

EFFECTS OF SWEEP ON CONTROLS

I - EFFECTIVENESS

By John G. Lowry and Harold I. Johnson

Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory

INTRODUCTION

The design of controls for unswept wings that fly at low speed has been discussed in several papers (references 1 to 7). The design procedures set forth in these papers are adequate to allow for the prediction of control characteristics within small limits. However, with airplane speeds approaching and sometimes exceeding the critical speed of the wing surface, these low-speed characteristics are drastically changed. This paper will use the results of about 25 investigations (references 8 to 28) to indicate the nature of these changes and to discuss the design of controls on swept wing.

At the present time, information on the behavior of controls in the transonic speed range is too meager to permit the development of a rational design procedure that applies at transonic speeds. Because of this situation, the design of control surfaces for transonic airplanes must still be based primarily on low-speed considerations. At the same time, however, the experimental results that are available for transonic speeds indicate certain trends which should be kept in mind in order to reduce the unfavorable effects of compressibility at high speeds. With this thought in mind, therefore, some of the important experimental data at transonic speeds will be discussed and a design procedure based on low-speed data will be presented. For convenience, the discussion will be divided into aileron effectiveness, lift effectiveness, and pitching-moment effectiveness. However, it should be realized that the parameters are closely interdependent and hence, if a certain geometric design feature causes a particular change in one of the parameters, it will usually cause a corresponding change in the others.

AILERON EFFECTIVENESS

Effects of Compressibility

Effects of sweep.— Information on the effect of sweep on aileron effectiveness at high subsonic speeds was obtained recently from tests in the Langley 8-foot high-speed tunnel (references 8 and 9). These tests were run on a wing of NACA 65-210 section which for the unswept case had an aspect ratio of 9.0, a taper ratio of 0.4, and a 20-percent-chord plain aileron covering 37.5 percent of the wing semispan near the

tip. In order to obtain the swept-wing configurations, the straight wing was rotated about the 40-percent-root-chord point and the tips extended so that they were parallel to the airstream. This procedure changed somewhat the aspect ratio, taper ratio, and wing section parallel to the stream direction but retained the advantages inherent in testing the same model at different angles of sweep. Some typical results from the investigation are shown in figure 1.

Here we have the change in rolling-moment coefficient produced by 20° change in total aileron angle plotted against Mach number for the straight wing and for the two wings sweptback 32.6° and 47.6°. It is noted that the ailerons on the straight wing remained fully effective up to the critical Mach number of the wing which was 0.73 at design lift coefficient. Beyond the critical Mach number the ailerons continued to lose effectiveness up to the highest test Mach number of 0.925. This large loss in rolling-moment effectiveness at supercritical Mach numbers is apparently a direct reflection of the generally large loss in lift effectiveness of trailing-edge control surfaces on straight airfoils at supercritical Mach numbers. The effects of sweepback are seen to be twofold. First, the aileron effectiveness, before compressibility effects appear, is reduced approximately by the factor $\cos^2 \Lambda$ in accordance with the simple theory of the effect of sweepback on flap effectiveness. Second, the Mach number at which compressibility effects first appear is raised by sweeping the wing back. For example, the aileron on the straight wing began to lose effectiveness at a Mach number of about 0.7, that on the 32.6° sweptback wing at a Mach number of 0.8, and that on the 47.6° sweptback wing at a Mach number of 0.9. It might be noted also that the drop-off in effectiveness due to compressibility effects becomes less abrupt as the sweepback angle is increased. These data show the desirability of resorting to sweepback in order to delay the loss in aileron control effectiveness that occurs at high subsonic speeds.

Some qualitative data on the effectiveness of ailerons at Mach numbers between the critical and 1.3 have been obtained by the Langley Pilotless Aircraft Research Division (reference 10) and are shown in figure 2. In these tests rocket-propelled test vehicles were fitted with low-aspect-ratio wing of NACA 65-series section having 20-percent-chord sealed ailerons deflected about 5° parallel to the relative wind. From continuous measurements of the rolling velocity and speed of the missiles the rolling-effectiveness parameter $\frac{pb}{2V}$ was determined as a function of Mach number. It should be noted that this parameter $\frac{pb}{2V}$ depends on the wing damping moment due to rolling as well as the aileron effectiveness so that some of the results are only qualitative with regard to aileron effectiveness. However, the results probably indicate correctly the effects of the various major design parameters on aileron effectiveness at transonic speeds. In figure 2 we have plotted the

$\frac{pb}{2V}$ per degree of aileron deflection against the flight Mach number.

