



# **SNS COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY**

**(An Autonomous Institution)**

**COIMBATORE-35**

**Accredited by NBA-AICTE and Accredited by NAAC – UGC with A+ Grade  
Approved by AICTE, New Delhi & Affiliated to Anna University, Chennai**



**DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONICS ENGINEERING**

**COURSE NAME: 16GE301 Professional Ethics**

**III YEAR / V SEMESTER**

**Unit 2– Engineering as Social Experimentation**

**Topic 1: Challenger Case Study**



# What We'll Discuss

## TOPIC OUTLINE



The Incident  
Design of Shuttle  
The Investigation  
Role of Communication



# The Incident



January 28, 1986

Launch



About 80 seconds after Launch  
(shuttle broke down)





# WHEN



- Tuesday, January 27th 1976
- The shuttle broke down 73 seconds into it's flight






# How




- Began after a seal on one of its booster failed to hold off pressurized gas from reaching the fuel tank. This led to the shuttle disassembling and breaking apart.



Less than 1 second after ignition, a puff of smoke appeared at the aft joint of the right booster, indicating that the O-rings burned through and failed to seal. At this point, all was lost.




# HOW



On the launch pad, the leak lasted only about 2 seconds and then apparently was plugged by putty and insulation as the shuttle rose, flying through rather strong cross-winds. Then 58.788 seconds after ignition, when the Challenger was 6 miles up, a flicker of flame emerged from the leaky joint. Within seconds, the flame grew and engulfed the fuel tank (containing liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen). That tank ruptured and exploded, destroying the shuttle.




# HOW



As the shuttle exploded and broke up at approximately 73 seconds after launch, the two booster rockets crisscrossed and continued flying wildly. The right booster, identifiable by its failure plume, is now to the left of its non-defective counterpart.




# Design of Shuttle







# Design of Shuttle





# Here's that crew!



The flight crew of Challenger 51-L. Front row, left to right: Michael J. Smith, pilot; Francis R. (Dick) Scobee, commander; Ronald E. McNair. Back row: Ellison S. Onizuka, S. Christa McAuliffe, Gregory B. Jarvis, Judith A. Resnik.



# Why

NASA did not address the issue even though they were aware of it.





# The Investigation



1970's:

less safe than more expensive alternative

1985:

scorching becomes noticeable

- Thiokol analysis shows worse on colder days
- Launch constraint by NASA (waived every launch)
- Thiokol Engineer Roger Boisjoly warns superiors “we could lose a flight”

August '85: NASA Meeting, no changes

Later, Feynman calls this strategy “Russian Roulette”



# The Investigation



Boisjoly and others: “too cold, delay launch!”

- Until 53°F

Management: how come some warmer launches show scorching?

- (crucial fact ignored--every single launch in cold temperatures showed damage)


Thiokol management gets the engineers to accept a launch recommendation.



# Role of Communication




Chart used by Thiokol Engineers on Jan 27 before launch





# Role of Communication

A Revised Chart by Rogers Commission Showing all launches





# Obfuscation during investigation



Famous physicist Richard Feynman performs experiment on television



- Dips o-ring in ice-water
- Shows greater stiffness
- also complains about slides, bullets

Edward Tufte, designer

- Provides further damning analysis of charts
- Condemns PowerPoint





**RECALL TIME**

**ASSESSMENT  
TIME**



# THANK YOU