STS-51L Case Study Report

Saatvik Sunilraj

Virginia Aerospace Science and Technology Scholars

STS-51L Case Study Report

The STS-51L Challenger disaster on January 28, 1986, was a significant failure in engineering and decision-making. Known technical issues with the O-rings were overlooked due to organizational pressure, leading to the launch despite unsafe conditions. This report examines the ethical violations, technical problems, and organizational pressures that caused the tragedy, highlighting key lessons for future space missions.

Violations of the NSPE Code of Ethics

The Challenger disaster shows clear violations of the NSPE Code of Ethics for Engineers, especially the Fundamental Canons and Rules of Practice. Morton Thiokol engineers and NASA officials ignored warnings about the O-ring seals' vulnerability to cold temperatures. Engineers like Roger Boisjoly warned that the O-rings would not work properly at the expected launch temperature of 29°F, which was much lower than their tested limits (National Aeronautics, 1986). Despite these warnings, Morton Thiokol management overrode their engineers' concerns due to pressure from NASA to continue with the launch (Department of Philosophy, n.d.)

This decision violated several ethical principles, including Canon 1: "Hold paramount the safety, health, and welfare of the public" (NSPE, n.d.). The engineers tried to follow this principle by resisting the launch approval, but management gave in to external pressures, betraying this principle. Also, Rule of Practice 1b, which requires engineers to notify their employers or clients of any condition that endangers public safety, was violated when management chose to ignore the engineers' warnings instead of reporting the issue to higher authorities (NSPE, n.d.). This failure to address known risks directly led to the shuttle's catastrophic failure.

Risk Benefit Analysis and Organizational Pressure

At NASA, the organizational culture at that time focused more on sticking to schedules and controlling costs rather than carefully assessing risks. NASA faced a lot of pressure to show that the Space Shuttle program was reliable and cost-effective, especially since they had to launch commercial satellites and support programs like the Teacher in Space initiative. This focus on meeting deadlines and keeping a good public image led to poor risk assessments, where the need to launch on time seemed more important than the serious risks posed by the O-ring problem.

Dan Goldin's later comment, "space flight is inherently dangerous," reflects the high-risk nature of space missions. However, the Challenger disaster showed that these risks need to be managed through careful engineering and a strong commitment to safety. The decision-making process failed to consider the disastrous consequences of an O-ring failure, which engineers knew about but didn't communicate effectively to those making the final decisions.

Technical and Organizational Failures

The design of the Space Shuttle played a big role in the disaster. The solid rocket boosters (SRBs) had a joint design that used O-rings to stop hot gases from escaping during launch. This design was known to be flawed, with reports showing that the O-rings eroded and allowed gas to leak even under normal conditions. The lack of thorough testing in extremely cold temperatures made things worse, which proved to be fatal during the STS-51L mission.

Organizational failures made these technical problems even worse. Decision-makers began to see the O-ring erosion as normal and acceptable, a process called "normalization of deviance." Communication breakdowns between engineers, management, and NASA leaders prevented critical safety issues from being properly addressed. This environment, where dissent was suppressed and risks were not adequately managed, ultimately led to the disaster.

Conclusion

The Challenger disaster highlights the importance of ethical and organizational responsibilities in high-risk engineering projects. The failure to prioritize safety, communicate properly, and follow ethical standards resulted in the loss of seven lives and damaged public trust in the space program. Future missions need to focus on safety, transparency, and accountability to avoid similar tragedies. By learning from the Challenger incident, NASA and other organizations can honor the STS-51L crew's legacy and maintain high standards in engineering and ethics.

References

Department of Philosophy and Department of Mechanical Engineering, Texas A&M University. (n.d.). ENGINEERING ETHICS: The Space Shuttle Challenger disaster [Instructor's Guide]. In *Instructor's Guide*. http://ethics.tamu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2017/04/Shuttle.pdf

National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (1986). *Report to the President: Actions to implement the recommendations of the Presidential Commission on the Space Shuttle Challenger accident* [Report]. https://www.nasa.gov/wp-content/uploads/static/history/rogersrep/actions.pdf

National Society of Professional Engineers. (n.d.). *Code of Ethics for Engineers*. https://www.nspe.org/sites/default/files/resources/pdfs/Ethics/CodeofEthics/NSPECodeofEthicsforEngineers.pdf

Ronald C. Kramer, Jaska, J. A., J., & Pritchard, M. S., S. (1994). *The space Shuttle Challenger disaster: A Study in Organizational Ethics*. Wadsworth Publishing. http://pirate.shu.edu/~mckenndo/pdfs/The%20Space%20Shuttle%20Challenger%20Disaster.pdf