It is seen that for these wings of 9-percent thickness and aspect ratio of 3 the unswept configuration experiences a sudden serious loss in aileron effectiveness at Mach numbers around 0.925. Because of the effects of rotational inertia of the rocket-propelled body and the longitudinal deceleration during these tests, the actual loss in effectiveness was somewhat greater than is shown by the data. As the sweepback angle is increased, the abrupt loss in effectiveness grows smaller until at a sweepback angle of 45° there appear to be no sudden changes in effectiveness through the transonic range. The aileron effectiveness at supersonic speeds is much less than at subsonic speeds for all sweepback angles, the difference being greatest for the unswept wing and least for the most highly swept wing.

Effect of thickness.— Other rocket tests (reference 10) have shown that airfoil section thickness appears to have a major effect on the loss in effectiveness of controls in the transonic range. Figure 3 illustrates this point. Here we have tests of two NACA 65-series symmetrical airfoils of different thickness ratios at an aspect ratio of 3.0. The 9-percent-thick section exhibited an abrupt loss in effectiveness at a Mach number of 0.925, but the 6-percent-thick section, although showing an equal loss in effectiveness from Mach number of 0.9 to 1.3, does not show the discontinuity at Mach numbers of about 0.9. Data for sweptback wings similar to that shown here indicated that for 45° sweepback, sudden changes in control effectiveness in the transonic speed range will be avoided if the thickness ratio is less than 10 or 12 percent. These data apply for deflections of 5° and therefore may not represent the variations for smaller deflections.

Effect of aspect ratio.— The effect of aspect ratio at 45° sweepback as determined from rocket tests (reference 10) is shown in figure 4. The control on the airfoil of aspect ratio 1.75 was considerably more effective than that of the airfoil of aspect ratio 3.0. This may very well be largely an effect of change in the damping moment due to rolling of the airfoils. The same trend in control effectiveness with aspect ratio was observed also on unswept airfoils of aspect ratio 1.75 and 3.0.

Effect of trailing-edge angle.— The trailing-edge angle of controls also appears to determine to a large extent the behavior of ailerons at transonic speeds. Some results from the Langley 8-foot high-speed tunnel (reference 8) and from the Ames 16-foot high-speed tunnel are shown in figure 5. This figure shows the rolling moment produced by aileron deflection for several wings at 2° angle of attack and at Mach numbers of about 0.85. We see that the aileron with a 20° trailing-edge angle on the unswept 12-percent-thick wing showed a reversal in effectiveness for the up-going aileron. This reversal of effectiveness extended to deflections of 10° , the largest tested. The aileron with the 11° trailing-edge angle on the unswept 10-percent-thick wing did not however show any

reversal even at slightly higher Mach numbers. Sweeping the wing with the large trailing-edge angle back 47° , as shown in this figure, also eliminated the reversal in effectiveness over the complete deflection range. Other Ames 16-foot high-speed-tunnel data (reference 16) indicate, however, that the trailing-edge angle of controls on swept wings is also critical. For example, ailerons with 16.4° trailing-edge angle on a 37° sweptback wing showed serious decreases in effectiveness with Mach number, whereas reducing the trailing-edge to 11.2° alleviated the large decrease in effectiveness. These results indicate two things: first, that the trailing-edge angle is important and should be kept as small as possible, and second, that sweeping the wing will reduce but will not necessarily eliminate the adverse effects of large trailing-edge angles on aileron effectiveness.

Aileron Design

Experimental results.— From the discussion thus far we see that the main effects of sweep are to delay the adverse effects of compressibility to higher Mach numbers and to reduce the magnitude of these effects when, and if, they do occur. In order to determine to what extent the design procedure for controls on unswept wings would have to be modified for swept wings, a semispan wing with an aspect ratio of 6 and taper ratio of $1/2$ was tested in the Langley 300 MPH 7- by 10-foot tunnel, unswept and with three sweep angles (reference 11). The wing was equipped with a variable-span, plain-sealed, 20-percent-chord aileron.

