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1.1 Importance of the Problem

The ionosphere is very complex between 50 and 90 kilometers (Km), where ionization is produced by only the most deeply penetrating radiations. This region is characterized by weakly-ionized plasma and large neutral species density as well as a complex ion chemistry and electron attachment and detachment processes (Whitten and Poppoff, 1971).

Routine measurements of meteorological and ionospheric parameters within this region are restricted by its unique composition and altitude. Meteorological data are quite plentiful below 65 Km, however, they are rare above that level. In contrast, the various radio techniques employed to measure ionospheric parameters are ineffective below about 65 Km. Because meteorological and ionospheric data seldom overlap, the research emphasis has been focused primarily on investigating the several observations of meteorological (stratospheric)-ionospheric coupling.

However, there is also considerable interest in studying other relationships among meteorological and ionospheric parameters throughout the 50-90 Km range. If such relationships exist, they would make possible an understanding of the characteristics of these parameters even when direct measurements are not available. This is
especially true in the case of ionospheric parameters below 60 Km, where ionization production is due to galactic cosmic rays, and therefore an essentially constant ionization production rate can be assumed.

1.2 Previous Related Research

A review of some early observations of meteorological-ionospheric coupling has been given by Bauer (1958). More recently, research has centered on explaining the anomalously high radio wave absorption observed during some winters. This phenomenon is often referred to as the "winter anomaly" in radio wave absorption.

Several authors (Gregory, 1965; Shapley and Beynon, 1965; Belrose, 1967; Rowe, Ferraro, Lee and Mitra, 1969; Sechrist, Mechtly, Shirke and Theon, 1969) have observed that the winter anomaly occurs simultaneously with major stratospheric warmings. A general discussion of the stratospheric warming phenomenon, including coupling with the ionosphere, can be found in Winds and Turbulence in the Stratosphere, Mesosphere, and Ionosphere, edited by Rawer (1968). One explanation for these relationships is in terms of hydrostatic coupling between low-level temperature and high-level density. However, Entsian, Gaygerov and Tarasenko (1971) found no direct, unique relation between hydrostatic coupling and the winter anomaly. Also, Heard (1967) noted a poor correlation between electron density measured at 70 Km and 10 millibar temperature.
Other explanations are based on changes in atmospheric composition, such as variations in ozone and nitric oxide concentrations (Mawdsley, 1961; Belrose, 1967; Sechrist, 1967). The latest evidence suggests that the winter anomaly is due to a variability in the electron loss rate (Geller and Sechrist, 1971; Cipriano, Hale and Mitchell, 1972).

Mitchell and Hale (1972) have qualitatively noted several of the relationships which are analyzed herein.

1.3 Specific Statement of the Problem

In this work, sufficient electrical conductivity data, obtained between 30 and 75 Km by the parachute-borne blunt probe technique (Hale, Hoult and Baker, 1968), are presented so that quantitative relationships among the various meteorological and ionospheric parameters can be determined.

The specific purposes of this work are:

a) To investigate relationships between meteorological and ionospheric parameters which are independent of altitude

b) To determine if electrical parameters measured below 60 Km are coupled with radio wave absorption occurring above that level.
CHAPTER II
DATA REDUCTION

2.1 Electrical Conductivity Data

2.1.1 The Blunt Probe Technique

Positive ($\sigma^+$) and negative ($\sigma^-$) conductivities are measured subsonically in the very low ionosphere by rocket-launched parachute-borne blunt probe payloads. The probe is similar in operational characteristics to a meteorological rocketsonde such as the Arcasonde, except that a flat plate charged particle sensor and electrometer replace the thermistor.

The procedure followed is to vary the potential ($V_p$) of the flat plate which consists of a central collecting surface and concentric guard ring of radii $a$ and $R$ respectively. The electric field ($E$) generated is given by

$$ E = \frac{2V_p}{\pi R} $$

and the current ($I_{p^+}$) to the collecting surface is

$$ I_{p^+} = \frac{2a^2 V_p \sigma^+}{R} $$

where $\sigma^\pm$ are the conductivities of the atmosphere (Hoult, 1965). To remove drift errors in the instrumentation, conductivities are determined from $dI_{p^+}/dV_p$ rather than $I_{p^+}/V_p$, where $V_p$ is established by applying a linear sweep
voltage ($V_s$) between the probe and return electrode. For $V_p$ greater than several volts

$$\frac{dI_{p+}}{dV_p} \approx \frac{dI_{p+}}{dV_s} \quad (3)$$

and therefore (2) becomes

$$\sigma_+ \approx \frac{R}{2a^2} \frac{dI_{p+}}{dV_s} \quad (4)$$

Both pre-launch calibration and in-flight conductivity data are telemetered at 1680 MHz to a GMD type meteorological recording system. This system, with the addition of an external two-track (data and timing channels) tape recorder, acquires the data.

