

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER

ADB804929

LIMITATION CHANGES

TO:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

FROM:

Distribution authorized to DoD only; Administrative/Operational Use; NOV 1941. Other requests shall be referred to National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC. Pre-dates formal DoD distribution statements. Treat as DoD only.

AUTHORITY

NASA TR Server website

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

# Reproduction Quality Notice

This document is part of the Air Technical Index [ATI] collection. The ATI collection is over 50 years old and was imaged from roll film. The collection has deteriorated over time and is in poor condition. DTIC has reproduced the best available copy utilizing the most current imaging technology. ATI documents that are partially legible have been included in the DTIC collection due to their historical value.

If you are dissatisfied with this document, please feel free to contact our Directorate of User Services at [703] 767-9066/9068 or DSN 427-9066/9068.

**Do Not Return This Document  
To DTIC**

Reproduced by  
**AIR DOCUMENTS DIVISION**



**HEADQUARTERS AIR MATERIEL COMMAND**

**WRIGHT FIELD, DAYTON, OHIO**

*The*  
**U.S. GOVERNMENT**

**IS ABSOLVED**

**FROM ANY LITIGATION WHICH MAY**

**ENSUE FROM THE CONTRACTORS IN-**

**FRINGING ON THE FOREIGN PATENT**

**RIGHTS, WHICH MAY BE INVOLVED.**

REEL - C

794

A.T.I.

20818

UNCLASSIFIED

Von Doenhoff, A.  
Underwood, W. J.

Aerodynamics (2)  
Control Surfaces (3)  
Tabs, Aileron - Effectiveness (9161A.3)  
Ailerons - Hinge moments (03206); Airfoils, Low  
drag (08238)

20818

NR L-777

Tests of a 0.1475c aileron with a tab on low-drag section for Curtiss XP-40 airplane in the low-turbulence tunnel

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

U.S. Eng.

Unclass. Nov'41 11

photos, graphs, drags

Tests were conducted of a 0.1475c aileron, on a low-drag XP-40 fighter wing section to determine methods of obtaining low aileron hinge moments while maintaining aileron effectiveness. It was found that the arrangement with a simple leading tab has important advantages over the plain aileron, and is suitable for use when extreme aileron travel at high speed is not necessary. If low hinge moments are required with large aileron deflections, the geared-tab arrangement appears to be satisfactory.

NOTE: Requests for copies of this report must be addressed to: N.A.C.A., Washington, D. C.

Air Documents Division, T-2  
AMC, Wright Field  
Microfilm No.

R C 794 F 20818

ATI No. 20818

NR Nov. 1941

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

# WARTIME REPORT

ORIGINALLY ISSUED  
November 1941 as  
Memorandum Report

TESTS OF A 0.1475c AILERON WITH A TAB ON LOW-DRAG SECTION  
FOR CURTISS XP-60 AIRPLANE IN THE LOW-TURBULENCE TUNNEL

By A. E. von Doenhoff and W. J. Underwood

Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory  
Langley Field, Va.



WASHINGTON

NACA WARTIME REPORTS are reprints of papers originally issued to provide rapid distribution of advance research results to an authorized group requiring them for the war effort. They were previously held under a security status but are now unclassified. Some of these reports were not technically edited. All have been reproduced without change in order to expedite general distribution.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

MEMORANDUM REPORT

for

Matériel Division, Army Air Corps

TESTS OF A 0.1475c AILERON WITH A TAB ON LOW-DRAG SECTION  
FOR CURTISS XP-60 AIRPLANE IN THE LOW-TURBULENCE TUNNEL

By A. E. von Doenhoff and W. J. Underwood

INTRODUCTION

Preliminary two-dimensional tests of the hinge-moment characteristic of a 0.1725c internally balanced aileron on the subject XP-60 wing section indicated that more internal balance would be required if light stick forces were to be obtained at high speeds. The present series of tests were therefore undertaken in order to investigate methods of reducing the slope of the hinge-moment curve while still maintaining the required aileron effectiveness.