The variation of the rate of change of rolling-moment coefficient with deflection $C_{l\delta}$ with span of aileron for the various angles of sweep is shown in figure 6. The aileron for this investigation extended inboard from the tip but the data are applicable for other aileron locations. The variation of $C_{l\delta}$ with sweep shown here also includes the effect of aspect ratio which varied from 6 for the straight wing to 3.43 for the 51.3° swept wing. It will be noted that as the sweep is increased and the aspect ratio decreases, the values of $C_{l\delta}$ decrease considerably and that this decrease is even greater for ailerons located near the wing tip. It should be remembered, however, that these data are for low Mach numbers and Reynolds number of about 2×10^6 . In order to make this chart of a more general nature, the data were reduced to the form more generally used — that is, the change in rolling moment for unit change in angle of attack over the aileron span $\frac{C_l}{\Delta\alpha}$. In making this reduction it was necessary to establish a nomenclature for swept wings. In order to be consistent with established procedures, the chords and spans of the swept wings are measured parallel and perpendicular to the plane of symmetry and the sweep angle is that of the wing leading edge (see fig. 7). The control surface deflections are measured in a plane perpendicular to the control hinge line. When the "unswept" wing

panel is referred to, it will represent the wing that would be obtained if the swept wing were rotated about the midpoint of the root chord until the 50-percent-chord line is perpendicular to the plane of symmetry. The tip is cut off parallel to the plane of symmetry. The chords in this case are measured perpendicular to the 50-percent-chord line. (The unswept spans and chords are primed in fig. 7.)

Design procedure.— In reducing the data of figure 6 from $C_{l\delta}$ to $\frac{C_l}{\Delta\alpha}$ as shown in figure 8, the values of $C_{l\delta}$ at each spanwise station were divided by $\cos^2\Lambda$ and the value of flap effectiveness parameter α_δ for the "unswept" wing panel. It will be noted that this method brought the curves together for large-span ailerons and for ailerons on wings swept less than 30° . The curve for $\Lambda = 0^\circ$ to 30° agrees with the theoretical curve (reference 2) for the same aspect ratio and taper ratio as the unswept wing. Short-span tip ailerons show, however, a loss in effectiveness for the higher sweep angles and indicate that on highly swept wings a partial-span aileron located slightly inboard will give more rolling moment than the same aileron located at the wing tip.

In using this chart for design purposes, it is necessary to correct the values of $\frac{C_l}{\Delta\alpha}$ for aspect ratio, taper, and flap chord. Aileron effectiveness $C_{l\delta}$ is obtained by using the formula at the top of the figure where $\frac{C_l}{\Delta\alpha}$ is obtained from the appropriate curve on this chart. The aspect-ratio correction K_1 is the ratio of $\frac{C_l}{\Delta\alpha}$ for the aspect ratio of the "unswept" wing to the value of $\frac{C_l}{\Delta\alpha}$ for aspect ratio 6 (obtained from reference 2) and for taper ratio of 1/2. The taper-ratio correction K_2 is the ratio of the value of $\frac{C_l}{\Delta\alpha}$ for the taper ratio of the "unswept" wing to the value of $\frac{C_l}{\Delta\alpha}$ for taper ratio of 1/2; both values (obtained from reference 2) are for aspect ratio 6. The flap effectiveness parameter α_δ is based on the unswept-aileron-chord ratio (see reference 1) and Λ is the sweep of the wing leading edge. The values of $C_{l\delta}$ thus obtained are for low lift coefficients and for small deflections, and some changes will occur if either is varied considerably.

Effect of deflection.— Figure 9 shows the ratio of $C_{l\delta}$ obtained at large aileron deflections to the values of $C_{l\delta}$ obtained from the previous figures. It will be noted that the loss in $C_{l\delta}$ for larger deflections is less for the swept wing than for the straight wing. The difference appears to be about the same as the difference in deflections

of the ailerons on the two wings measured in the stream direction. Thus, it would appear that larger deflections can be used on swept wings which would tend to alleviate the low effectiveness of the ailerons. The results of swept-wing-aileron investigations indicate that the effectiveness, as with straight wings, is relatively constant with lift coefficient so long as no unusual or sudden changes in flow occur over the wing.

Comparison of estimated and test results.- In order to determine the reliability of this method in predicting C_{l8} for wings of other sweeps, aspect ratios, and taper ratios, values of C_{l8} were estimated for 14 wings and are compared in figure 10 with the measured values.

Figure 10 is a plot of $C_{l8_{est}}$ against $C_{l8_{test}}$; the solid line is the line of agreement. The scatter of points around the line of agreement indicates that the method gives good agreement for these rather conventional sweptback wings, that is, wings of aspect ratio between 2.5 to 6 and taper ratios between 0.4 to 1. This method, however, cannot be expected to give as good results for all cases of swept wings, particularly for those of extremely low aspect ratio and/or with extreme taper.

