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SUMMARY

Tests have been conducted in the Langley high-speed 7- by 10-foot tunnel to determine the effect of tail dihedral on lateral control effectiveness of a complete-model configuration having differentially deflected horizontal-tail surfaces. Limited tests were made to determine the lateral characteristics as well as the longitudinal characteristics in sideslip. The wing had an aspect ratio of 3, a taper ratio of 0.14, 28.80° sweep of the quarter-chord line with zero sweep at the 80-percent-chord line, and NACA 65A004 airfoil sections. The test Mach number range extended from 0.60 to 0.92.

There are only small variations in the roll effectiveness parameter $C_{l\phi}$ with negative tail dihedral angle. The tail size used on the test model, however, is perhaps inadequate for providing the roll rates specified by current military requirements at subsonic speeds. The lateral aerodynamic characteristics were essentially constant throughout the range of sideslip angle from 12° to -12°. A general increase in yawing moment was noted with increased negative dihedral throughout the Mach number range.

INTRODUCTION

The use of thin flexible wings for high-speed airplanes frequently has resulted in the loss of control effectiveness of conventional flap-type ailerons at high subsonic speeds which makes it necessary to

*Title, Unclassified.
consider other means of lateral control. A promising lateral control
device presently being considered is an all-movable, differentially
deflected horizontal tail. References 1 to 3 present lateral-control
data for differentially deflected horizontal-tail surfaces for Mach num-
bers of 0.055 to 2.0. Data obtained prior to those presented in refer-
ences 1 to 3 have been summarized in reference 4. These data include
effects of wing plan form, aeroelasticity, and control deflection angle
through wide ranges of angle of attack and angle of sideslip. Data
have been obtained, however, only for constant dihedral angles, in most
cases zero degree. Longitudinal stability requirements for high-speed
airplanes have indicated the need for low horizontal-tail positions,
which in some cases can only be accomplished by large negative tail
dihedral angles.

This paper presents results of an investigation to determine the
lateral control effectiveness as well as the stability characteristics
of a differentially deflected horizontal tail through a systematic varia-
tion of dihedral angles from 0° to -30°. The results presented herein
include only a very limited analysis.

SYMBOLS

The data are presented about the system of axes shown in figure 1. The
moment coefficients are referred to a center-of-gravity location
which is at the quarter-chord point of the wing mean aerodynamic chord.

\[ C_D \]  
\[ C_L \]  
\[ C_r \]  
\[ \Delta C_I, \Delta C_R, \Delta C_Y \] incremental forces and moment due to control deflection

\[ C_{IP} = \frac{\Delta C_I}{p \bar{b}} \]

\[ C_{IG} = \frac{\Delta C_I}{5}, \text{ per degree} \]
\( C_m \) pitching-moment coefficient, \( \frac{\text{Pitching moment}}{qS} \)

\( C_n \) yawing-moment coefficient, \( \frac{\text{Yawing moment}}{qSb} \)

\( C_{n\delta} = \frac{\Delta C_n}{\delta}, \) per degree

\( \frac{C_{n\delta}}{C_{l\delta}} \) ratio of yawing moment to rolling moment due to control deflection

\( C_Y \) lateral-force coefficient, \( \frac{\text{Lateral force}}{qS} \)

\( C_{Y\delta} = \frac{\Delta C_Y}{\delta}, \) per degree

b wing span, ft

c local wing chord parallel to plane of symmetry, ft

\( \bar{c} \) wing mean aerodynamic chord, \( \frac{2}{S} \int_0^{b/2} c^2 dy, \) ft

\( \iota_t \) effective angle of incidence of horizontal tail with respect to fuselage center line, deg

M Mach number

p rolling velocity, radians/sec

\( \frac{pb}{2V} \) wing-tip helix angle, radians

q dynamic pressure, \( \frac{\rho V^2}{2}, \) lb/sq ft

S wing area, sq ft

V free-stream velocity, ft/sec

\( \alpha \) angle of attack, deg

\( \beta \) angle of sideslip, deg
Tests were conducted in the Langley high-speed 7- by 10-foot tunnel of a sting-supported model having a wing of aspect ratio 3, a taper ratio of 0.14, zero sweep at the 80-percent-chord line \( (\Lambda_{c/4} = 28.80^\circ) \), and NACA 65A004 airfoil sections parallel to the plane of symmetry. This wing is the same aspect-ratio-3 wing that was obtained by clipping the tips of a basic aspect-ratio-4 wing discussed in reference 5. The fuselage had a fineness ratio of 10.94 and was similar to the fuselage of reference 5 except for the cylindrical afterbody. The details of the fuselage are given in figure 2.

