.....	269
9.2.1	<i>Category and Relationship Taxonomic Labels</i>	271

9.3	Factors Influencing the Relationships.....	271
9.3.1	<i>Knowledge as the Influence on the Use of an Approach.....</i>	272
9.3.2	<i>Organisational Factors that Influence the Use of a Less Sophisticated Approach.....</i>	273
9.3.3	<i>Project Factors that Influence the Use of a Less Sophisticated Approach</i>	275
9.3.4	<i>Personal Factors that Influence the Use of a Less Sophisticated Approach</i>	277
9.3.5	<i>Organisational Factors that Influence the Use of a More Sophisticated Approach.....</i>	280
9.3.6	<i>Project Factors that Influence the Use of a More Sophisticated Approach</i>	282
9.3.7	<i>Personal Factors that Influence the Use of a More Sophisticated Approach</i>	283
9.4	The Gestalts of Selected Conception–Approach Relationships.....	284
9.4.1	<i>The Cowboy Gestalt: The Other-than-Programming–Ad Hoc Relationship.....</i>	285
9.4.2	<i>The Cataloguer Gestalt: The Catalogue–Atomistic Relationship</i>	289
9.4.3	<i>The Methodist Gestalt: The Idealise–Circumscribed Relationship.....</i>	293
9.4.4	<i>The Magician Gestalt: The Contrast–Adjustable Relationship.....</i>	297
9.4.5	<i>The Master Gestalt: The Integrate–Adjustable Relationship.....</i>	301
9.5	Summary	305
10	Discussion	307
10.1	Gestalts of Analysis/Design.....	309
10.1.1	<i>The Cowboy.....</i>	309
10.1.2	<i>The Cataloguer.....</i>	310
10.1.3	<i>The Methodist</i>	311
10.1.4	<i>The Magician.....</i>	312
10.1.5	<i>The Master.....</i>	313
10.2	Profiling Analyst/Designers.....	314
10.2.1	<i>The Lower Professional View.....</i>	316
10.2.2	<i>The Middle Professional View.....</i>	316

10.2.3	<i>The Higher Professional View</i>	318
10.3	Gestalts and Stages of Development	319
10.4	Implications for the Profession, Education, and IS Research.....	323
10.4.1	<i>Implications for the Profession</i>	323
10.4.2	<i>Implications for Education</i>	324
10.4.3	<i>Implications for IS Research</i>	328
10.5	Contributions to Phenomenographic Research.....	330
10.6	Limitations of the Results	333
10.7	Validity and Reliability.....	335
10.7.1	<i>Confidence</i>	335
10.7.2	<i>Congruence</i>	336
10.7.3	<i>Interpretive Awareness</i>	337
10.8	Generalisability.....	337
10.9	Closing Remarks.....	338
	References	341

List of Figures

Figure 1.1:	Elements of a research process with examples (Adapted from Crotty 1998, p. 5).....	8
Figure 1.2:	An overview of the study process and thesis structure for this study.....	14
Figure 2.1:	Bostrom and Heinen’s association between systems designers’ frames of reference and BIS project failures. (Reproduced from Bostrom & Heinen 1977a, p. 21).....	26
Figure 2.2:	Curtis et al.’s layered behavioural model for software development upon which they base their description of software project design team members. (Reproduced from Curtis et al. 1988, p. 1269).....	29
Figure 2.3:	The mean (from highest to lowest) and standard deviations of the importance ratings by systems analysts of 12 job behaviour dimensions. (Adapted from Arvey & Hoyle 1974, p. 64).....	36
Figure 3.1:	The variation in IS designers’ ways of conceptualising humans as users of IS. (Adapted from Isomäki 2002, 2007).....	47
Figure 3.2:	The variation in consultants’ ways of experiencing requirements elicitation interviews (Adapted from Davey & Cope 2009).....	49
Figure 3.3:	The variation in students’ ways of experiencing software development (Adapted from Boustedt 2010).....	53
Figure 3.4:	The variation in second year university students’ ways of conceiving IS design. (Adapted from Rose et al. 2005).....	55
Figure 3.5:	The variation in early undergraduate students’ ways of conceiving an IS (Adapted from Cope 2000, 2002a; n.d.).....	58
Figure 3.6:	The <i>potential</i> overlap of phenomenographic results from studies of IS and ISD phenomena with analyst/designers’ ways of experiencing analysis/design.....	59
Figure 3.7:	An alignment of the outcome spaces from phenomenographic studies of professionals’ and students’ ways of experiencing ISD and IS phenomena.....	63
Figure 4.1:	The method of sampling for the widest possible variation of experience.....	70
Figure 4.2:	My phenomenographic constant comparison method based on Glaser and Strauss (1967).	81
Figure 4.3:	The conceptual apparatus of ways of experiencing learning (Reproduced from Marton & Booth 1997, p. 91).....	87

