

3540

AD O 756417

TECHNICAL REPORT

73-23-PR

01

A HUMAN FACTORS EVALUATION  
OF  
COLD-WET HANDWEAR

by

John M. McGinnis

John M. Lockhort

Carolyn K. Bense

3540

Approved for public release ;  
distribution unlimited.

April 1972

UNITED STATES ARMY  
NATICK LABORATORIES  
Natick, Massachusetts 01760



PIONEERING RESEARCH LABORATORY



Distribution of this document  
is unlimited.

TECHNICAL REPORT  
73-23-PR

A HUMAN FACTORS EVALUATION  
OF  
COLD-WET HANDWEAR

by

John M. McGinnis  
John M. Lockhart  
Carolyn K. Bense

April 1972

United States Army Natick Laboratories  
Pioneering Research Laboratory  
Natick, Massachusetts

20030113058

## FOREWORD

The study reported here was conducted by the Human Factors Group, Behavioral Sciences Division, PRL, at the request of the Clothing and Personal Life Support Equipment Laboratory. This work was carried on as part of Project 1J664713DL40, Handwear, Wet Weather, and Task 02 under Project Number 1T062106A121, Human Factors Analysis and Design Guidance in Support of Materiel Research and Development.

## Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express their thanks to Mr. Herman Madnick who initiated this study, to SP4 John R. Klotz and SP4 Roy L. MacArt for their assistance in the collection of the data, and to Mrs. Mary Ann Wall for here assistance in data analysis.

## Contents

	Page
List of Figures	v
List of Tables	vi
List of Appendices	viii
Abstract	ix
Section I. Introduction	1
Section II. Dry Glove Investigation	3
Method	3
Subjects	3
Apparatus and Tasks	3
Procedure	4
Results	7
Tasks	7
Temperature	9
Questionnaire	10
Section III. Wet Glove Investigation	13
Method	13
Subjects	13
Apparatus	13
Procedure	13
Results	15
Tasks	15
Temperature	17
Questionnaire	18

Contents (cont'd)

	Page	
Section IV. Discussion	20	-
Section V. Conclusions	24	
References	26	•
Figures	27	
Tables	39	
Appendices	58	

## List of Figures

Figure		Page
1.	Mean Torque Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Dry Glove).	27
2.	Mean Two-Hand Turning Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Dry Glove).	28
3.	Mean O'Connor Finger Dexterity Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Dry Glove).	29
4.	Mean Cord and Cylinder Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Dry Glove).	30
5.	Mean Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Dry Glove).	31
6.	Mean digital temperature as a function of handwear and task (Dry Glove).	32
7.	Mean Torque Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Wet Glove).	33
8.	Mean Two-Hand Turning Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Wet Glove).	34
9.	Mean O'Connor Finger Dexterity Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Wet Glove).	35
10.	Mean Cord and Cylinder Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Wet Glove).	36
11.	Mean Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Wet Glove).	37
12.	Mean digital temperature as a function of handwear and wet vs. dry gloves.	38

## List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Analysis of Variance of Torque Test Performance Data (Dry Glove)	39
2.	Analysis of Variance of Two-Hand Turning Test Performance Data (Dry Glove)	40
3.	Analysis of Variance of O'Connor Finger Dexterity Test Performance Data (Dry Glove)	41
4.	Analysis of Variance of Cord and Cylinder Test Performance Data (Dry Glove)	42
5.	Analysis of Variance of Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test Performance Data (Dry Glove)	43
6.	Mean Score for Each Task under Each Handwear Condition (Dry Glove)	44
7.	Analysis of Variance of Temperature Data (Dry Glove)	45
8.	Mean Digital Temperature for Each Handwear Condition and Each Task (Dry Glove)	46
9.	Questionnaire Results: Mean Rankings of Handwear Conditions (Dry Glove)	47
10.	Analysis of Variance of Torque Test Performance Data (Wet Glove)	48
11.	Analysis of Variance of Two-Hand Turning Test Performance Data (Wet Glove).	49
12.	Analysis of Variance of O'Connor Finger Dexterity Test Performance Data (Wet Glove)	50
13.	Analysis of Variance of Cord and Cylinder Test Performance Data (Wet Glove)	51
14.	Analysis of Variance of Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test Performance Data (Wet Glove)	52



List of Tables (cont'd)

Table		Page
15.	Mean Test Score for Each Task on Each Day (Wet Glove)	53
16.	Mean Score for Each Task under Each Handwear Condition (Wet Glove)	54
17.	Mean Scores on Two Tasks for Each Handwear and Day Combination (Wet Glove)	55
18.	Analysis of Variance of Digital Temperature Data (Wet Glove)	56
19.	Questionnaire Results: Mean Rankings of Handwear Conditions (Wet Glove)	57

## List of Appendices

Appendix	Page
A Photographs of Handwear Conditions	58
1. Standard Leather Glove	59
2. Impermeable Glove	60
3. Leather Glove with Wool Inserts	61
4. Impermeable Glove with Wool Inserts	62
5. Impermeable Glove with Built-In Insulation	63
B Glove Study Questionnaire	64