2.1.2 Procedure for Determining Conductivities

Utilizing tape playback equipment, a data "tachometer" and a two-track hot-pen recorder, both calibration and conductivity data are converted from tape to a strip chart recording of current as a function of time ($t$). Sample calibration and conductivity curves are shown in Figure 1, the latter curve being somewhat typical at about 55 Km. The quantities $dI_{p+}/dV_s$ in (4) are computed from the slopes given in Figure 1 by

$$\frac{dI_{p+}}{dV_s} = \frac{1}{R_{cal}} \frac{(dI_{p+}/dt)_{cal}}{(dI/dt)_{cal}} \quad (5)$$
where $R_{cal}$ is the calibration resistance. Substituting (5) into (4) yields

$$\sigma_{\pm} = \frac{R}{2a^2 R_{cal} (dI_p/\text{d}t)_{cal}}$$

which gives $\sigma_{\pm}$ as functions of time.

The probe's position is continuously monitored by ground based radar, allowing the conductivities to be plotted as functions of altitude (z). Response limitations of the system prohibit accurate measurements of $dI_p/\text{d}t$ above 63 Km, and therefore $\sigma_-$ is not computed above this level.

2.1.3 The Conductivity Data

Between January 22, 1971 and February 1, 1972, conductivity data were obtained from 10 blunt probes launched at White Sands Missile Range (WSMR), New Mexico, and NASA Wallops Island (WI), Virginia (see Table 1). Data from six of these launches have been previously reported by Mitchell and Hale (1972). Conductivities obtained on January 19, 1972, are given in Figure 2, while smoothed curves representing conductivity data for each of the launches are presented in Figures 3 and 4, the dashed line being the average curve for all 10 launches.

Figures 3 and 4 indicate that day-to-day variations can be quite large for both positive and negative conductivities. For example, $\sigma_+$ values determined on
Table 1
Parameters for Blunt Probe Launchings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Local Time (Hours)</th>
<th>Solar Zenith Angle (Degrees)</th>
<th>Apogee (Km)</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 Jan 71</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jan 71</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb 71</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Jun 71</td>
<td>0810</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Jul 71</td>
<td>0705</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Oct 71</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jan 72</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jan 72</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Jan 72</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb 72</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 22, 1971, are up to five times greater than those of July 28, 1971, and σ-values for January 26, 1971, are about a factor of five greater than those of February 1, 1972.

2.2 Meteorological Data

Meteorological data are provided by the Loki Dart system of the Meteorological Rocket Network (MRN) which measures upper atmospheric temperature (T) by means of a bead thermistor sensor (Ballard and Rofe, 1969). Atmospheric density (ρ) and pressure (P) are then calculated from the hydrostatic relation and a reference pressure obtained from supporting radiosonde data (Olsen, 1972).

On three occasions, indirect methods were required to determine meteorological parameters. No MRN data were available on January 26, 1971, and values of T, ρ and P were obtained by averaging data from January 25 (0930 MST) and 27 (1200 MST), 1971. The radiosonde reference pressure was in error on June 9, 1971, and this information was provided by the June 9 (0500 MST), 1971 National Meteorological Center's 10 millibar chart. On January 6, 1972, MRN data were not available above 50 Km, and temperatures for this region were determined by averaging the January 5 (1500 EST) and 7 (1000 EST), 1972 values. Except for the above cases, and July 28, 1971, all meteorological data were measured within three hours of the blunt probe launches (see Table 2).
Figure 5. January 19, 1972 Temperature Data
Figure 6. Smoothed Temperature Profiles
Figure 7. Smoothed Temperature Profiles
## Table 2

**Loki Dart Launch Times**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Local Time (Hours)</th>
<th>$\Delta t^*$ (Hours)</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 Jan 71</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jan 71</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb 71</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-2.25</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Jun 71</td>
<td>0930</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Jul 71</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Oct 71</td>
<td>0845</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jan 72</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jan 72</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Jan 72</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb 72</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>WSMR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$\Delta t = \text{Loki Launch Time} - \text{Blunt Probe Launch Time}$
Temperatures for January 19, 1972, are given in Figure 5, and smoothed temperature profiles are shown in Figures 6 and 7 which indicate that day-to-day variations in temperature are quite small, seldom exceeding 10 per cent.