TESTS AND RESULTS

Measurements of the hinge moment and lift coefficient were made in the low-turbulence tunnel on an aileron having the following characteristics:

aileron chord,  $c_a = 0.1475c$

aileron overhang =  $0.60c_a$

aileron tab =  $0.26c_a$

where  $c$  = wing chord

The ends and gap between the leading edge of the aileron and the model were sealed as shown in figures 1 and 2. The effective balance, that is, the distance from the hinge point to the middle of the gap, is  $0.689c_a$ . Because this aileron was of shorter chord than those previously tested on this model, the skirts overhanging the aileron were extended. One-eighth-inch clearance was maintained between the skirt ends and the aileron.

11-7

Tests were made with the following tab motions:

motion no. 1, tab locked . . .  $\delta_t = 0$  degrees

motion no. 2, tab leading . . .  $\delta_t = \frac{\delta_a}{4}$  degrees

motion no. 3, tab leading . . .  $\delta_t = \frac{\delta_a}{2}$  degrees

motion no. 4, tab leading . . .  $\delta_t = 4.77 \sin 88_a$  degrees

where

$\delta_t$  is the tab deflection relative to the aileron deflection, and

$\delta_a$  is the aileron deflection

The relations, motions no. 2 and no. 3, were obtained with a simple bar linkage. The relation, motion no. 4, was obtained with the geared mechanism shown in figures 3 and 4.

The results of these tests are given in figures 5 and 6.

#### DISCUSSION

In figure 5, the aileron with motion no. 1 (tab locked) was overbalanced except at the outer limits of the aileron motion. Because of this overbalance, a leading tab was added which would increase the effectiveness of the 0.1475c aileron as well as reduce the overbalance. As shown, the aileron with motion no. 2 ( $\frac{\delta_t}{\delta_a} = 0.25$ ) was still slightly overbalanced for small deflections although the effectiveness was increased slightly over that for the aileron with the tab locked. With motion no. 3 ( $\frac{\delta_t}{\delta_a} = 0.50$ ), the aileron was slightly underbalanced, giving a negative slope of the hinge-moment curve throughout the range of aileron deflections. The effectiveness was again increased due to the faster tab motion.

Data for motion no. 4 ( $\delta_t = 4.77 \sin 88_a$ ) given in figure 6 show that the sinusoidal tab motion results in a nearly linear relation between hinge moment and aileron deflection. Although

the geared tab gave slightly higher hinge moments than motion no. 3 in the range of low aileron deflections, the hinge moments using motion no. 4 can be varied by a simple adjustment of the amplitude of the tab motion (see fig. 3).

The aileron effectiveness of the 0.1475c aileron with tab motions no. 3 and no. 4 was practically the same as the effectiveness of the 0.1725c aileron obtained in the preliminary tests.

Other qualities of the aileron in addition to those given directly in figures 5 and 6 have a bearing on the choice of aileron design. It may be pointed out that the arrangement with a simple leading tab has certain advantages over the plain aileron. The tab rate can be easily adjusted during flight testing to give the desired range of stick forces. Furthermore, an analysis of the data indicates that the change in hinge moment due to rolling is considerably less for the aileron with a leading tab than for a plain aileron of larger chord having the same effectiveness. When equally balanced in the low-deflection range, the tabbed aileron has slightly lower hinge moments for large aileron deflections than the plain aileron, because of the tendency of the tab to lose its effectiveness at these large deflections, thus relieving the unbalanced hinge moment at a point where the tab is no longer required. The beneficial effect on hinge moments at large deflections is of course smaller than with the geared tab, for which it is possible to effect large reductions in the hinge moments at large aileron deflections.

Comparison of these two-dimensional results with similar tests on the left wing panel of the 0.36-scale model tested in the 7- by 10-foot tunnel shows a discrepancy in the percent balance needed to give zero slope to the hinge-moment curve. The two-dimensional results from the low-turbulence tunnel show that on an aileron without a tab an effective balance of  $0.62c_a$  is required; whereas the necessary percent balance, as judged from the 7- by 10-foot tunnel data, is  $0.56c_a$ . About one-half of this discrepancy may be due to a decrease in the unbalanced portion of the hinge moment caused by three-dimensional flow at the ends of the aileron. The remainder of the discrepancy remains unexplained, although scale effects and the effects of model supports may account for some of the difference between the tests in the two tunnels.

#### CONCLUSIONS


The data presented in this report show several possible arrangements for obtaining low aileron hinge moments while maintaining aileron effectiveness. The simple leading tab has

4

some important advantages over the plain aileron and is suitable for use when extreme aileron travel at high speed is not necessary. If low hinge moments are required with large aileron deflections, the geared arrangement appears to be satisfactory from the aerodynamic point of view.

Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory,  
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics,  
Langley Field, Virginia, November 29, 1941.

L-777



NATIONAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

NATIONAL ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

WING CHORD =  $c_w$   
AIRFOIL CHORD =  $c_a = 0.1475 c_w$   
BALANCE =  $0.50 c_a$   
EFFECTIVE BALANCE =  $0.609 c_a$

Fig. 1 Airfoil Balance  
STR. 122  
SCALE - FULL

L-6-7



Figure 2.- The 0.147/c aileron showing rubber end seal.




Fig. 3 CURTISS LOW DRAG SECTION - AILERON  
NO. SCALE AILERON CHORD,  $C_{a2} = 0.1475c_w$   
TAB =  $0.26c_w$





Figure 4.- The 0.1475c aileron showing geared tab mechanism.

1-777



Motion of the leading edge  
 1. 1. LEADING EDGE  
 2. 2. LEADING EDGE  
 3. 3. LEADING EDGE  
 4. 4. LEADING EDGE  
 5. 5. LEADING EDGE  
 6. 6. LEADING EDGE  
 7. 7. LEADING EDGE  
 8. 8. LEADING EDGE  
 9. 9. LEADING EDGE  
 10. 10. LEADING EDGE  
 11. 11. LEADING EDGE  
 12. 12. LEADING EDGE  
 13. 13. LEADING EDGE  
 14. 14. LEADING EDGE  
 15. 15. LEADING EDGE  
 16. 16. LEADING EDGE  
 17. 17. LEADING EDGE  
 18. 18. LEADING EDGE  
 19. 19. LEADING EDGE  
 20. 20. LEADING EDGE  
 21. 21. LEADING EDGE  
 22. 22. LEADING EDGE  
 23. 23. LEADING EDGE  
 24. 24. LEADING EDGE  
 25. 25. LEADING EDGE  
 26. 26. LEADING EDGE  
 27. 27. LEADING EDGE  
 28. 28. LEADING EDGE  
 29. 29. LEADING EDGE  
 30. 30. LEADING EDGE  
 31. 31. LEADING EDGE  
 32. 32. LEADING EDGE  
 33. 33. LEADING EDGE  
 34. 34. LEADING EDGE  
 35. 35. LEADING EDGE  
 36. 36. LEADING EDGE  
 37. 37. LEADING EDGE  
 38. 38. LEADING EDGE  
 39. 39. LEADING EDGE  
 40. 40. LEADING EDGE  
 41. 41. LEADING EDGE  
 42. 42. LEADING EDGE  
 43. 43. LEADING EDGE  
 44. 44. LEADING EDGE  
 45. 45. LEADING EDGE  
 46. 46. LEADING EDGE  
 47. 47. LEADING EDGE  
 48. 48. LEADING EDGE  
 49. 49. LEADING EDGE  
 50. 50. LEADING EDGE  
 51. 51. LEADING EDGE  
 52. 52. LEADING EDGE  
 53. 53. LEADING EDGE  
 54. 54. LEADING EDGE  
 55. 55. LEADING EDGE  
 56. 56. LEADING EDGE  
 57. 57. LEADING EDGE  
 58. 58. LEADING EDGE  
 59. 59. LEADING EDGE  
 60. 60. LEADING EDGE  
 61. 61. LEADING EDGE  
 62. 62. LEADING EDGE  
 63. 63. LEADING EDGE  
 64. 64. LEADING EDGE  
 65. 65. LEADING EDGE  
 66. 66. LEADING EDGE  
 67. 67. LEADING EDGE  
 68. 68. LEADING EDGE  
 69. 69. LEADING EDGE  
 70. 70. LEADING EDGE  
 71. 71. LEADING EDGE  
 72. 72. LEADING EDGE  
 73. 73. LEADING EDGE  
 74. 74. LEADING EDGE  
 75. 75. LEADING EDGE  
 76. 76. LEADING EDGE  
 77. 77. LEADING EDGE  
 78. 78. LEADING EDGE  
 79. 79. LEADING EDGE  
 80. 80. LEADING EDGE  
 81. 81. LEADING EDGE  
 82. 82. LEADING EDGE  
 83. 83. LEADING EDGE  
 84. 84. LEADING EDGE  
 85. 85. LEADING EDGE  
 86. 86. LEADING EDGE  
 87. 87. LEADING EDGE  
 88. 88. LEADING EDGE  
 89. 89. LEADING EDGE  
 90. 90. LEADING EDGE  
 91. 91. LEADING EDGE  
 92. 92. LEADING EDGE  
 93. 93. LEADING EDGE  
 94. 94. LEADING EDGE  
 95. 95. LEADING EDGE  
 96. 96. LEADING EDGE  
 97. 97. LEADING EDGE  
 98. 98. LEADING EDGE  
 99. 99. LEADING EDGE  
 100. 100. LEADING EDGE