## Abstract

Subjects performed a battery of manual performance tasks (Torque Test, Minnesota Two-Hand Turning Test, O'Connor Fine Finger Dexterity Test, Cord Manipulation and Cylinder Stringing Test, Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test) under six handwear conditions: bare-handed, standard leather glove, impermeable glove, leather glove with wool inserts, impermeable glove with wool inserts, and impermeable glove with built-in insulation. Each subject performed the tests under each handwear condition for 14 days at 35°F ambient temperature and this comprised the Dry Glove Investigation. An additional Wet Glove Investigation involved the same tests and handwear conditions and was of four days' duration. On Days 2 and 3, subjects immersed their gloved hands into 35°F water for two minutes prior to testing each glove condition while, on Days 1 and 4, there was no water immersion. During the Dry Glove Investigation, the impermeable gloves resulted in superior performance on the Torque Test. For the remaining tests, the bare hand condition resulted in superior performance and the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation resulted in inferior performance compared to the other handwear conditions. Performance level on all tasks decreased on the first day of water immersion, but performance on the Minnesota Two-Hand Turning Test only was adversely affected on both water immersion days. It was recommended that the impermeable glove with built-in insulation be given no further consideration and that the impermeable gloves, with and without wool inserts, be given serious consideration for field use under wet-cold conditions.

## SECTION I

### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to evaluate five types of cold-wet handwear with regard to their effects on manual performance and hand skin temperature. The particular technical characteristics addressed in this study were: "...Investigation of the human engineering ramifications of this clothing and equipment system will be required... It is desired that the system reduce the performance degradation below that caused by the current field clothing and equipment by its lighter weight" (Ref. 1, Para. 10).

The handwear systems investigated in this study were the bare hand, an impermeable glove, with and without wool inserts and with built-in insulation, and the standard Army five finger leather glove, with and without wool inserts. Thus, there were five glove conditions and a bare hand condition. The effects of handwear on manual performance were determined for five different manual tasks. The tasks were chosen as being representative of a wide range of tasks involving manual and finger dexterity, measuring aspects of manual dexterity which are judged to be important for performing military activities, and being sensitive to decrements in performance which result from the wearing of protective handwear.

In several unpublished studies, Lockhart found that the effects of handwear on manual performance were a function of the type of task performed. The time to complete fine finger dexterity tasks was 200 to 300% greater when subjects wore standard five finger leather gloves with wool inserts than when they performed these tasks with bare hands. Cooling the bare hands slowly to a hand skin temperature of 45°F resulted in only a 30 to 45% decrease in the number of task components completed in 30 seconds. Thus, cold impairment of fine finger dexterity was less than that produced by wearing the standard leather glove with wool inserts. On a task involving dexterity of the whole

hand, cold-produced impairment of the bare hands yielded performance levels comparable to glove-produced decrements. When a screw tightening task was used, which involves whole-hand dexterity and torque, the exposure of the bare hands to cold resulted in severe decrements while the wearing of the leather glove with wool inserts had little effect on performance.

The present handwear evaluation comprised two series of tests: a Dry Glove Investigation at 35°F ambient for 14 days and a briefer, Wet Glove Investigation at the same temperature with pre-test submersion of the gloved hand in 35°F water. The more extensive time period was used to determine whether relative glove impairment shifted as a function of practice. The wet glove investigation was conducted because all five types of gloves are for use in the field under cold-wet conditions. The methods and results for each of these two series of tests are presented separately. The discussion of results is directed to both series.

## SECTION II

### DRY GLOVE INVESTIGATION

#### Method

**Subjects** — The subjects were 10 volunteer enlisted men assigned to the Climatic Research Laboratory Test Subject Platoon. The subjects ranged in age from 20 to 25 years and had had previous cold exposure experience. They were separated into two groups of five subjects each with one group participating in the morning hours (AM Group) and one participating in the afternoon (PM Group).

**Apparatus and Tasks** — The battery of tasks was performed in a climatic chamber with ambient temperature controls, but without relative humidity or windspeed controls. The following tasks, numbered in the order performed, were included:

1. **Torque Test** — a new test which measures the amount of angular force which can be applied to a 0.75-in. diameter brass cylinder when it is grasped in one hand. It is assumed that this test is closely related to the ability to hold onto objects and has little relation to dexterous manipulation. One trial on this task consisted of two successive tries. The higher of the two scores, in inch-pounds, was used in subsequent analyses.

2. **Minnesota Two-Hand Turning Test** — a widely used test designed to measure manual dexterity. The subject starts at the upper right hand corner of a form board containing 60, 1.5-in. diameter and 7/8-in. thick blocks, picks up each block with the lead hand, turns it over, and places it down with the following hand until all blocks have been turned.

3. **O'Connor Fine Finger Dexterity Test** — a test widely used for measuring fine finger dexterity and aptitude for assembling small mechanical parts. In the shortened form used in this study, the subject was required to pick up and place three pegs in each of 20 holes.