2.3 High Frequency Radio Wave Absorption

2.3.1 The Absorption Measurements

High frequency (HF) radio wave absorption data were obtained from the A3 continuous wave technique as described in IQSY Instruction Manual No. 4 Ionosphere (ICSU, 1963). Such measurements were made at WSMR by monitoring the 5.00 MHz radio signal from WWV in Fort Collins, Colorado. A 3.36 MHz signal from Annapolis, Maryland to University Park, Pennsylvania provided absorption data concurrent with the WI blunt probe launches, these data being provided by J. N. Rowe, A. J. Ferraro and H. S. Lee of the Ionosphere Research Laboratory, University Park, Pennsylvania.

The A3 method yields results representative of absorption at the mid-point of the transmitter-to-receiver path. Thus it can be seen from Table 3, which contains geographical coordinates of the transmitting, receiving and launching facilities, that both paths provide absorption data representative of locations far removed from the blunt probe launch sites. At WSMR the distance between the launch facility and the transmitter-to-receiver mid-point is about 470 Km, while for the WI experiment this distance
Table 3
Coordinates of the Transmitting, Receiving and Launching Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Longitude (Degrees)</th>
<th>Latitude (Degrees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>Receiving</td>
<td>-78.0E</td>
<td>40.8N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis</td>
<td>Transmitting</td>
<td>-76.5E</td>
<td>39.0N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallops Island</td>
<td>Launching</td>
<td>-75.4E</td>
<td>37.8N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Sands, Missile Range</td>
<td>Receiving and Launching</td>
<td>-106.5E</td>
<td>32.4N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td>Transmitting</td>
<td>-105.1E</td>
<td>40.6N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is about 310 Km. Absorption over both paths takes place almost entirely above 60 Km (Lee, 1973), where ionization production is principally due to solar ultraviolet (UV) radiation.

2.3.2 Relative Absorption

To facilitate day-to-day comparisons, absorption data are determined relative to the mean absorption level of the previous night. This relative absorption \( L \) is given by

\[
L = 20 \log_{10} \frac{A}{A_0}
\]  

(7)

where \( A \) is the measured signal field strength and \( A_0 \) the average signal intensity of the preceding night. Relative absorption data were determined for each blunt probe launch date, and portions of the February 1, 1972 data are shown in Figure 8. Smoothed curves representing relative absorption data as functions of time are presented in Figures 9 and 10, where the WI absorption scale has been shifted to correspond with the WSMR scale on days of low absorption (Rowe and Hale, 1972).

Figures 9 and 10 indicate that day-to-day variations in relative absorption can be very large, especially in the early afternoon. For example, \( L \) values observed at that time on January 26, 1971, are about 20 decibels (Db) higher than those recorded just six days later. From (7), this 20 Db difference translates into an order of magnitude
variation in the quantity A/A_0. No evidence of strong solar
flare activity was found in any of these data.

The following relative absorption values are analyzed
in Sections 4.3.2, 4.3.3 and 4.3.4 respectively:

a) L_n, defined by L at the time the sun's hour
angle (ψ) is 0°. (This occurs about 1203 and 1209 Local
Time at WSMR and WI respectively, and therefore L_n is
referred to as the relative noon absorption.)

b) L_X(AM or PM), defined by L at the times the solar
zenith angle (X) is nearest 60°. (A zenith angle of 60°
was chosen after Sechrist et al., 1969.)

c) L_p, defined by L at the time of blunt probe
launch.

Solar zenith angles are computed from the standard
relation

\[ \cos X = \cos \delta \cos \psi \cos \phi + \sin \delta \sin \phi \]  

where δ is the solar declination and φ the latitude.
Table 4 contains the times and zenith angles corresponding
to their respective absorptions, where the latitudes and
longitudes required for determining X, ψ and φ are taken
from the mid-points of their respective absorption paths.
Figure 9. Smoothed Relative Absorption Curves
Figure 10. Smoothed Relative Absorption Curves
### Table 4