Figure 4.4:	The basic structure of learning (Reproduced from Marton & Booth 1997, p. 84).....	87
Figure 4.5:	The elaborated structure of learning (Reproduced from Marton & Booth 1997, p. 85).....	88
Figure 4.6:	The basic unit of a way of experiencing a phenomenon (Marton & Booth 1997, p. 88, Figure 5.3).....	89
Figure 4.7:	The structure of awareness.....	89
Figure 5.1:	The variation in the interviewees' ways of experiencing analysis/design based on anecdotal comparison.....	98
Figure 5.2:	Overview of the data analysis and interpretation process for this study. (Overleaf).....	107
Figure 5.3:	Part (A) of the data analysis and interpretation process.....	109
Figure 5.4:	The initial salient constituents coded during part (A) of the data analysis and interpretation process.....	110
Figure 5.5:	Part (B) of the data analysis and interpretation process.....	112
Figure 5.6:	The awareness of analysis/design categories of description and outcome space.....	113
Figure 5.7:	Part (C) of the data analysis and interpretation process.....	115
Figure 5.8:	The analytical framework for the initial approaches to analysis/design categories.....	116
Figure 5.9:	Part (D) of the data analysis and interpretation process.....	119
Figure 5.10:	The initial analytical framework for the conceptions of analysis/design categories (Overleaf).....	120
Figure 5.11:	Part (E) of the data analysis and interpretation process.....	128
Figure 5.12:	Initial conception categories and approach categories relationships.....	128
Figure 5.13:	Part of Cope's (2000) analytical framework seen as a meld of the Marton and Booth (1997) what/how and structural/referential frameworks.....	133
Figure 5.14:	Cope's structure of awareness (Reproduced from Cope 2000, p. 16).....	134
Figure 5.15:	Rose et al.'s (2005) analytical framework seen as melds of the Marton and Booth (1997) what/how and structural/referential frameworks.....	135
Figure 5.16:	Marton's (1988a) logical structure of the experiential perspective with an example.....	137
Figure 5.17:	Rubin's figure (Rubin 1915).....	141
Figure 6.1:	Parts (F) and (G) of the data analysis and interpretation process.....	144
Figure 6.2:	An overview of the theoretical underpinnings of phenomenography as used in this study (Overleaf).....	145
Figure 6.3:	The external relation in contrast with the internal relation.....	149