4. Cord Manipulation and Cylinder Stringing Test – a new test designed by McGinnis to measure proficiency in handling soft, flexible materials. It consists of 10 large and one small loop of 3/32-in., woven nylon cord attached at equal intervals to a flexible webbing base with a hook at the far end, and of 10, 1/2-in., plastic cylinders with a 3/8-in. bore. The nearest loop is elongated until the sides are brought together, the doubled end is inserted through a cylinder, and the distal end is opened to form a smaller loop. The next loop is then elongated, passed through the first loop and through a cylinder. This procedure continues until the 10 loops form a chain with one cylinder mounted on each link. The smaller final loop is inserted through the tenth and placed over the hook to complete the task.

5. Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test – a test which measures proficiency in the use of wrenches and screwdrivers. Two open-end wrenches, one large crescent wrench, and a screwdriver are used to relocate six bolt, nut, and washer combinations of three different sizes.

The score for each of the last four tests was the time required to complete the given number of components on the task, recorded to the nearest 0.01 minute.

Testing was conducted at 35°F with minimal windspeed. A thermocouple was taped to the little finger of the subject's nonpreferred hand and its output in the form of skin temperature was recorded on a Leeds-Northrup Speedomax Recording System. The subjects were outfitted in fatigues, wool socks, leather combat boots, wool shirts, field jackets, and field trousers.

Procedure – Before the testing began, a glove specialist fit and issued to each subject one new, correctly-sized pair of each of the following types of gloves which were used only by that subject throughout the study: a standard five finger leather glove, an impermeable glove, an impermeable glove with built-in insulation, and one pair of wool inserts. The wool inserts were worn with both the leather gloves and the impermeable gloves. These five types of gloves plus the bare hand condition comprised the six levels of the handwear variable.

Two practice sessions were conducted during which the subjects were given instructions on the performance of each of the manual tasks. For the first practice session, the subject performed each task bare-handed and then while wearing each of the five types of gloves in the following order: standard leather glove, impermeable glove, leather glove with wool inserts, impermeable glove with wool inserts, and impermeable glove with built-in insulation (Appendix A). The first practice session (P1) required two days to complete. The second practice session (P2) required one day and the order of presentation of handwear conditions for each subject was random. At each of the practice sessions, one trial was given on each of the five tasks under each of the six handwear conditions.

Each subject subsequently participated in 12 experimental sessions. The subject was exposed to only one experimental session per day and was always tested in the morning (AM Group) or always in the afternoon (PM Group). At each experimental session, the subjects performed the manual tasks in the order specified above with one exception. On any one day, one pair of subjects in the morning and one pair in the afternoon received the Hand Tool Test in the third position. The subjects were given one trial on each test with one of the six handwear conditions before moving to the next handwear condition. There was a 10 min. rest between the third and fourth handwear conditions. The order of presentation of handwear was counterbalanced between subjects for each day with four subjects receiving the same order as four other subjects. The order of presentation was also counterbalanced within subjects across each six-day period.

The data from each task were subjected to separate analyses of variance. The experimental design used in analysing the task data was a hierarchical one of the form: Subjects (1-5) by Handwear Condition (Bare hands and five glove types) by Days (P1, P2, and 12 experimental days) within Groups (AM vs. PM).

The subject's digital temperature was recorded on each trial and served as the raw data for another analysis of variance. The design for the analysis of the temperature



data was a hierarchical one of the form: Subjects (1-5) by Handwear Condition (Bare hands and five glove types) by Dexterity Test (1-5) by Days (P1,P2, and 12 experimental days) within Groups (AM vs. PM).

At the conclusion of the study, all subjects were given a questionnaire (Appendix B) in which their subjective responses to various aspects of the gloves were requested.

## Results

The analyses of the task scores, the temperature data, and the questionnaire responses will be presented separately below.

**Tasks** – The main effects of days and of handwear were significant for each of the five tasks (Tables 1-5). The effect of days indicated that the performance of the subjects improved significantly over the course of the experiment.

The results related to the significant main effect of handwear varied with the task being performed. The mean for each handwear condition, obtained by summing across days, sessions, and subjects, is presented in Table 6. The significant main effect of handwear was analyzed further for each task using the Newman-Keuls multiple comparison test (Ref. 4), the results of which are also indicated in Table 6.

The results of the analysis of variance of the Torque Test data are presented in Table 1. Performance on this test with any of the three types of impermeable gloves was significantly better than with the bare hand, the leather glove without inserts, or the leather glove with wool inserts. Scores for the leather glove with wool inserts were lower than those obtained with bare hands and with the leather glove without inserts. Figure 1 shows mean Torque Test scores as a function of days of testing and type of handwear. There was a gradual improvement in scores over days on this task with few shifts in the relative effectiveness of various handwear conditions and the interaction between handwear and days of testing was not significant.