LIFT EFFECTIVENESS

Effects of Compressibility

Effects of sweep.- The problem of control lift effectiveness is closely related to the problem of aileron rolling effectiveness. In the case of ailerons, we are interested in the rolling moment caused by the lift effectiveness of a control located some distance outboard on a wing. In the case of an elevator or a rudder, we are interested directly in the lift effectiveness of the control, inasmuch as this lift effectiveness determines how much elevator control will be required to pitch the airplane through its angle-of-attack range or how much rudder control will be required to offset yawing moments due to the use of ailerons, asymmetric power, and so forth. Because of the close functional relationship between all the primary controls, therefore, one might expect to find that the effects of compressibility on the lift effectiveness of elevators and rudders will be largely the same as the effects of compressibility on the rolling-moment effectiveness of ailerons and vice versa. This expectation is borne out by an analysis of the available experimental data pertaining to full-span controls that would likely be used as elevators and rudders. Some effects of compressibility on the lift effectiveness of such controls will be considered now.

An examination of the data for full-span control surfaces on unswept airfoils, tested recently in the Langley 3-foot high-speed tunnel, the Langley 16-foot high-speed tunnel, and the Langley 24-inch high-speed tunnel (references 15 and 25 to 28), permit two conclusions to be made regarding lift effectiveness at high subsonic speeds. First, below the critical speed of the airfoil the control lift effectiveness is essentially unaffected by compressibility effects. Second, at speeds slightly above the critical speed the controls tested always experienced an abrupt loss in effectiveness which continued up to the highest speed tested. The data suggest that the control effectiveness for small deflections for these unswept configurations of conventional thickness would probably reverse at Mach numbers in the neighborhood of 0.9.

Further light is shed on this phenomenon by results obtained from wing-flow tests (references 12 and 13), which are shown in figure 11. This plot shows the control-effectiveness parameter $C_{L\delta}$, measured over $\pm 4^\circ$ control deflection, plotted against Mach number. Data are shown for an unswept configuration of 10-percent thickness, the actual sweep of leading edge being 13° , and for a 35° sweptback configuration of 9-percent thickness. It is noted that the control effectiveness for the unswept tail surface actually did reverse for small deflections at a Mach number of approximately 0.95. At higher Mach numbers the control regained effectiveness for small deflections. It may be noted also that the sweptback configuration did not lose completely its control effectiveness at any speed up to a Mach number of 1.10. Actually, the control effectiveness of the sweptback configuration fell off by about 40 percent from its low-speed value. Although these data were obtained at very low Reynolds number, that is, approximately one million, there is no proof that the phenomenon of control reversal shown by the unswept configuration will not occur also at higher Reynolds numbers, perhaps to a different degree. From figure 11 it should not be assumed that the unswept control had reversed effectiveness at all deflections.

Effect of deflection.— Figure 12 will show how the lift produced by the control varies with deflection at different Mach numbers for the straight tail surface. One curve is for a Mach number of 0.35 where the force break occurred, one is for a Mach number of 0.96 where the control effectiveness was reversed, and one is for a Mach number of 1.04 where the control had regained effectiveness at all deflections.

It should be noted that, although the flap gave a net loss in lift between deflections of -4° and 4° at a Mach number of 0.96, as was shown in figure 11 by the negative value for $C_{L\delta}$ at higher deflections, the flap produced lift in the proper direction. Hence, it would probably be possible to use such a control for trimming in combination with an adjustable stabilizer or an adjustable fin at transonic speeds,

but it is believed everyone would object to such a control because of the illogical type of control motion it would introduce. In this connection, however, floating-model tests of very thin unswept airfoils have not shown reversed control effectiveness at transonic speeds for the moderately small deflections that were tested. Hence, it seems premature to condemn completely the use of unswept configurations at transonic speeds. Much more data is needed to determine the effects of airfoil thickness, of flap trailing-edge angle, and of possibly other geometric parameters on the flap effectiveness of unswept tail surfaces. For the present time, however, we know that the flap on the 9-percent-thick, 35° sweptback tail surface showed no signs of complete loss of effectiveness even for small deflection at any speed up to a Mach number of 1.10, the highest Mach number reached.

