**UNCLASSIFIED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AD NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD474861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIMITATION CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Critical Technology; DEC 1965. Other requests shall be referred to Arnold Engineering Development Center, Arnold AF Station, TN. This document contains export-controlled technical data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUTHORITY**

AEDC 29 Dec 1971
DYNAMIC STABILITY TESTS ON A 1/5-SCALE MODEL OF THE BIG Q AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE AT MACH NUMBERS FROM 1.5 TO 4

G. E. Burt
ARO, Inc.

PROPERTY OF U. S. AIR FORCE
ARNOLD AIR FORCE STATION
AF 40(600)1200
December 1965

This document is subject to special export controls and may not be transmitted to foreign governments or foreign nationals without prior approval of Arnold Engineering Development Center.

VON KÁRMÁN GAS DYNAMICS FACILITY
ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
ARNOLD AIR FORCE STATION, TENNESSEE
NOTICES

When U. S. Government drawings specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related Government procurement operation, the Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data, is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise, or in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

Qualified users may obtain copies of this report from the Defense Documentation Center.

References to named commercial products in this report are not to be considered in any sense as an endorsement of the product by the United States Air Force or the Government.
DYNAMIC STABILITY TESTS ON A 1/5-SCALE MODEL OF THE BIG Q AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE AT MACH NUMBERS FROM 1.5 TO 4

G. E. Burt
ARO, Inc.

This document is subject to special export controls and each transmission to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of Arnold Engineering Development Center.

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited (for official use only).
FOREWORD

The work reported herein was done at the request of the Air Force Weapons Laboratory (AFWL), Research and Technology Division (RTD), Air Force Systems Command (AFSC) under Program Element 62405064, Project 5797, Task 579712.

The results of the tests presented were obtained by ARO, Inc. (a subsidiary of Sverdrup and Parcel, Inc.), contract operator of the Arnold Engineering Development Center (AEDC), AFSC, Arnold Air Force Station, Tennessee, under Contract AF40(600)-1200. The tests were conducted from September 13 to 15, 1965 under ARO Project No. VA0608, and the manuscript was submitted for publication on November 9, 1965.
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Tests were conducted in the 40-in. supersonic tunnel of the von Karman Gas Dynamics Facility to determine the dynamic stability characteristics of a 1/5-scale model of the Big Q air-to-air missile. Data were obtained at Mach numbers from 1.49 to 3.99 at the model trim angle of attack and at plus and minus 1 to 2 deg from trim at a near constant Reynolds number of $8 \times 10^6$, based on model length. The effects of Mach number and canard angle on the damping-in-pitch derivatives and effective slope of the pitching-moment curve at the trim angle of attack are presented.
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### NOMENCLATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reference area (model body cross-sectional area), ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_m$</td>
<td>Pitching-moment coefficient, pitching moment/$q_m Ad$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{m,q}$</td>
<td>$\frac{\partial C_m}{\partial (qd/2V_\infty)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{m,\dot{\alpha}}$</td>
<td>$\frac{\partial C_m}{\partial (\dot{\alpha} d/2V_\infty)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{m,\alpha}$</td>
<td>Slope of the pitching-moment curve $\left(\frac{\partial C_m}{\partial \alpha}\right)_{\alpha = 0}$, 1/rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{m,\theta}$</td>
<td>Effective slope of the pitching-moment curve, 1/rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_y R$</td>
<td>Cycles to damp to a given ratio $R$, cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Reference length (model diameter), ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Frequency of oscillation, cycles/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Model mass moment of inertia about the pivot axis, slug-ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l$</td>
<td>Model length, in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_\theta$</td>
<td>Angular restoring-moment parameter, ft-lb/rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_\delta$</td>
<td>Angular viscous-damping-moment parameter, ft-lb-sec/rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M'_\theta$</td>
<td>Aerodynamic angular restoring-moment parameter, ft-lb/rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M'_\delta$</td>
<td>Aerodynamic angular viscous-damping-moment parameter, ft-lb-sec/rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_\infty$</td>
<td>Free-stream Mach number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>Pitching velocity, rad/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q_\infty$</td>
<td>Free-stream dynamic pressure, lb/ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Ratio of amplitude of a damped oscillation after a given number of cycles to the initial amplitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Re_\ell$</td>
<td>Reynolds number based on model length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Time, sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\( V_m \) Free-stream velocity, ft/sec
\( x_{cg} \) Distance from model nose to pivot axis, in.
\( \alpha \) Angle of attack, deg
\( \dot{\alpha} \) Time rate of change of angle of attack, rad/sec
\( \alpha_t \) Trim angle of attack, deg
\( \delta \) Canard deflection angle, deg
\( \theta \) Angular displacement, rad or deg
\( \dot{\theta} \) Angular velocity, rad/sec
\( \ddot{\theta} \) Angular acceleration, rad/sec^2
\( \phi \) Model angular coordinate, deg
\( \omega \) Angular frequency, rad/sec
\( \frac{\omega_d}{2V_m} \) Reduced frequency parameter, rad