The results of the analysis of variance performed on the Two-Hand Turning Test data are presented in Table 2. The significant handwear effect is reflected in fastest time scores for the bare hand condition, fast time scores for the leather and the impermeable gloves without wool inserts, slow time scores for both wool insert combinations, and slowest time scores for the impermeable glove with built-in insulation. The significant handwear by days interaction is reflected in a gradual reduction in the differences among conditions with increasing practice on the task (Figure 2).

For the O'Connor Finger Dexterity Test, the main effects of handwear and of days and the handwear by days interaction were significant (Table 3). Mean bare hand performance was superior to that for all glove conditions (Table 6). Performance with the leather glove without wool inserts was impaired relative to the bare hand condition, was not reliably different from that for the impermeable glove condition, and was superior to that for the impermeable glove with wool insert condition. With the impermeable glove, O'Connor Test scores were not reliably different from those for the impermeable glove with wool insert condition, but were superior to those for the leather glove with wool inserts. Performances for both wool insert combinations did not differ from each other, but both these types of handwear resulted in better scores than did the impermeable glove with built-in insulation condition. The significant handwear by days interaction is reflected in some reordering of glove performance levels across days and by a gradual decrease in the extent of differences among glove conditions (Figure 3).

For the Cord and Cylinder Test, the main effects of handwear and of days and the handwear by days interaction were significant (Table 4). Mean Cord and Cylinder performance times were fastest for the bare hand condition, slowest for the impermeable glove with built-in insulation condition, and second slowest for the leather glove with wool insert condition. Mean performance times among the remaining three conditions did not differ significantly (Table 6). Once again, the significant handwear by days interaction reflects both shifts in scores among the glove conditions across days and a gradual decrease in the differences among these conditions (Figure 4).

On the Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test, only the main effects of days and of handwear conditions were significant (Table 5). For the main effect of handwear, mean test scores were slowest using the impermeable glove with built-in insulation, fastest for the bare hand condition, and second fastest for the leather glove without inserts. Mean performance among the three remaining conditions did not differ significantly (Table 6). The handwear by days interaction was not significant on the Bennett Test indicating that relative task difficulty among handwear conditions was not altered by continued testing (Figure 5).

**Temperature** — The results of the analysis of variance performed on the digital temperature data are presented in Table 7. It can be seen that there were significant main effects attributable to tasks and to handwear condition. The tasks were always performed in the same order. Thus, task condition was confounded with time in the chamber. It was therefore expected that temperature would decrease between the beginning and the end of performance of the five tasks. The mean temperature during each task is presented in Table 8 and it can be seen that this expected decrease in digital temperature did occur.

The mean digital temperature for each handwear condition is also presented in Table 8. The highest temperatures were obtained with the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation or wool inserts. The mean digital temperature with the impermeable glove without inserts was slightly higher than that obtained with bare hands. The lowest mean temperatures were recorded when the leather glove was worn with or without inserts.

Figure 6, a plot of the significant handwear by tasks interaction, also reflects the differences in mean digital temperatures as a function of dexterity task and handwear condition discussed above. The significant interaction is attributable to the decrease in bare hand temperature over tasks. For the Torque Test (T1), bare hand temperature was higher than temperatures under the five glove conditions and the digital temperatures obtained with the three types of impermeable glove were approximately equal to each other. The digital temperatures for the leather gloves, with and without inserts, were approximately equal and lower than the temperatures for any other handwear conditions.

On the next task, the Two-Hand Turning Test (T2), the relationships among digital temperatures as a function of handwear were the same as on the Torque Test. However, bare hand temperatures and those with the impermeable glove without inserts were decreased relative to the Torque Test. For the third task, the O'Connor Finger Dexterity Test (T3), all temperatures were decreased with the bare hand temperature level falling

below those achieved with the impermeable gloves with wool inserts and the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation. On the Cord and Cylinder Test (T4), all temperatures again decreased. Bare hand temperature was approximately equal to those recorded with the leather glove and the impermeable glove. Digital temperature with the impermeable glove with built-in insulation was highest followed by that with the impermeable glove with wool inserts.

On the last task, the Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test (T5), temperature with the impermeable glove increased slightly as did that with the five finger glove with wool inserts. The latter was approximately equal to the leather glove and the bare hand temperatures. The other temperatures were lower than they had been on the previous task, but the impermeable glove with built-in insulation still yielded the highest temperature, followed by the impermeable glove with wool inserts.

**Questionnaire** — The six handwear conditions were ranked by means of the questionnaire (Appendix B). Results for each of the seven questions are presented below and summarized in Table 9.

1. "Which handwear condition was warmest?" — The results of this question are closely related to the number of layers of insulation. The impermeable gloves with wool inserts and the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation were tied for warmest, leather gloves with wool inserts were third, leather gloves and impermeable gloves were tied for fourth and bare hands were rated as coldest. These rankings and the measured digital temperatures were not closely related.