Figure 6.4:	Internal relations are in the person-thing internal relation set, which is in and of the world.....	150
Figure 6.5:	The conception–of analytical framework based on intentionality as theory of mind	155
Figure 6.6:	The approach–to analytical framework based on intention as theory of action..	158
Figure 6.7:	A model of the folk concept of intentionality (Reproduced from Malle & Knobe 1997, p. 112)	159
Figure 6.8:	The outcome space, categories, and themes form a hierarchy of Gestalts.....	168
Figure 6.9:	The metaphor of a stream of consciousness extended to the researcher transecting the stream. (Image sources: (a) Curtis 2011; (b) Dohrn 2011).....	171
Figure 6.10:	The Gestalt or field that is the static point of view of the dynamic person-phenomenon internal relation	172
Figure 6.11:	The relation is the focus of phenomenographic research.(2003; 1995; 1994)....	182
Figure 7.1:	Part (H) of the data analysis and interpretation process.....	188
Figure 7.2:	The conception-of-analysis/design analytical framework	189
Figure 7.3:	The field of Conception Category 1.....	192
Figure 7.4:	The field of Conception Category 2.....	196
Figure 7.5:	The field of Conception Category 3.....	200
Figure 7.6:	The field of Conception Category 4.....	206
Figure 7.7:	The field of Conception Category 5.....	212
Figure 7.8:	The conception categories outcome space (Overleaf)	215
Figure 8.1:	Part (I) of the data analysis and interpretation process	222
Figure 8.2:	The approach-to-analysis/design analytical framework	223
Figure 8.3:	The field of Approach Category 1	227
Figure 8.4:	The field of Approach Category 2	234
Figure 8.5:	The field of Approach Category 3	240
Figure 8.6:	The field of Approach Category 4	248
Figure 8.7:	The approach categories outcome space. (Overleaf)	254
Figure 9.1:	Part (J) of the data analysis and interpretation process.....	259
Figure 9.2:	The relationships analytical framework.....	261
Figure 9.3:	The set of relationships between conception and approach categories.....	269
Figure 9.4:	The Other-than-programming–Ad hoc relationship showing parallel Gestalts at the field level.....	286
Figure 9.5:	The hypothetical analyst/designer’s view of the Other-than-programming–Ad hoc development life cycle	288
Figure 9.6:	The Catalogue–Atomistic relationship showing parallel Gestalts at the field level.....	290

Figure 9.7:	The hypothetical analyst/designer’s view of the Catalogue–Atomistic development life cycle.....	292
Figure 9.8:	The Idealise–Circumscribed relationship showing parallel Gestalts at the field level.....	294
Figure 9.9:	The hypothetical analyst/designer’s view of the Idealise–Circumscribed development life cycle.....	296
Figure 9.10:	The Contrast–Adjustable showing parallel Gestalts at the field level.....	298
Figure 9.11:	The hypothetical analyst/designer’s view of the Contrast–Adjustable development life cycle.....	300
Figure 9.12:	The Integrate–Adjustable relationship showing a parallel in the Gestalts at the theme level.....	302
Figure 9.13:	The hypothetical analyst/designer’s view of the Integrate–Adjustable development life cycle.....	304
Figure 10.1:	The logical relationships between the conception and approach categories from this study and the categories from phenomenographic studies of ISD and IS phenomena. (Overleaf).....	315
Figure 10.2:	Dall’Alba & Sandberg’s (2006) alternative professional development model with hypothetical development trajectories. (Reproduced from Dall’Alba & Sandberg 2006, p. 400).....	320
Figure 10.3:	Dall’Alba & Sandberg’s alternative professional development model with Gestalts of analysis/design as the vertical dimension and hypothetical development trajectories (Based on Dall’Alba & Sandberg 2006).....	321
Figure 10.4:	Royce’s waterfall development <i>concept</i> (Reproduced from Royce 1970/1987, p. 329).....	325
Figure 10.5:	Royce’s waterfall development method (Adapted from Royce 1970/1987, p. 338).....	326