Design Procedure

Since the control lift effectiveness is so closely related to the aileron rolling effectiveness, the design of controls such as elevators on tailless aircraft will not be discussed in detail. The lift effectiveness parameter $C_{L\delta}$ however showed about the same variation with sweep as did the aileron effectiveness; that is, there was a decrease in $C_{L\delta}$ with increase in sweep and decrease in aspect ratio (see fig. 13). Reducing these data to eliminate the sweep angle and flap chord by dividing the values of $C_{L\delta}$ at each spanwise station by $\cos^2\Lambda$ and $c\delta$ of the "unswept" control brought the curves together except for the small-span controls on highly swept wings which again showed a loss in effectiveness (see fig. 14). The values of $C_{L\delta}$ for other wings equipped with tip controls may be obtained in a manner similar to the aileron effectiveness, except that the aspect-ratio correction is the ratio of the lift-curve slope for the "unswept" wing to the lift-curve slope for aspect ratio 6 (K_3) (see fig. 14). As with aileron effectiveness, the reliability of this method was checked by estimating $C_{L\delta}$ for nine wings and comparing with the measured value of $C_{L\delta}$. Good agreement was obtained for all wings except two for which the control was located other than at the tip. Since unswept lift data indicate the lift effectiveness is different for controls starting at the tip than for those starting at the root, this disagreement would probably be expected. Thus, in addition to the restriction placed on the method of prediction of aileron effectiveness, that is, aspect ratio and taper ratio, we must also limit this method to controls starting at the wing tip.

PITCH EFFECTIVENESS

Effects of Compressibility

Reproduced from
best available copy.

In addition to a knowledge of the effects of compressibility on aileron characteristics and lift effectiveness, the designer of a high-speed flying-wing-type airplane needs to know what the effects of compressibility will be on the pitching moment produced by trailing-edge flaps. Here, the emphasis is on sweptback configurations almost entirely because of the necessity for providing a reasonably large, allowable, center-of-gravity range together with a reasonably high, trimmed, maximum lift coefficient. Some data showing the effects of compressibility on the pitching-moment effectiveness of longitudinal controls on sweptback wings are shown in figure 15.


This figure shows the pitching-moment parameter $C_{m\delta}$ plotted against Mach number for various sweptback wing-flap combinations (references 12 and 14). The pitching-moment slopes shown here are with reference to a point at 17 percent of the mean aerodynamic chord of each of the wings. This point was found to be the low-speed aerodynamic-center location for the isolated wings, having 35° and 45° of sweepback and an aspect ratio of 3, which are shown in this figure. It is seen that the effects of compressibility on pitching-moment control are relatively small at all speeds tested which are up to a Mach number of 1.1. The maximum loss in effectiveness of the $\frac{1}{4}$ -chord plain flap on the 35° sweptback NACA 65-009 airfoil, which was the only configuration tested through the speed of sound, was about 30 percent. Partial-span flaps on the tapered 35° sweptback wing show a similar tendency to lose pitching-moment effectiveness as the speed of sound is approached. With 45° of sweepback, the longitudinal control effectiveness of the full-span 25-percent-chord flap on a 12-percent-thick wing was completely unaffected by compressibility up to a Mach number of 0.89. These data indicate that trailing-edge-type longitudinal controls will retain considerable pitching-moment effectiveness at transonic speeds if as much as 35° sweepback is used and if the wing thickness is not too great; for the cases under consideration the maximum thickness was about 12 percent.

Effects of Sweep

The limited amount of low-speed data for the effects of sweep and spanwise location on the pitch effectiveness does not permit the construction of design charts. The pitching-moment data for one series of swept wings do, however, show consistent variations with sweep for sweep angles greater than 30° (fig. 16) but are not complete enough to account for all the variables.


CONCLUSIONS

It appears from the data presented that no serious problems resulting from compressibility effects will be encountered so long as the speeds are kept below the critical speed of the wing or tail surface and the trailing-edge angle is kept small, that is, less than about 14° . Above critical speeds, however, the behavior of the control depends to a large extent on the wing sweep angle. The main effects of sweeping the wing or tail are to postpone to higher Mach numbers the adverse effects of compressibility and to decrease these adverse effects when they occur. The design procedures presented, although of a preliminary nature, appear to offer a method of estimating the effectiveness of flap-type controls on swept wings of normal aspect ratio and taper ratio.