2. "Which handwear condition gave the best grip (Torque Test)?" — The impermeable gloves were ranked first as they were on the objective test. Impermeable gloves with wool inserts were second and the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation were third, instead of being practically tied as they were on the test results. Bare hands

were fourth on both the questionnaire and the test. Leather gloves with wool inserts were fifth and leather gloves were last as compared with the reverse order on the Torque Test results.

3. "Which handwear condition was best for turning over the blocks (Two-Hand Turning Test)?" – Bare hands were judged first by a large margin and they were first on the test. Impermeable gloves were second, leather gloves with wool inserts were third, followed closely by leather gloves in fourth and impermeable gloves with wool inserts in fifth place. The impermeable gloves with built-in insulation were last by a large margin as they were on the test.

4. "Which handwear condition was best for placing the small pins in the holes (O'Connor Dexterity Test)?" – Bare hands were judged best by a large margin and the impermeable gloves were second. The leather gloves were rated slightly better than either the impermeable gloves with wool inserts or the leather gloves with wool inserts, which were tied. The impermeable gloves with built-in insulation were definitely last.

5. "Which handwear condition was best for stringing the cylinders (Cord and Cylinder Manipulation Test)?" – Bare hands were ranked first. Impermeable gloves were second, followed closely by impermeable gloves with wool inserts, leather gloves were fourth, leather gloves with wool inserts were fifth, and impermeable gloves with built-in insulation were last, with fifth and sixth differing by only two points in their total ratings.

6. "Which handwear condition was best for working with hand tools (Bennett Test)?" – Bare hands were judged best, impermeable gloves were second, leather gloves and impermeable gloves with inserts were third and fourth but differed only slightly. Leather gloves with wool inserts were a poor fifth and impermeable gloves with built-in insulation were last by a large margin.

7. The last question was a general one: "Which do you think would be best for general Army use under cold-wet conditions?" - The answers definitely favored protecting the hands, bare hands being the least preferred condition by a large margin. The first preference also by a large margin was the impermeable gloves with wool inserts. Leather gloves with wool inserts were second, the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation were third, followed closely by the impermeable gloves in fourth place and the leather gloves in fifth.

**SECTION III**  
**WET GLOVE INVESTIGATION**

**Method**

**Subjects** — Seven of the subjects who had participated in the Dry Glove Investigation served as subjects in this study.

**Apparatus** — The manual dexterity tasks and the temperature recording device used in this investigation were the same as those used in the Dry Glove Study. The subjects continued to use the gloves that they had previously been issued (Appendix A) except that, after testing under either leather glove condition, the leather shells were hung in front of a fan to dry and new or dry wool inserts were used for the next appropriate condition.

**Procedure** — The procedure was generally the same as that employed in the Dry Glove Investigation. However, this study included only four sessions. The first session (Day 1) consisted of the data from the last day of the previous study. At the second and third sessions (Days 2 and 3), the subjects immersed their gloved fingers beyond the third finger joint in water for 2 min. before the start of testing of each glove condition. Water and chamber temperatures were both 35°F and chamber windspeed was minimal. The immersion preceded only those trials on which the subjects wore gloves and there was no immersion on Days 1 and 4. After removing their gloved hands from the water, the subjects were allowed to shake or squeeze excess water from the gloves and the five manual tasks were then performed under that handwear condition.

A separate analysis of variance was done on the performance data from each of the dexterity tasks. The experimental design was of the form: Subjects (1-7) by Handwear Condition (Bare hands and five glove types) by Days (1-4).



The subject's digital temperature was recorded on each trial and served as the raw data for an analysis of variance. The design for the analysis of the temperature data was: Subjects (1-7) by Handwear Condition (Bare hands and five glove types) by Dexterity Test (1-5) by Days (1-4).

At the conclusion of testing, all subjects were again given the questionnaire (Appendix B).

## Results

The analyses of the task data, the temperature data, and the questionnaire responses will be presented separately below.

**Tasks** — The main effect of days was significant in the analysis of variance performed on each task (Tables 10-14). The results of the subsequent Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons tests on the means for the significant main effect of days are presented in Table 15. The main effect of handwear was also found to be significant for all tasks (Tables 10-14). The results of the Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons tests on the means for the significant handwear effects are presented in Table 16 and those of the Newman-Keuls test on the means for the two significant handwear and days interactions (Tables 10 and 14) are presented in Table 17.

Mean Torque Test performance on Day 2, the first session in which the gloved hand was immersed in cold water, was significantly poorer than that on Days 1, 3, and 4 (Table 15, Figure 7). Regarding the effect of handwear condition, lowest Torque Test scores occurred when the leather gloves, with or without wool inserts, were worn (Table 16). The significant handwear by days interaction (Table 10) reflects the following relationships within and among glove conditions. Within glove conditions, immersion of the gloved hand in cold water had an effect on Torque Test performance only for the impermeable glove with built-in insulation. For this glove condition, performance was significantly poorer on the first immersion day, Day 2, than on any of the other three testing days (Table 17).