SUBSCRIPTS

\( o \) Maximum conditions
\( v \) Vacuum conditions
\( w \) Wind-on conditions
SECTION I
INTRODUCTION

Tests were conducted on a 1/5-scale model of the Big Q air-to-air missile to determine its dynamic stability characteristics at Mach numbers ranging from 1.5 to 4 and canard angles of 0, 5, 10, and 15 deg. Static stability tests were conducted on this model in June 1965 over essentially the same range of test conditions and with the same canard angles (Ref. 1). The model was tested at a near constant Reynolds number of $8 \times 10^6$, based on model length, at its trim angle of attack ($\alpha_t$) and ±1 to ±2 deg from $\alpha_t$.

The tests, as outlined in Table I, were conducted using a small amplitude (±3 deg), free oscillation, cross-flexure pivot balance. Data obtained at all Mach numbers and canard angles at the model trim angle of attack are presented.

SECTION II
APPARATUS

2.1 WIND TUNNEL

The 40-in. supersonic tunnel (Gas Dynamic Wind Tunnel, Supersonic (A)) is a continuous, closed-circuit, variable density wind tunnel with an automatically driven flexible plate-type nozzle and a 40- by 40-in. test section. The tunnel operates at Mach numbers from 1.5 to 6 at maximum stagnation pressures from 29 to 200 psia, respectively, and stagnation temperatures up to $300^\circ$F ($M_\infty = 6$). Minimum operating pressures are about one-tenth of the maximum at each Mach number. A description of the tunnel and airflow calibration information may be found in Ref. 2.

2.2 MODEL

Details of the Big Q model are shown in Fig. 1. The model (Fig. 2), supplied by AFWL, has a 9-deg half-angle, blunted conical nose with cruciform canards and a cylindrical afterbody with cruciform fins in line with the canards. The canards at $\phi = 90$ and 270 deg could be pitched at angles from 0 to 15 deg. The canards at $\phi = 0$ and 180 deg were fixed at zero inclination with the model centerline. A spacer was provided to locate the balance pivot axis 12.00 in. aft of the model nose ($x_{cg}/\ell = 0.522$), and ballast was added to locate the model center of gravity exactly at the balance pivot.

2.3 STING-BALANCE SYSTEM

The dynamic stability balance (Fig. 3) is a one-degree-of-freedom, free oscillation, sting-supported system incorporating a cross flexure
The balance was designed for an initial displacement amplitude of about 3 deg; however, the model geometry limited the displacement to slightly above 2 deg. The model could be locked remotely by means of the locking device shown in Fig. 3 which was actuated by a solenoid located in the aft portion of the sting. The model was locked when the pin on the locking device engaged a hole in the model bulkhead (Fig. 4).

Figure 4 shows the oscillating air system which was used to displace the model. The driving force was obtained from a high pressure air supply which could be adjusted to the pressure level necessary to overcome the damping moment on the model by means of a pressure regulator. The model was oscillated by bursts of air alternately emitted from two jets by an oscillating servo valve at a frequency which could be varied remotely by means of a low frequency oscillator. The driving force could be stopped abruptly by a remotely operated solenoid valve.

SECTION III
PROCEDURE

The equation of motion for a free oscillation, one-degree-of-freedom system may be expressed as

\[ \ddot{\theta} - M\dot{\theta}^2 - M\theta = 0 \]

The method for computing the dimensionless damping-in-pitch derivatives is indicated by the following expressions:

\[ \theta = \theta_0 e^{(M\dot{\theta}/21)^t} \sin \sqrt{-M\theta/I} t \]

\[ M\dot{\theta} = \frac{2\pi f L \alpha R}{C_{YR}} \]

\[ M'\dot{\theta} = M\theta - M\dot{\theta} (\omega_1/\omega_w) \]

\[ C_{m_{\alpha}} + C_{m_{\alpha}} = M'\dot{\theta} (2V_\infty/q_\infty A_d^3) \]

The expression for obtaining the aerodynamic viscous-damping-moment parameter (M'\dot{\theta}) is based on the premise that the structural damping of a cross-flexure pivot varies inversely with the frequency of oscillation (Ref. 3).

The change in model oscillation frequency from the wind-off to the wind-on condition may be used to obtain the effective slope of the
pitching-moment curve by the following expressions:

\[ M_\theta = - I \omega^2 \]

\[ M_\theta' = M_\theta' - M_\theta \]

\[ M_\theta' = - I (\omega_0^2 - \omega_v^2) \]

\[ C_{m\theta} = M_\theta' / q_\infty Ad \]

The test procedure for obtaining the data was to adjust the oscillator and pressure regulator (Fig. 4) until the air jets were forcing the model at its undamped natural frequency and required amplitude. The solenoid valve was then closed, which allowed the model to oscillate freely. The oscillatory motion of the model, monitored by a strain-gage bridge on the outside flexure (Fig. 3), was recorded by a direct writing oscillograph. A signal to indicate the exact time at which the solenoid was closed was also recorded on the oscillograph.