REFERENCES

1. Langley Research Department: Summary of Lateral-Control Research (Compiled by Thomas A. Toll.) NACA TN No. 1245, 1947.
2. Weick, Fred E., and Jones, Robert T.: Résumé and Analysis of N.A.C.A. Lateral Control Research. NACA Rep. No. 605, 1937.
3. Ames, Milton B., Jr., and Sears, Richard I.: Determination of Control-Surface Characteristics from NACA Plain-Flap and Tab Data. NACA Rep. No. 721, 1941.
4. Crane, Robert M.: Computation of Hinge-Moment Characteristics of Horizontal Tails from Section Data. NACA CB No. 5B05, 1945.
5. Swanson, Robert S., and Crandall, Stewart M.: Lifting-Surface-Theory Aspect-Ratio Corrections to the Lift and Hinge-Moment Parameters for Full-Span Elevators on Horizontal Tail Surfaces. NACA TN No. 1175, 1947.
6. Fischel, Jack, and Ivey, Margaret F.: Collection of Test Data for Lateral Control with Full-Span Flaps. NACA TN No. 1404, 1947.
7. Pitkin, Marvin, and Maggin, Bernard: Analysis of Factors Affecting Net Lift Increment Attainable with Trailing-Edge Split Flaps on Tailless Airplanes. NACA ARR No. L4I13, 1944.
8. Luoma, Arvo A.: An Investigation of a High-Aspect-Ratio Wing Having 0.20-Chord Plain Ailerons in the Langley 3-Foot High-Speed Tunnel. NACA RM No. L6H28d, 1946.
9. Luoma, Arvo A., Bielat, Ralph P., and Whitcomb, Richard T.: A Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Lateral Control Characteristics of Plain Ailerons on a Wing with Various Amounts of Sweep. NACA RM No. L7I15, 1947.
10. Sandahl, Carl A., and Strass, H. Kurt: Additional Results in a Free-Flight Investigation of Control Effectiveness of Full-Span, 0.2-Chord Plain Ailerons at High Subsonic, Transonic, and Supersonic Speeds to Determine Some Effects of Wing Sweepback, Aspect Ratio, Taper, and Section Thickness Ratio. (Prospective NACA paper)
11. Fischel, Jack, and Schneider, Leslie E.: Low-Speed Wind-Tunnel Investigation of a 51° Sweptback Semispan Wing Equipped with Ailerons Having Three Spans and Three Trailing-Edge Angles. (Prospective NACA paper)

12. Johnson, Harold I.: Measurements of the Aerodynamic Characteristics of a 35° Sweptback NACA 65-009 Airfoil Model with $\frac{1}{4}$ -Chord Plain Flap by the NACA Wing-Flow Method. NACA RM No. L7F13, 1947.
13. Adams, Richard E., and Silsby, Norman S.: Tests of a Horizontal-Tail Model through the Transonic Speed Range by the NACA Wing-Flow Method. NACA RM No. L7C25a, 1947.
14. Kuhn, Richard E., and King, Thomas J., Jr.: An Investigation of the Aerodynamic Characteristics of an 0.08-Scale Model of the Chance Vought XF7U-1 Airplane in the Langley High-Speed 7- by 10-Foot Tunnel. Part III - Longitudinal Control Characteristics. TED No. NACA DE308. NACA RM No. L7E01, Bur. Aero., 1947.
15. Bielat, Ralph P.: Investigation at High Speeds of a Horizontal-Tail Model in the Langley 8-Foot High-Speed Tunnel. NACA RM No. L6L10b, 1947.
16. Boddy, Lee E., and Morrill, Charles P., Jr.: The Aerodynamic Effects of Modifications to the Wing and Wing-Fuselage Intersection of an Airplane Model with the Wing Swept Back 35° . NACA RM No. A7J02, 1947.
17. Schuldenfrei, Marvin, Comisarow, Paul, and Goodson, Kenneth W.: Stability and Control Characteristics of an Airplane Model Having a 45.1° Swept-Back Wing with Aspect Ratio 2.50 and Taper Ratio 0.42 and 42.8° Swept-Back Horizontal Tail with Aspect Ratio 3.87 and Taper Ratio 0.49. NACA RM No. L7B25, 1947.
18. Goodson, Kenneth W., and Comisarow, Paul: Lateral Stability and Control Characteristics of an Airplane Model Having a 42.8° Sweptback Circular-Arc Wing with Aspect Ratio 4.00, Taper Ratio 0.50, and Sweptback Tail Surfaces. NACA RM No. L7G31, 1947.
19. Gilruth, R. R., and Wetmore, J. W.: Preliminary Tests of Several Airfoil Models in the Transonic Speed Range. NACA ACR No. L5E08, 1945.
20. Daum, Fred L., and Sawyer, Richard H.: Tests at Transonic Speeds of the Effectiveness of a Swept-Back Trailing-Edge Flap on an Airfoil Having Parallel Flat Surfaces, Extreme Sweepback, and Low Aspect Ratio. NACA CB No. L5H01, 1945.