Among glove conditions, Torque Test scores for the three impermeable glove conditions were superior to those for the two leather glove conditions on Day 1. On the first wet glove day, Day 2, Torque performance with the impermeable glove, with and without wool inserts, declined relative to Day 1 and was not different from that

for the leather glove with wool inserts. Also, on the first wet glove day, Torque performance using the impermeable glove with built-in insulation declined and was not different from that for both leather glove conditions (Table 17).

For the Two-Hand Turning Test, performance on the dry glove days (Days 1 and 4) was significantly better than that on the wet glove days (Days 2 and 3). The effect of water immersion on the O'Connor Finger Dexterity Test was less extreme than that for the Two-Hand Turning Test. There was a significant difference in performance only between Days 1 and 2 (Table 15). For both tasks, the time scores were slowest when the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation or either glove with wool inserts were worn. The next slowest scores were obtained with the impermeable and leather gloves. These scores were not significantly different from those achieved with the impermeable glove with wool inserts (Table 16). The fastest scores were obtained with bare hands. Figure 8 is a plot of mean performance level on the Two-Hand Turning Test as a function of handwear and days. The same information for the O'Connor Test is presented in Figure 9.

On the Cord and Cylinder Test, Day 2 scores were inferior to those on Days 1 and 4 (Table 15). Among handwear conditions, however, there appears to be no systematic reordering of task performance as a function of immersion of the hands in cold water (Figure 10).

Scores for Days 2 and 3 on the Bennett Hand Tool Test did not differ from each other, but the Day 2 performance level was significantly worse than the Day 1 and the Day 4 levels (Table 15). In general, immersion of the gloved hand in cold water resulted in slower scores for the handwear conditions, including the bare hand which was not immersed (Figure 11). By Day 3, there was a partial recovery of the impaired scores.

The significant handwear by days interaction on the Bennett Test (Table 14) is reflected in the following relationships. Within glove conditions, immersion of the gloved hand in cold water resulted in poorer test performance on both wet glove days, Days 2 and 3, as compared with Day 1 for the leather glove condition and Days 1 and 4 for the impermeable glove with built-in insulation. Bennett Test performance for the bare hand condition on the first wet day was impaired relative to Day 1 performance even though the bare hand was not immersed in water (Table 17).

Among glove conditions, Bennett performance on Day 1 was impaired relative to the bare hand condition when the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation and with wool inserts were worn. Also, performance with the impermeable gloves with wool inserts was poorer than that for the leather glove condition. For the first day of water immersion, Day 2, the impermeable glove with built-in insulation yielded impaired performance relative to all other handwear conditions and there were no significant differences among these other conditions. By Day 3, performance with the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation and with the leather gloves with wool inserts was impaired only relative to that for the bare hand condition. Other differences among the handwear conditions were not significant. Performance differences among all handwear conditions were not significant on Day 4.

Temperature — The results of the analysis of variance performed on the hand skin temperature data are presented in Table 18. There were significant main effects attributable to days, handwear, and tasks. Of chief interest is the significant handwear by days interaction. Figure 12 is a plot of the mean skin temperatures of Days 1 and 4 (dry gloves) vs. Days 2 and 3 (wet gloves). For the five types of gloves, mean temperatures for Days 1 and 4 were higher than those for Days 2 and 3.

Temperature with the three types of impermeable gloves were higher than those with the leather glove on wet glove days, but were lower than bare hand temperatures. The most extreme differences in temperatures on wet, as compared to dry, glove days occurred

when the leather gloves, with and without wool inserts, were worn. With these two types of gloves, mean temperatures dropped from approximately 65°F on dry days to 49°F on wet days. Mean temperatures for the three types of impermeable gloves remained above 55°F even when these gloves were wet.

**Questionnaire** – At the end of the Wet Glove Study the six handwear conditions were ranked for use under the conditions of the study by means of the questionnaire (Appendix B). Table 19 shows the results for wet gloves for each of the seven questions and six handwear conditions.

1. "Which handwear condition was warmest?" The impermeable glove with built-in insulation was ranked first, impermeable gloves with wool inserts were second, impermeable gloves were third, followed by bare hands and leather gloves with wool inserts, which were tied for fourth, and leather gloves were sixth.

2. "Which handwear condition gave the best grip (Torque Test)?" - Impermeable gloves were first, second when worn with wool inserts, and the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation were third. Bare hands were fourth. Leather gloves were ranked fifth and leather gloves with wool inserts were last.

3. "Which handwear condition was best for turning over the blocks (Two-hand Turning Test)?" – Bare hands were rated first, impermeable gloves second, impermeable gloves with wool inserts were third, leather gloves were fourth, leather gloves with wool inserts were fifth, and impermeable gloves with built-in insulation were last. The rankings were exactly the same for Question 4, "Which handwear conditions were best for placing the small pins in the holes (O'Conner Dexterity Test)?", for Question 5, "Which handwear condition was best for stringing the cylinders (Cord and Cylinder Test)?", and for Question 6, "Which handwear condition was best for working with hand tools (Bennett Test)?", except that on Question 6, impermeable gloves with built-in insulation ranked fifth and leather gloves with wool inserts were last.