Times and Zenith Angles for their Respective Absorption Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Location</th>
<th>Type Absorption</th>
<th>Local Time (Hours)</th>
<th>Solar Zenith Angle (Degrees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 Jan 71/WSMR</td>
<td>( L_n )</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_{XPM} )</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_p )</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jan 71/WSMR</td>
<td>( L_n )</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_{XPM} )</td>
<td>1334</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_p )</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb 71/WSMR</td>
<td>( L_n )</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_{XPM} )</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_p )</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Jun 71/WSMR</td>
<td>( L_n )</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_{XPM} )</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_p )</td>
<td>0810</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Jul 71/WSMR</td>
<td>( L_n )</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_{XPM} )</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_p )</td>
<td>0705</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Oct 71/WSMR</td>
<td>( L_n )</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_{XPM} )</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_p )</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jan 72/WI</td>
<td>( L_n )</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_{XPM} )</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_p )</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jan 72/WSMR</td>
<td>( L_n )</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_{XPM} )</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L_p )</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 (Cont'd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>$L_n$</th>
<th>$L_{XPM}$</th>
<th>$L_p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 Jan 72/ WI</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb 72/ WSMR</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


CHAPTER III
CHARGED PARTICLE DENSITIES

3.1 Positive Ion Densities

Assuming a small ion model (Hale, 1967), positive ion densities \( N^+ \) can be derived from the measured conductivity data by the relation

\[
N^+ = \frac{\sigma^+}{e\mu^+}
\]  

(9)

where \( e \) is the electronic charge and \( \mu^+ \) the averaged positive ion mobility.

The mobility of a single ionic species is given by (Dalgarno, 1962; McDaniel, 1964)

\[
\mu = \mu_o \frac{T P_o}{T_o P}
\]  

(10)

where \( P_o \) and \( T_o \) are the reference sea level pressure and temperature respectively, and \( \mu_o \) the reduced mobility, which is assumed to be \( 1.8 \text{ cm}^2 \text{V}^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1} \) for positive ions (Loeb, 1955, Cole and Pierce, 1965). Substituting (10) into (9) yields

\[
N^+ = \frac{\sigma^+ T_o P}{e\mu_o + T_o P_o}
\]  

(11)

Smoothed curves of positive ion densities as functions of altitude are given in Figures 11 and 12, the dashed line
being the average curve for all 10 launches. These data are subject to the uncertainties in the assumed mobility.

Because MRN Loki Darts did not reach the altitudes achieved by the blunt probes, the N+ curves do not extend as high as those for $\sigma_+$. However, if T and P values are obtained from the COSPAR International Reference Atmosphere, 1965 (CIRA 65), then N+ values can be estimated wherever $\sigma_+$ data are available. The average N+ profile, calculated from CIRA 65 and blunt probe data, is shown in Figure 13.

Figures 11, 12 and 13 indicate that positive ion densities experience minimum values between 63 and 66 Km, suggesting the region where ionization production by solar UV radiation supplants production by galactic cosmic rays occurring at the lower altitudes (Mitchell and Hale, 1972).

3.2 Electron Densities

Negative conductivity is given by the sum of negative ion and electron conductivities, that is

$$\sigma_- = N_- e\mu_- + N_e e\mu_e$$

(12)

where $N_-$ and $N_e$ are negative ion and electron densities respectively, and $\mu_-$ and $\mu_e$ are their respective mobilities. Conservation of charge requires that

$$N_- = N_+ - N_e$$

(13)

and substituting (13) into (12) gives

$$\sigma_- = (N_+ - N_e) e\mu_- + N_e e\mu_e$$

(14)
Figure 11. Smoothed Positive Ion Density Profiles
Figure 12. Smoothed Positive Ion Density Profiles
Figure 13. The Average Positive Ion Density Profile Computed from CIRA 65
Since $\mu_e > \mu_-$, (14) can be written

$$N_e \approx \frac{\sigma - N_e e\mu_+}{e\mu_e}$$

(15)

Because electron drift velocity is not a linear function of the applied electric field, electron mobility is difficult to define. Electron mobility can be estimated as a function of $E/P$ (Mitchell and Hale, 1972), however, this procedure introduces some uncertainty in the absolute values of electron densities. Since all data were reduced in a consistent manner, a greater level of confidence is placed in electron densities considered relative to each other than in their absolute values.

Electron densities are calculated from (15), where $\mu_o-$ is assumed to be $2.3 \text{ cm}^2 \text{V}^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1}$ (Loeb, 1955; Cole and Pierce, 1965) and all meteorological data are taken from CIRA 65. At altitudes between 45 and 63 Km, where $\sigma - >> \sigma +$, (15) reduces to

$$N_e \approx \frac{\sigma_-}{e\mu_e}$$

(16)

Smoothed curves of electron densities as function of altitude are presented in Figures 14 and 15.