The model was so constructed that the horizontal-tail panel (mounted from the fuselage center line) could be individually deflected through an angle-of-incidence range from 15° to -15° in 5° increments and mounted to provide a dihedral-angle range from 30° to -30° from the wing-chord plane extended.
The horizontal and vertical tails had quarter-chord sweep angles of 14.37° and 28.00°, respectively, and unswept trailing edges. Details of the complete model are given in figure 2. A photograph of the model and support system is presented as figure 3 in which is shown the horizontal tail with asymmetric deflection.

The model was tested through a Mach number range from 0.60 to 0.92 with corresponding Reynolds numbers ranging from approximately $2.6 \times 10^6$ to $3.4 \times 10^6$, based on the wing mean aerodynamic chord. The angle-of-attack range varied with loading conditions, the maximum range being from about -2° to 22°.

Force tests were made to determine the effect of dihedral on the rolling effectiveness of an all-movable differentially deflected horizontal tail at dihedral angles of 0°, -15°, and -30°. Longitudinal and lateral aerodynamic characteristics were also obtained. The forces and moments were measured by means of a six-component electrical strain-gage balance mounted internally in the fuselage. Limited data were also obtained from tests through a range of sideslip angle from 12° to -12° at several constant angles of attack.

CORRECTIONS

Blockage corrections were applied to the data by the method of reference 6. Jet-boundary corrections to angle of attack and drag were applied in accordance with reference 7.

Tares due to the sting support have not been applied, except for a fuselage-base-pressure correction to drag, since from past experience it was found that these tares are negligible.

The angles of attack have been corrected for deflection of the sting support and balance under load. No attempt has been made to correct the data for aeroelastic distortion of the wing; however, such distortion is believed to be negligible since the wing was constructed of steel.

RESULTS

Lateral Characteristics

The lateral aerodynamic characteristics for the complete-model configuration are presented as increments of total control deflection in figures 4 to 11 for angles of dihedral of 0°, -15°, and -30°.
There are only small variations in the roll effectiveness parameter $C_{n\delta}$ with negative tail dihedral angle at any given Mach number or angle of attack (at least up to $\alpha = 15^\circ$), as shown in figure 4 for constant total roll control deflection of $-10^\circ$ and in figure 9 for constant effective tail incidence. The dashed curves in figure 4 represent the values of $C_{n\delta}$ at the trim angle of attack with the center of gravity at $\pi/4$ for various effective stabilizer angles. These results are summarized in figure 5.

In order to provide an approximate assessment of the adequacy of the present lateral-control system, simple one-degree-of-freedom calculations were made to determine the rolling-moment coefficient required in order to satisfy current flying qualities requirements. Experimental values of the damping-in-roll derivative $C_{lP}$ were obtained from reference 8 for an aspect-ratio-3 wing. A value of $\frac{pb}{2V} = 0.09$ was used, since reference 9 specifies this value within the range from 1.1 times stalling speed to minimum combat speed for fighter-type aircraft. The resulting required value of $\Delta C_l$ is approximately 0.025, which is about 30 percent more than was achieved with a total differential tail deflection of $30^\circ$. These calculations, of course, are very approximate; however, it would seem that the tail size used on the present model is smaller than should be provided to meet current subsonic roll requirements for fighter-type aircraft.

There was a general increase in $C_{n\delta}$ with increasing negative dihedral throughout the Mach number range and for angles of attack up to at least $15^\circ$ for conditions of either constant control deflection or of constant effective stabilizer angle, as may be seen in figures 6 and 10. There was a corresponding variation in the lateral force increment $C_{Y\delta}$. (See figs. 7 and 11.) These effects are due to increases in the lateral component of the horizontal-tail loads which increased with negative dihedral. Figure 8 presents the ratio of the yawing moment to rolling moment due to control deflection $\frac{C_{n\delta}}{C_{l\delta}}$ for the configurations having constant control deflection. These data indicate that the yawing moment increases substantially with increasing negative dihedral angle throughout the Mach number range. The configuration having $\delta_t = -10^\circ$ showed wide variations with angle of attack particularly at $M = 0.90$ and 0.92. These variations were due principally to the low values of $C_{l\delta}$ in this Mach number range shown in figure 4(b) rather than to the variation in $C_{n\delta}$.
The effect of the vertical tail on the incremental lateral characteristics is shown in figure 12 for \( M = 0.80 \) and \( \delta = -20^\circ \left( \alpha_1 = 0^\circ \right) \) for each value of dihedral angle \( \Gamma \). The vertical tail tends to decrease the rolling moment throughout the range of angle of attack (fig. 12(a)). This effect on \( C_{lb} \) is in the direction expected for the loads induced on the vertical tail by asymmetrical deflection of the horizontal tail. Increases in negative dihedral angle (in effect lowering the horizontal tail) decreased the induced loads carried by the vertical tail by as much as 40 percent, as may be seen in figures 12(b) and 12(c).