4. "Which do you think would be best for general Army use under cold-wet conditions?" — Impermeable gloves with wool inserts ranked first, impermeable gloves with built-in insulation were second, and impermeable gloves were third, leather gloves were fourth, leather gloves with wool inserts fifth, and bare hands were ranked last.

## SECTION IV

### Discussion

The relative extent of performance differences among gloves appears to be related generally to differences in the physical characteristics of the gloves. The work of Lyman (Ref. 2) consisted of analysing physical characteristics of gloves and determining the effects of these characteristics on manipulative performance. Based on the finding that loss of information at the fingertips is a primary source of decrement in manipulative performance, Lyman concluded that the amount of this loss is strongly affected by the particular configuration of friction, type of material, material thickness, and material location on the fingertips. Bradley (Ref. 3) investigated the relationship among four physical characteristics of gloves (tenacity, snugness, suppleness, and protectiveness against injury) and the times for operation of push buttons, toggle switches, rotary knobs, and horizontally- and vertically-operable levers. In his study, Bradley concluded that increasing snugness of glove fit can be expected to improve performance of most types of control operations. In the present study, the results of both Wet and Dry Glove Investigations suggest the importance of proper fit and of physical characteristics such as surface friction, thickness, and material flexibility on the performance of the gloved hand.

The Torque Test is very different from the other tests used in the present study. It measures the amount of angular force which can be exerted by grasping and twisting. Results are believed to be closely related to the surface friction between the glove material and the cylindrical handle which is grasped. Under dry glove conditions, scores for the impermeable gloves were 22% higher than those for bare hands and scores for leather gloves were 18% lower than those for the bare hands. The superiority of the three types of impermeable gloves in Torque Test performance reflects the superior surface friction afforded by this impermeable material. Within this general material effect, glove thickness had a small effect on Torque Test performance. Dry leather gloves gripped better alone than when worn with inserts, and scores with impermeable gloves were somewhat higher than when they were used in combination with wool inserts or had built-in insulation.

Results of the Dry and the Wet Glove Investigations were in good agreement with each other since the scores and the rank orders for the gloves were nearly the same under both conditions.

The wearing of gloves produced a significant impairment in manual performance involving dexterity. Bare hand performance was superior to that for all glove conditions on all four dexterity tests for both wet and dry gloves. The relative extent of glove-impaired manual performance differs as a function of the task with the impairment being greater for fine-finger dexterity tasks than for whole-hand dexterity tasks. Based on overall means, during the Dry Glove Investigation, performance on the Cord and Cylinder and on the O'Connor Finger Dexterity Tests was slower by factors of 1.89 and 1.48, respectively, when the leather glove was worn as compared with bare hand performance. Compared with the bare hand condition, the leather glove condition increased performance time scores on the Two-Hand Turning Test and the Bennett Hand Tool Test by factors of 1.31 and 1.11, respectively. Wearing the impermeable glove with built-in insulation resulted in scores of 2.53, 1.74, 1.73, and 1.29 times longer than those for the bare hand condition on the Cord and Cylinder Test, the O'Connor Test, the Two-Hand Turning Test, and the Bennett Hand Tool Test, respectively. The Cord and Cylinder Test was more sensitive than the other tests to glove-induced impairment of performance. However, this test may be sensitive to dexterity requirements over and above those required for successful field performance of the combat soldier.

The effect of glove thickness on performance is apparent from the results on the four dexterity tests, but is particularly clear in the analysis of the Two-Hand Turning Test data. In this case, bare hand performance was superior, followed by that for the two glove conditions without inserts, and then by performance for the two glove conditions with wool inserts. Performance was poorest for the impermeable glove with built-in insulation. The results for the other tasks requiring dexterity generally contain performance rankings consistent with glove thickness, but significant differences among the conditions are not as clearly related to a thickness effect as that for the Two-Hand Turning Test



data. The consistently poorer performance on all the dexterity tests when using the impermeable glove with built-in insulation is attributable not only to glove thickness but also to the relative inflexibility of this handwear.

Based on what is inferred to be a relatively weak thickness effect on most tasks in the present study, it is assumed that the use of leather gloves, which were oversized to fit with wool inserts, resulted in a relative absence of snugness of fit for both glove conditions and possibly a slight impairment of performance. It is hypothesized that, if the subjects wore the right size glove for the shell conditions and a necessarily larger glove for the wool insert conditions, snugness as a confounding factor would be eliminated and the thickness effect would be greater for all tasks on which a thickness effect was observed in the present study.

In the present study, it also was noted that, while gloves interfered with the handling of small nuts and washers on the Bennett Test, the protection provided by the gloves against the cold and the scraping of the hands may have aided performance on this test. While this last observation may account partially for the overall reduction of glove impairment on the Bennett Test, it is assumed also that performance on the Bennett does require less dexterity than is needed for the other tests.