3.3 Negative Ion Densities

From Figures 11 through 15 it can be seen that $N_+ >> N_e$ between 30 and 63 Km. Combining this observation with the requirement for charge neutrality given by (13) yields
Figure 15. Smoothed Electron Density Profiles
\[ N_- \approx N_+ \] (17)

within this altitude range. Thus Figures 11 and 12 are also representative of \( N_- \) profiles.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 General Procedure
Correlations among positive and negative conductivities, meteorological parameters and HF radio wave absorption are obtained as functions of altitude. Correlation coefficients (r) are calculated between each pair of parameters at altitudes for which 10 data points are available (one point from each launch). Table 5 lists the height ranges within which correlation coefficients are computed, and r values are given at 5 Km intervals in the Appendix. Parameters that are well correlated with one another are analyzed in the following sections.

4.2 Positive Conductivity
4.2.1 Positive and Negative Conductivities
Below about 40 Km the two conductivities are approximately equal (see Figures 3 and 4), indicating an absence of electrons. However, they diverge rapidly from each other above 40 Km, and their r values drop quickly with increasing altitude, becoming less than 0.65 above 46 Km (see Appendix).

4.2.2 Positive Conductivity and Temperature
Positive conductivity correlates very well with temperature, the strongest correlations (r > 0.90)
Table 5

Height Ranges within which Correlation Coefficients are Determined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\sigma_+$</th>
<th>$\sigma_-$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_+$</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>30-63 Km</td>
<td>30-58 Km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_-$</td>
<td>30-63 Km</td>
<td>xX</td>
<td>30-58 Km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>30-58 Km</td>
<td>30-58 Km</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>30-63 Km</td>
<td>30-63 Km</td>
<td>30-58 Km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
occurring between 48 and 58 Km. The r values remain greater than 0.70 at lower altitudes until a relatively sharp drop begins at 32 Km. The correlation coefficients between $\sigma_+$ and T are plotted as functions of altitude in Figure 16.

Relationships of the form

$$\sigma_+ = a(z)T - b_+(z)$$

are obtained at the various altitudes by the least squares method. Graphs of such functions are given for heights of 35, 45 and 55 Km in Figures 17, 18 and 19 respectively.

Between 33 and 58 Km, where $r \geq 0.75$, the slopes $(a(z))$ are proportional to the intercepts $(b_+(z))$ in such a manner that

$$\frac{a(z)}{b_+(z)} = a_+(z)$$

where $a_+(z)$ is a weak function of altitude. Substituting (19) into (18) gives

$$\sigma_+ = b_+(z)(a_+(z)T - 1.0)$$

where $b_+(z)$ and $a_+(z)$ are given in Figures 20 and 21 respectively. Assuming $b_+(z)$ to be a linear function of altitude yields (see Figure 20)

$$b_+(z) = 2.67Z - 82.3$$

within the height range being considered.
Figure 16. Correlation Coefficients ($\sigma^+$ and $T$) vs Altitude
Figure 17. Positive Conductivity vs Temperature (35 Km)

Z = 35 km

\[ \sigma_+ = (0.0641 T - 14.0) \times 10^{12} \]

r = 0.82
\[ Z = 45 \text{ km} \]
\[ \sigma_+ = (0.145T - 34.9) \times 10^{-12} \]
\[ r = 0.82 \]

Figure 18. Positive Conductivity vs Temperature (45 Km)
\( Z = 55 \text{ km} \)

\[ \sigma_+ = (0.0282 T - 6.88) \times 10^{12} \]

\[ r = 0.97 \]

Figure 19. Positive Conductivity vs Temperature (55 Km)
Figure 20. Intercept \( b_+(z) \) vs Altitude

32 - 58 km

\[ b_+(z) = 2.67Z - 82.3 \]

\[ r = 0.97 \]
Figure 21. Slope-Intercept Ratio ($a_+(z)$) vs Altitude
Figure 21 indicates that \( a_+(z) \) is virtually independent of altitude above 43 Km, while below this level it varies linearly with height. Such behavior is strikingly similar to that exhibited by the temperature profiles in Figures 6 and 7, suggesting that \( a_+(z) \) may be replaced by \( a_+(T) \) in (20), that is

\[
\sigma_+ = b_+(z)(a_+(T)T - 1.0)
\]  

(22)

Figure 22, which plots \( a_+(T) \) as a function of the average temperatures given in Figures 6 and 7, indicates that (22) can be expressed as

\[
\sigma_+ = 4.12 \times 10^{-3} b_+(z)((-2.77 \times 10^{-3} T + 1.78) T - 243)
\]  

(23)

between 33 and 43 Km, and as

\[
\sigma_+ = 4.12 \times 10^{-3} b_+(z)(T - 243)
\]  

(24)

from 44 to 58 Km.