The lateral aerodynamic characteristics due to differential deflection of the horizontal tail with and without the vertical tail, shown in figure 13 for a representative value of \( M \) of 0.80 at \( \alpha = 0^\circ \), were essentially constant through the range of sideslip angles.

### Longitudinal Characteristics

The longitudinal characteristics of the complete-model configuration with both symmetrical and asymmetrical deflection of the horizontal tail for the range of dihedral angles investigated, along with tail-off characteristics, are presented in figures 14 to 16. (In order to facilitate presentation of the data, staggered scales have been used in several of the figures and care should be taken in identifying the proper scale for each curve.)

The overall trends of the pitching-moment characteristics above \( 10^\circ \) angle of attack for a given dihedral angle are generally similar for either the symmetrical or asymmetrical (roll control) deflection at a given effective stabilizer setting. Increasing the negative dihedral of the horizontal tail improved the linearity of the pitching-moment curves up to \( \alpha = 15^\circ \) as would be expected (see figs. 14(c), 15(c), and 16(c)) for this type of configuration. Figure 17 shows that the variations of \( C_L \), \( C_D \), and \( C_m \) with sideslip angle are not greatly affected by tail dihedral.

### CONCLUSIONS

From tests conducted in the Langley high-speed 7- by 10-foot tunnel of differentially deflected horizontal-tail surfaces on a configuration having a low-aspect-ratio thin wing through a range of negative tail dihedral angles, the following conclusions can be made:
1. There are only small variations in the roll effectiveness parameter $C_{l_8}$ with negative tail dihedral angle. The tail size used on the test model, however, is perhaps inadequate for providing the roll rates specified by current military requirements at subsonic speeds.

2. There was a general increase in yawing moment with increase in negative dihedral throughout the Mach number range up to an angle of attack of $15^\circ$.

3. The lateral aerodynamic characteristics were essentially constant throughout the range of sideslip angle from $12^\circ$ to $-12^\circ$ at a Mach number of 0.80.

Langley Research Center,
National Aeronautics and Space Administration,
Langley Field, Va., October 1, 1958.
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Figure 1.- Axes system and convention used to define positive sense of forces, moments, and angles.
Figure 2.- Details of model. (All dimensions are in inches unless otherwise indicated.)
Figure 3. - Model mounted in tunnel.
Figure 4.- Variation with angle of attack of the roll-control parameter for each tail dihedral angle and a constant control deflection through a range of effective stabilizer settings. Center-of-gravity location at $c/4$. 

\[\text{(a) } M = 0.60 \text{ and } 0.80.\]
(b) $M = 0.90$ and 0.92.

Figure 4.- Concluded.
Figure 5.- Variation with angle of attack of $C_{L_{trim}}$ for a constant control deflection of $-10^\circ$ for each dihedral angle. Center-of-gravity location at $\bar{c}/4$. 
Figure 6.- Variation with angle of attack of the yawing-moment parameter for each tail dihedral angle and a constant control deflection through a range of effective stabilizer settings. Center-of-gravity location at $\tilde{c}/4$. 

(a) $M = 0.60$ and $0.80$. 

$\gamma$ values: $0$, $-5$, $0$, $-10$, $-15$, $-10$. 

$\delta_L$, $\delta_H$, $\delta$. 

$M = 0.60$ and $0.80$. 

$C_{n_E}$ versus $\alpha$, deg. 

$\Gamma = 30^\circ$, $15^\circ$, $0^\circ$. 

Angle of attack, $\alpha$, deg. 

$C_{n_E}$ values: $-0.004$, $-0.002$, $0$, $0.002$, $0.004$. 

$\delta_L$, $\delta_H$, $\delta$. 

$45^\circ$, $90^\circ$, $135^\circ$. 

Center-of-gravity location at $\tilde{c}/4$. 

$\gamma$ values.
(b) $M = 0.90$ and $0.92$.