21. Bennett, Charles V., and Johnson, Joseph L.: Experimental Determination of the Damping in Roll and Aileron Rolling Effectiveness of Three Wings Having 2° , 42° , and 62° Sweep-back. NACA TN No. 1278, 1947.
22. Goodson, Kenneth W., and Myers, Boyd C., II: An Investigation of the Aerodynamic Characteristics of an 0.08-Scale Model of the Chance Vought XF7U-1 Airplane in the Langley High-Speed 7- by 10-Foot Tunnel. Part IV - Aileron Characteristics. TED No. NACA DE308. NACA RM No. L7H22, Bur. Aero., 1947.
23. Letko, William, and Goodman, Alex: Preliminary Wind-Tunnel Investigation at Low Speed of Stability and Control Characteristics of Swept-Back Wings. NACA TN No. 1046, 1946.
24. Feigenbaum, David, and Goodman, Alex: Preliminary Investigation at Low Speeds of Swept Wings in Rolling Flow. NACA RM No. L7E09, 1947.
25. Schueller, Carl F., Korycinski, Peter F., and Strass, H. Kurt: Tests of a Full-Scale Horizontal Tail Surface in the Langley 16-Foot High-Speed Tunnel. NACA TN No. 1074, 1946.
26. Schueller, Carl F., Hieser, Gerald, and Cooper, Morton: Aerodynamic Force Characteristics at High Speeds of a Full-Scale Horizontal Tail Surface Tested in the Langley 16-Foot High-Speed Tunnel. NACA RM No. L7D08a, 1947.
27. Lindsey, W. F.: Effect of Compressibility on the Pressures and Forces Acting on a Modified NACA 65,3-019 Airfoil Having a 0.20-Chord Flap. NACA ACR No. L5G31a, 1946.
28. Ilk, Richard J.: Characteristics of a 15-Percent-Chord and a 35-Percent-Chord Plain Flap on the NACA 0006 Airfoil Section at High Subsonic Speeds. NACA RM No. A7H19, 1947.

Lowry




AILERON EFFECTIVENESS AT HIGH SUBSONIC SPEEDS

Figure 1.




ROLLING EFFECTIVENESS AT TRANSONIC SPEEDS

Figure 2.



EFFECT OF THICKNESS ON ROLLING EFFECTIVENESS AT TRANSONIC SPEEDS


Figure 3.



EFFECT OF ASPECT RATIO ON ROLLING EFFECTIVENESS AT TRANSONIC SPEEDS


Figure 4.

Lowry




EFFECTS OF TRAILING-EDGE ANGLE AND SWEEP ON AILERON EFFECTIVENESS

Figure 5.




EFFECT OF SWEEP AND SPANWISE LOCATION ON AILERON EFFECTIVENESS

Figure 6.



Swept-wing nomenclature.


Figure 7.



DESIGN CHART FOR AILERONS ON SWEEP WINGS


Figure 8.

Lowry



LOSS IN EFFECTIVENESS AT LARGE DEFLECTIONS


Figure 9.



COMPARISON OF ESTIMATED AND EXPERIMENTAL AILERON EFFECTIVENESS


Figure 10.

126 d7



CONTROL EFFECTIVENESS AT TRANSONIC SPEEDS


Figure 11.



VARIATION OF CONTROL EFFECTIVENESS WITH DEFLECTION

Figure 12.


Lowry



Effect of sweep and spanwise location on control effectiveness.

Figure 13.


$$C_{L\delta} = \frac{C_{L\delta}}{a_\delta} \times K_3 \times a_\delta \times \cos^2 \Lambda$$



Design chart for $C_{L\delta}$ on swept wing.


Figure 14.

126(f)



PITCH CONTROL AT TRANSONIC SPEEDS

Figure 15.



Effect of sweep and span on $C_{m\delta}$

Figure 16.