The temperature coefficient for positive conductivity \((\sigma_{+T})\) is defined by

\[
\sigma_{+T} = \frac{1}{\sigma_+} \frac{\partial \sigma_+}{\partial T}
\]  

(25)

and, from (22) may be written as

\[
\sigma_{+T} = \frac{a_+(T) + T}{a_+(T)T - 1.0} \frac{\partial a_+(T)}{\partial T}
\]  

(26)

Values for \( \sigma_{+T} \) are given at 5 Km intervals in Table 6, where the required temperatures are obtained from the average curve in Figures 6 and 7. The values found in
33 - 43 km
\[ a_+ (T) = (-1.3 \times 10^5) T + 7.32 \times 10^3 \]
\[ r = -0.93 \]

44 - 58 km
\[ a_+ (T) = 4.12 \times 10^3 \]
\[ r = -0.16 \]

Figure 22. Slope-Intercept Ratio \( a_+ (T) \) vs Temperature
Table 6
Temperature Coefficients for Positive Conductivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height ($K_m$)</th>
<th>Temperature Coefficient ($^\circ K^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 are up to an order of magnitude greater than can be expected to result solely from the temperature dependence of the mobility of a single species, as inferred from (10).

From (9), these unexpectedly large values of $\sigma_{+T}$ imply either that $N_+$ is a function of $T$ or that (10) does not describe $\mu_+(T)$ within this altitude range. The former seems less probable because $N_+$ would be expected to correlate well with $N_e$, but no such corresponding correlation between $\sigma_+$ and $\sigma_-$ is observed (except at altitudes where $N_e \approx 0$). The latter could be due to the rapid variations with temperature in the size of the hydrated ions expected to form at these altitudes (Narcisi and Bailey, 1965). In this case, the large values computed for $\sigma_{+T}$ would be due to the effect on $\mu_+$ of variations in the amount of water clustering (Kebarle, Searles, Zolla, Scarborough and Arshadi, 1967). This effect does not appear to be uniform throughout the 33-58 Km region (see Figure 22 and Table 6). If this speculative reasoning is valid, then the assumptions and expressions from which (11) was derived must be re-evaluated.

4.3 High Frequency Radio Wave Absorption and Negative Conductivity

4.3.1 General Discussion

Since absorption occurs almost entirely above 60 Km, where ionization production is principally dependent on solar UV radiation (see Section 2.3.1), it exhibits the strong diurnal variations seen in Figures 9 and 10. In contrast, negative conductivity is determined below 65 Km,
where ionization production is primarily due to galactic cosmic rays, and therefore exhibits relatively little variability over a one year period of measurement. Thus, excepting the small overlap between 60 and 65 Km, absorption and negative conductivity data are measured in regions having vastly different production sources.

However, both relative absorption and negative conductivity are expected to be proportional to electron density at their respective levels. Therefore, comparisons of these two parameters should make it possible to determine if electron densities at the separate levels are coupled. Such comparisons are made for the L values defined in Section 2.3.2, and the results are discussed in the following sections.

4.3.2 Relative Noon Absorption ($L_n$) and Negative Conductivity

Correlation coefficients between relative noon absorption and negative conductivities at 62 and 63 Km are greater than 0.90. As the altitudes from which $\sigma_-$ data are obtained decrease, the correlation coefficients between $L_n$ and $\sigma_-$ also decrease, dropping below 0.70 at 52 Km. Figure 23 plots the correlation coefficients between $L_n$ and $\sigma_-$ as functions of the altitude of $\sigma_-$. The r values between these two parameters appear to be independent of the season and solar zenith angle at which they are measured (see Tables 1 and 4), and also of the blunt probe launch time (see Table 1).
The good correlations between $L_n$ and $\sigma_-$ imply that coupling does exist between electron densities at the separate levels. Since ionization production differs greatly within the two regions, it can be speculated that the day-to-day variations in $L_n$ are due to changing atmospheric conditions affecting electron loss rate, and not to variations in production. Furthermore, the large distances from the launch facilities to the mid-points of their absorption paths (see Section 2.3.1) suggest that the atmospheric conditions which affect electron loss rate extend over a large geographical area.