Figure 6.- Concluded.
Figure 7. - Variation with angle of attack of the lateral-force parameter for each tail dihedral angle and a constant control deflection through a range of effective stabilizer settings. Center-of-gravity location at \( \overline{c}/4 \).
(b) $M = 0.90$ and 0.92.

Figure 7.- Concluded.
Figure 8.- Variation with angle of attack of the ratio of yawing-moment parameter to roll-control parameter for each tail dihedral angle and a constant control deflection through a range of effective stabilizer settings.

(a) $M = 0.60$ and $0.80$. 
(b) $M = 0.90$ and $0.92$.

Figure 8.- Concluded.
Figure 9: Variation with angle of attack of the roll-control parameter for each tail dihedral angle and a constant effective stabilizer setting through a range of control deflections.

(a) $M = 0.60$ and 0.80.
(b) \( M = 0.90 \) and 0.92.

Figure 9.- Concluded.
Figure 10. - Variation with angle of attack of the yawing-moment parameter for each tail dihedral angle and a constant effective stabilizer setting through a range of control deflections.
(b) \( M = 0.90 \) and 0.92.

Figure 10.- Concluded.
Figure 21.- Variation with angle of attack of the lateral force parameter for each tail dihedral angle and a constant effective stabilizer setting through a range of control deflections.

(a) $M = 0.60$ and 0.80.
(b) $M = 0.90$ and $0.92$.

Figure 11.- Concluded.
Figure 12.- Variation with angle of attack of the effect of the vertical tail on the lateral characteristics for a control deflection of $-20^\circ$ and each tail dihedral angle at $M = 0.80$. 

(a) Variation of $C_{l8}$ with $\alpha$. 

Vertical tail
• On
• Off

$\Gamma = -30^\circ$

$\Gamma = -15^\circ$

$\Gamma = 0^\circ$

Angle of attack, $\alpha$, deg
(b) Variation of $C_{n_8}$ with $\alpha$.

Figure 12.- Continued.
Vertical tail

- On
- Off

(c) Variation of $C_{Y\delta}$ with $\alpha$.

Figure 12. Conclude.
Figure 13.- Effect of sideslip on the lateral control characteristics of each tail dihedral angle with and without vertical tail at $M = 0.80$ and $\alpha = 0^\circ$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\delta_1$, deg</th>
<th>$\delta_2$, deg</th>
<th>$\delta_3$, deg</th>
<th>$\delta_4$, deg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFH 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>WFH 0 10 -10 -20</td>
<td>WFVH 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>WFVH 0 10 -10 -20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $\Gamma = -30^\circ$
- $\Gamma = -15^\circ$
- $\Gamma = 0^\circ$
Figure 11.- Longitudinal aerodynamic characteristics of model having symmetrical and asymmetrical horizontal-tail deflection for $\Gamma = 0^\circ$.
Figure 14. Continued.
(c) Variation of $C_m$ with $\alpha$.

Figure 14.- Continued.
(c) Continued.

Figure 14.- Continued.
(c) Continued.

Figure 14.- Continued.
(c) Concluded.

Figure 14.— Concluded.
Figure 15.- Longitudinal aerodynamic characteristics of model having symmetrical and asymmetrical horizontal-tail deflections for $\Gamma = -15^\circ$. 

(a) Variation of $\alpha$ with $C_L$. 

\[(a)\] Variation of $\alpha$ with $C_L$. 

\[\text{Figure 15.- Longitudinal aerodynamic characteristics of model having symmetrical and asymmetrical horizontal-tail deflections for } \Gamma = -15^\circ.\]
Figure 15. - Continued.
(c) Variation of $C_m$ with $\alpha$.

Figure 15. - Continue.
(c) Continued.

Figure 15.- Continued.
(c) Continued.

Figure 15. - Continued.
(c) Concluded.

Figure 15.—Concluded.
Figure 16. - Longitudinal aerodynamic characteristics of model having symmetrical and asymmetrical horizontal-tail deflections for $\Gamma = -30^\circ$. 
(b) Variation of $C_D'$ with $C_L$.

Figure 16.- Continued.
(c) Variation of $C_m$ with $\alpha$.

Figure 16.- Continued.
(c) Continued.

Figure 16.- Continued.
(c) Continued.

Figure 16.- Continued.
(c) Concluded.

Figure 16.- Concluded.
Figure 17: The effect of sideslip on the longitudinal aerodynamic characteristics of the complete-model configuration at $M = 0.80$ and effective stabilizer setting of zero.