NATIONAL ADVISORY  
 COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS  
 CONFIDENTIAL

FIG. 5. CURVES FOR DATA SECTION - NACA 66, P-118 (SUPERSONIC)  
 20.5 INCH CHORD  
 AIRFOIL - 0.155 INCH CHORD, 0.000 INCH LEADING EDGE, AND  
 0.000 INCH TRAILING EDGE  
 (CHORD AND LEADING EDGE)

W.H.H.

REEL - C

794

A.T.I.

20818

FORM 100 (13 FEB 47)

Von Doenhoff, A.  
Underwood, H. J.

DIVISION: Aerodynamics (2)

SECTION: Control Surfaces (3)

CROSS REFERENCES: Tabs, Aileron - Effectiveness (91614.3)

Ailerons - Hinge Moments (03208); Airfoils, Low  
drag (08258)

ATI-20818

ORIG. AGENCY NUMBER  
MR L-777

REVISION

AUTHOR(S)

AMER. TITLE: Tests of a 0.1475c aileron with a tab on low-drag section for Curtiss XP-60 airplane in the low-turbulence tunnel

FORG'N. TITLE:

ORIGINATING AGENCY: National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

TRANSLATION:

COUNTRY	LANGUAGE	FORG'N CLASS	U. S. CLASS.	DATE	PAGES	ILLUS.	FEATURES
U.S.	Eng.		Unclass.	Nov '41	11		photos, graphs, drawings

#### ABSTRACT

Tests were conducted of a 0.1475c aileron, on a low-drag XP-60 fighter wing section to determine methods of obtaining low aileron hinge moments while maintaining aileron effectiveness. It was found that the arrangement with a simple loading tab has important advantages over the plain aileron, and is suitable for use when extreme aileron travel at high speed is not necessary. If low hinge moments are required with large aileron deflections, the geared-tab arrangement appears to be satisfactory.

NOTE: Requests for copies of this report must be addressed to: N.A.C.A., Washington, D. C.

*P-60 Aircraft*

FORM 10 (13 FEB 47)

Von Doenhoff, A.  
Underwood, H. J.

DIVISION: Aerodynamics (2)  
SECTION: Control Surfaces (3)  
CROSS REFERENCES: Tabs, Ailoron - Effectiveness (91614.3);  
Ailorons - Hinge Moments (03208); Airfoils, Low  
drag (08258)

ATI- 20818

ORIG. AGENCY NUMBER  
MR L-777

REVISION

AUTHOR(S)

AMER. TITLE: Tests of a 0.1475c aileron with a tab on low-drag section for Curtiss XP-60 airplane in the low-turbulence tunnel

FORG'N. TITLE: *Low Drag, Ailerons P111*

ORIGINATING AGENCY: National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C.

TRANSLATION:

COUNTRY	LANGUAGE	FORG'N. CLASS.	U. S. CLASS.	DATE	PAGES	ILLUS.	FEATURES
U.S.	Eng.		Unclass.	Nov '41	11		photos, graphs, drawings

ABSTRACT

Tests were conducted of a 0.1475c aileron, on a low-drag XP-60 fighter wing section to determine methods of obtaining low aileron hinge moments while maintaining aileron effectiveness. It was found that the arrangement with a simple leading tab has important advantages over the plain aileron, and is suitable for use when extreme aileron travel at high speed is not necessary. If low hinge moments are required with large aileron deflections, the geared-tab arrangement appears to be satisfactory.

NOTE: Requests for copies of this report: Washington, D. C.

AD-B804 929

T-2, HQ., AIR MATERIEL COMMAND

AIR TECHNIC



240 400