Expressions of the form

$$L_n = a_-(z)\sigma_- + b_-(z)$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

are determined in a manner analogous to that described in the case of (18). Graphs of $L_n$ as functions of $\sigma_-$ are given in Figures 24, 25 and 26 for heights of 50, 55 and 60 Km respectively, while plots of $a_-(z)$ and $b_-(z)$ as functions of altitude are shown in Figures 27 and 28. These latter figures indicate that $a_-(z)$ is an exponentially decreasing function of altitude, and that $b_-(z)$ is essentially independent of height. Between 54 and 63 Km, where $r \geq 0.74$, $a_-(z)$ can be approximated by a linear function of altitude. Within this height range (27) becomes (see Figures 27 and 28)

$$L_n = (-6.55\times10^{-3}Z + 0.468)\sigma_- + 18.5$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)
Relative Noon Absorption vs Negative Conductivity at 50 Km

\[ L_n = (1.73 \times 10^{11}) \sigma_- + 20.1 \]

\[ r = 0.65 \]
\[ \sigma_- \text{ at } 55 \text{ km} \]
\[ L_n = (1.08 \times 10^{11}) \sigma_- + 18.7 \]
\[ r = 0.76 \]

Figure 25. Relative Noon Absorption vs Negative Conductivity at 55 Km
$\sigma_{-}$ at 60 km

$L_n = (7.38 \times 10^{10})\sigma_{-} + 18.2$

$r = 0.88$

Figure 26. Relative Noon Absorption vs Negative Conductivity at 60 Km
$a_-(z) = (-6.55 \times 10^3)z + 0.468$

$r = 0.99$

Figure 27. Slope ($a_-(z)$) vs Altitude
suggesting that a significant percentage of \( L_n \) is independent of \( \sigma_- \), and therefore, from (16), of \( N_e \). This percentage ranges from 42 per cent on January 26, 1971, to 84 per cent on February 1, 1971. An explanation of this result requires considerations beyond the scope of this work.

High correlation coefficients between \( L_n \) and \( \sigma_- \) are obtained despite the February 1, 1972 data, which exhibit negative conductivity values that are too low for their corresponding relative absorption (see Figures 25 and 26). This fact is discussed further in the next section.

4.3.3 Relative Absorption at a Given Solar Zenith Angle of 60° (\( L_\chi \)) and Negative Conductivity

Correlation coefficients between relative absorption at a zenith angle of 60° and negative conductivity are not as high as those observed between \( L_n \) and \( \sigma_- \) (see Appendix). The reason for the poorer correlations found in this case can be inferred from Figures 29 and 30, which respectively give \( L_{\chi AM} \) and \( L_{\chi PM} \) as functions of \( \sigma_- \) at 60 Km. In both morning and afternoon cases, the two summer launch data exhibit \( L_\chi \) values which are too low for their corresponding negative conductivities. This observation suggests seasonal variations in the quantity \( L_\chi \).

Figures 29 and 30 also indicate that while the February 1, 1972 \( L_{\chi AM} \) value agrees with its corresponding \( \sigma_- \) value, the \( L_{\chi PM} \) value for this date does not. The seemingly uncharacteristic behavior of the February 1, 1972
data can be seen in Figures 24, 25, 26 and 30, but not in Figure 29. This suggests that the coupling between the two levels discussed in the previous section may have broken down shortly after the $L_{XAM}$ measurement (1012 MST - see Figures 8 and 10).

4.3.4 Relative Absorption at the Time of Blunt Probe Launch ($L_p$) and Negative Conductivity

Relative absorption determined at the time of blunt probe launch is poorly correlated with negative conductivity (see Appendix). This is not surprising since the payload launches occurred over a wide variety of times, zenith angles and seasons (see Table 1). A plot of $L_p$ as a function of $\sigma -$ at 60 Km is shown in Figure 31.