**SECTION IV
PRECISION OF MEASUREMENTS**

The balance was calibrated during bench tests before and after testing. The calibrations were obtained by use of known moments and displacements which were accurate within ±1 percent of their maximum value.

Both the damping-in-pitch derivatives \( C_{m_q} + C_{m_\alpha} \) and the effective slope of the pitching-moment curve \( C_{m_\theta} \) are affected by the uncertainties in determining the model moment of inertia (I), angular frequency of oscillation (\( \omega \)), and tunnel free-stream dynamic pressure (\( q_\infty \)). The damping derivatives are also affected by uncertainties in the amplitude ratio (R), the number of cycles to damp to this ratio \( (C_{yR}) \), and the free-stream velocity \( (V_\infty) \).

As a result of the above sources of error, the estimated maximum uncertainties in \( C_{m_q} + C_{m_\alpha} \) and \( C_{m_\theta} \) are given in Fig. 5.
SECTION V
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Figure 6 shows the effect of canard deflection angle (\(\delta\)) on the damping-in-pitch derivatives (\(C_{m_q} + C_{m_\alpha}\)) and effective slope of the pitching-moment curve (\(C_{m\theta}\)) at the model trim angle of attack at Mach numbers of 1.49, 1.99, 2.48, 2.99, and 3.99. Increasing \(\delta\) has no appreciable effect on \(C_{m_q} + C_{m_\alpha}\) but increases \(C_{m\theta}\) except for Mach 3.99, where \(C_{m\theta}\) is practically invariant.

Data from Fig. 6 have been plotted in Fig. 7 to show the influence of Mach number for a given canard deflection angle. The results show that the damping derivatives decrease as Mach number increases for all canard deflection angles, and the model is dynamically stable at all conditions. For all canard deflection angles other than zero the model is statically stable and the effective slope of the pitching-moment curve decreases, to make the model less stable, as Mach number is increased. Increasing Mach number increases the model's static stability for zero canard deflection and shows the model to be unstable at Mach 1.5 and 2.

The pitching-moment curve slope data (\(C_{m\alpha}\)) from Ref. 1, for zero canard deflection are shown in Fig. 7 and are not in good agreement with the present data. In fact, the present data indicate that a slope reversal occurs in the pitching-moment curves between angles of attack of \(\pm 1\) deg at \(M_e = 1.5\) and 2.

The data from the static force tests were obtained at \(-1 \geq \alpha \geq 2\) and show some nonlinearities in the pitching moment near zero angle of attack. The pitching-moment curve slopes (\(C_{m\theta}\)) obtained in the dynamic stability tests correspond to the effective moment for an amplitude range of \(\pm 1.5\) deg which encompasses the region of the nonlinearity. Although not presented here, static-moment data from the dynamic stability tests show that the nonlinearity in the pitching moment decreases with increased Mach number, and thus it would be expected that the data from Ref. 1 would be in better agreement with the present results at the higher Mach numbers.

It is believed, however, that if the static-force data were obtained over a smaller angle-of-attack range near \(\alpha = 0\) the results would be in better agreement with the present data.

Figure 8 shows the model trim angle-of-attack (\(\alpha_t\)) variation with Mach number for canard deflection angles of 5, 10, and 15 deg and data from Ref. 1. The agreement is believed to be within the accuracy of the two balance systems.
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### TABLE I
TEST SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\delta$, deg</th>
<th>$M_\alpha$</th>
<th>$Re \times 10^{-6}$</th>
<th>$\alpha$, deg*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>-1.9, 0, 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.9, 0, 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.9, 0, 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.9, 0, 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.9, 0, 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.6, 6.6, 7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2, 5.2, 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1, 4.2, 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2, 4.2, 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6, 4.6, 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.1, 8.1, 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1, 7.1, 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2, 6.1, 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3, 6.3, 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1, 7.1, 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.9, 9.0, 9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2, 8.2, 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6, 7.6, 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1, 8.1, 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1, 11.1, 12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The trim angle of attack is the middle column.
Tests were conducted in the 40-in. supersonic tunnel of the von Kármán Gas Dynamics Facility to determine the dynamic stability characteristics of a 1/5-scale model of the Big Q air-to-air missile. Data were obtained at Mach numbers from 1.49 to 3.99 at the model trim angle of attack and at plus and minus 1 to 2 deg from trim at a near constant Reynolds number of $8 \times 10^6$, based on model length. The effects of Mach number and canard angle on the damping-in-pitch derivatives and effective slope of the pitching-moment curve at the trim angle of attack are presented.
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