List of Tables

Table 1.1:	A comparison of the philosophical, epistemological, and theoretical perspective positions for survey and phenomenographic research.	12
Table 2.1:	Project success continuum: software developer perspective (Linberg 1999, p. 190).	22
Table 2.2:	Two examples of why projects, including BISSD projects, fail	24
Table 2.3:	Examples of research topics outside the scope set by the results of this study that are related to analyst/designers and analysis/design.	34
Table 3.1:	The conceptions business analysts’ emphasise when describing business process management. (Adapted from Reiter et al. 2010).....	51
Table 5.1:	The background characteristics of the interviewees	99
Table 5.2:	The characteristics of the IS and projects described by the interviewees.	100
Table 5.3:	The proportion of the question types 1–5 used across all interviews.	103
Table 5.4:	The number of questions for the question types 1–5 for all interviews.	104
Table 5.5:	The initial approach categories of description (Adapted from Box 2009).....	117
Table 5.6:	The outcome space for the initial approach categories (Adapted from Box 2009)	118
Table 5.7:	The initial conception categories of description	122
Table 5.8:	The outcome space for the initial conception categories	124
Table 5.9:	The percentage of agreement between 13 IS researchers’ and my classifications of quotes to the initial conception categories.	126
Table 5.10:	The percentage of agreement between each IS researcher’s and my classifications of quotes to initial conception categories.	126
Table 5.11:	The average ranks for the initial conception categories of description ranked by 11 IS researchers.	127
Table 6.1:	Examples of how intentionality is manifested in the results of some phenomenographic studies and, where available, how intentionality is defined.	163
Table 9.1:	An interpretation using the adapted instance of a closure argument	265
Table 9.2:	The taxonomic labels for the conception–approach relationships	271
Table 9.3:	Organisational factors described by interviewees as influences on the use of less sophisticated approaches.....	274

Table 9.4:	Project factors described by interviewees as influences on the use of less sophisticated approaches	276
Table 9.5:	Personal factors described by interviewees as influences on the use of less sophisticated approaches	278
Table 9.6:	Organisational factors described by interviewees as influences on the use of more sophisticated approaches	281
Table 9.7:	Project factors described by interviewees as influences on the use of more sophisticated approaches	283
Table 9.8:	Personal factors described by interviewees as influences on the use of more sophisticated approaches	284

Abstract

Business information systems (BIS) projects succeed or fail because of people. A better understanding of the people who analyse/design BIS could lead to more successes. This study of the qualitatively different ways that analyst/designers' conceive of and approach their work improves our understanding. Twenty interviews with analyst/designers with varying expertise and years of experience were analysed, interpreted, and described using a research method that evolved from orthodox phenomenography.

This evolved method itself contributes to phenomenography. The significant contributions are: 1) GIFTed data analysis, a data analysis technique incorporating Gestalt theory, types of intentionality, and Gurwitsch's field theory of consciousness; 2) a generic conception-of analytical framework; 3) a generic approach-to analytical framework.

The categories resulting from the phenomenographic analysis, and which describe analyst/designers' awareness of analysis/design, are treated as Gestalts. The categories form two sets: conceptions and approaches. The five conception categories are: 1) Differentiate analysis/design as something other than programming; 2) Catalogue separate analysis/design tasks into a sequential and orderly activity; 3) Idealise analysis/design as how to deliver what the client wants; 4) Contrast actual and ideal analysis—what and design—how; 5) Integrate exploring the organisation and problem with creating an abstract solution. The four approach categories are: 1) An ad hoc process that as quickly as possible delivers something to the client and solves the problem; 2) An atomistic process that produces artefacts to show that some analysis and design took place; 3) A circumscribed process that produces the best artefacts and solution; 4) An adjustable process that shares an understanding of the problem and a vision of the solution to satisfice stakeholders. Ten relationships between conception and approach categories were deemed rational. Five relationships, which are the relationships between the highest approach category to which a conception category is related, were selected for closer examination. These five Gestalts of analysis/design, the cowboy, the cataloguer, the methodist, the magician, and the master are described as

parallel Gestalts at the field or theme level of the categories and as development life cycles.

All these results reveal at a collective level a number of different ways analyst/designers experience analysis/design, thus contributing to a people-centred foundation for research aimed at increasing BIS project successes.

The history of humanity has slowly been increasing the boundaries of knowledge and knowing more and more and more, and feels comfortable inside there, but at the edges, it's always going to be a challenge.

Neil Armstrong (1930–2012), Commander, Apollo 11 —

Malley, A. (Host), Stoykov, V. (Introducer) & evotv (Creator & Producer) 2012, 1 May, *An audience with Neil Armstrong: Part 1 Space Race*, Video, *A special edition of evotv's the bottom line*, CPA Australia, <cpaaustralia.com.au/thebottomline>.