Thus negative conductivity measurements appear to be good indicators of $L_n$ (see Section 4.3.2), but not necessarily of $L_p$. For example, all three morning launches (see Table 1) exhibited $\sigma -$ values corresponding to $L_n$, suggesting that atmospheric conditions affecting the relative noon absorption are set early in the day and are subject to little subsequent diurnal variation. If this is the case, it then becomes possible to speculate that relative noon absorption can be predicted from an early morning measurement of the negative conductivity at about 60 Km.
Figure 29. Relative Absorption for a Zenith Angle of 60° (AM) vs Negative Conductivity at 60 Km
Figure 30. Relative Absorption for a Zenith Angle of 60° (PM) vs Negative Conductivity at 60 Km
Figure 31. Relative Absorption at the Time of Blunt Probe Launch vs Negative Conductivity at 60 Km
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary of Results

Electrical conductivities, measured in the very low ionosphere at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, and Wallops Island, Virginia by the parachute-borne blunt probe technique, are compared with meteorological parameters obtained from MRN Loki Darts and A3 radio wave absorption measurements. Charged particle densities are derived from the conductivities.

Between 33 and 58 Km, day-to-day variations in positive conductivity are well correlated with corresponding changes in atmospheric temperature. The temperature coefficient for positive conductivity is about an order of magnitude greater than that expected from classical theory, suggesting that positive ion mobility may be a strong function of temperature.

Day-to-day changes in the amount of relative noontime absorption reflect corresponding variations in negative conductivity at heights as low as 53 Km, indicating that coupling exists between electron densities at separate levels. This coupling most likely involves atmospheric conditions affecting electron loss rate. The results also suggest that the relative noon absorption can be predicted from early morning measurements of negative conductivity.
5.2 Suggestions for Further Research

The results discussed in this paper are somewhat tentative because of the limited amount of conductivity data available. Therefore, additional data are required before more definitive conclusions are possible. Also, current data reduction procedures must be improved so that the negative conductivity data measured above 63 Km can be utilized for analysis.

Assuming that additional conductivity data confirm the findings of this work, the physical and chemical processes occurring in the very low ionosphere would become the focus for additional research. A more sophisticated instrumentation package than the blunt probe would be required, such as one which measures not only conductivities but also ionic mobilities or charged particle densities. Also, routine measurements of temperature above 65 Km would be needed to extend certain results to higher altitudes.

In the course of this work it was observed that the relative absorption at a zenith angle of $60^\circ$ is well correlated, in a negative sense, with neutral density at 50 Km (see Appendix). Because this observation is independent of the blunt probe data, it is not considered in this work. However, these data are available, and they should be examined before any definitive conclusions are made.

Significant disagreements remain in the electron density profiles measured by various rocket and ground-based methods in the low ionosphere (Rowe, 1973). Because
electron density is of fundamental importance, continued progress will be difficult until a consensus can be reached on the electron density profile for this region.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\sigma_+$</th>
<th>$\sigma_-$</th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>$L_n$</th>
<th>$L_{XAM}$</th>
<th>$L_{XPM}$</th>
<th>$L_p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- .24</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$Z=30$ Km</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$Z=35$ Km</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$Z=40$ Km</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$Z=45$ Km</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$Z=50$ Km</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[
\begin{array}{lcccccc}
\sigma_+ & .33 & .97 & -.26 & .18 & .55 & .35 & .56 \\
\sigma_- & .44 & -.08 & .76 & .48 & .38 & .28 \\
T & -.26 & .29 & .59 & .39 & .55 \\
\rho & Z=55 \text{ Km} & -.09 & -.68 & -.69 & -.64 \\
\sigma_+ & .45 & xx & xx & .25 & .66 & .46 & .64 \\
\sigma_- & xx & xx & .88 & .52 & .50 & .40 \\
L_h & & & & .56 & .69 & .54 \\
L_{\chi AM} & & & & & .84 & .90 \\
L_{\chi PM} & Z=60 \text{ Km} & & & & & .92 \\
\end{array}
\]

Note: Correlation coefficients between the various L values are independent of altitude and therefore are presented only once.
Relations Among Low Ionosphere Parameters and High Frequency Radio Wave Absorption

Charged particle conductivities measured in the very low ionosphere at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, and Wallops Island, Virginia, are compared with atmospheric parameters and high frequency radio wave absorption measurements. Charged particle densities are derived from the conductivity data. Between 33 and 58 km, positive conductivity correlated well with neutral atmospheric temperature, with temperature coefficient as large as $4.6\% K^{-1}$. Good correlations were also found between HF radio wave absorption and negative conductivity at altitudes as low as 53 km, indicating that the day-to-day absorption variations were principally due to variations in electron loss rate.