Performance on all tasks and for all handwear conditions improved with practice. In the cases of glove-impaired task performances, the extent of differences among gloves and between glove conditions and the bare hand condition decreased with practice, reaching what appeared to be fairly stable levels by the end of the study. One practical consequence of this finding is the possibility that, because of frustrations introduced by gloves during initial practice, some people may discard their handwear and not practice with gloves sufficiently to become proficient in their use on that task.

For those two days in which the gloved hands were immersed in cold water, performance on all tasks for almost all handwear conditions, including the bare hand which was not immersed, was impaired relative to performance on the previous dry day. Except

for the Two-Hand Turning Test, task performance for most handwear conditions improved on the second wet day. It is therefore assumed that the performance effect of water immersion on the first wet day was primarily attributable to cold-induced discomfort. In the water immersion portion of the present study, no consistent differences in performance were found between the leather glove conditions and impermeable glove conditions that could be related directly to the fact that the leather gloves absorbed water and the impermeable gloves did not. However, the extreme differences in hand skin temperatures when the leather gloves were wet as opposed to the wet impermeable gloves do not rule this out.

Based upon the results of the present study, it is recommended that the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation be given no further consideration for use as the Army cold-wet impermeable glove. Although these gloves provided some protection against cold exposure, performance scores were consistently inferior when they were used. A decision among the other glove types is most difficult. The impermeable glove with wool inserts was favored by the test subjects, provided somewhat better cold protection than either the leather or the impermeable gloves alone, and afforded significantly higher performance levels on the Cord and Cylinder Test than did the leather glove with wool inserts. Time scores on the four dexterity tests were slightly faster for the leather gloves than for the impermeable gloves. However, scores on three of the same four tests were slightly faster for the impermeable gloves with wool inserts than for the leather gloves with wool inserts. The impermeable gloves, with or without inserts, are definitely superior to the standard leather glove, with or without inserts, for tasks involving the application of torque and other work involving whole-hand gripping and the application of angular force.

## SECTION V

### Conclusions

1. Results of the present study for both dry and wet gloves support the importance of proper fit and physical characteristics such as surface friction, thickness, and flexibility for the performance of the gloved hand.

2. The impermeable gloves worn with or without wool inserts are definitely superior to bare hands and bare hands are superior to standard leather gloves with or without inserts for tasks involving the application of torque and other work involving whole-hand gripping and the application of angular force.

3. Torque Test performance is closely related to the surface friction between the glove material and the cylindrical handle which is grasped.

4. The wearing of gloves, when compared with the bare hand condition, produced significant impairment in manual performance involving dexterity.

5. Gloved hand performance on dexterity tests appears to be inversely related to glove thickness and to the stiffness of the glove material.

6. The relative extent of glove-impaired manual performance differs as a function of the task, with the impairment being greater for fine-finger dexterity tasks than for whole-hand dexterity tasks.

7. The Cord and Cylinder Test is more sensitive than the other dexterity tasks to glove-induced impairment of performance. However, this task may be sensitive to dexterity requirements over and above those required for successful field performance of the combat soldier.

8. The consistently poor performance on all dexterity tests when test subjects used the impermeable glove with built-in insulation is attributed to the thickness and secondarily to the relative inflexibility of this handwear.

9. Performance on all tasks and for all handwear conditions improved with practice.

10. During the performance of glove-impaired tasks, differences among gloves decreased with practice reaching fairly stable levels by the end of the study, with scores tending to approach the bare hand level.

11. The nature of this study does not permit conclusions concerning the durability of the handwear tested.

12. Performance of the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation was inferior to the other impermeable gloves on the Torque Test and was consistently inferior to all the other gloves tested, on all tasks involving dexterity. This glove should not be considered further.

13. The impermeable glove, with or without the wool insert, performed well during this study. It furnishes a more positive grasp than can be secured with the bare hand or with the standard leather glove, is slightly warmer than the latter, is almost equal to it for performing tasks involving dexterity, and is preferred by the test subjects. Within the limitations of this study it appears to be an excellent impermeable glove for field use under wet - cold conditions.

## References

1. Technical Characteristics for Handwear, Wet Weather. September 1969.
2. Lyman, J. "Final Report on Studies of Some Variables Relating Handcovering Design to Manual Performance in Extreme Environments". Los Angeles: Department of Engineering, University of California at Los Angeles, February 1956. Report No. 56-7.
3. Bradley, J.V. Glove characteristics influencing control manipulability. *Human Factors*, 1969, 11, 21-36.
4. Winer, B. J. *Statistical Principles in Experimental Design*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

- X - X IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/BUILT-IN INSULATION
- - □ IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- △ - △ LEATHER GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- - ■ IMPERMEABLE GLOVE
- ▲ - ▲ LEATHER GLOVE
- - ● BARE HANDS




Figure 1. Mean Torque Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Dry Glove).




Figure 2. Mean Two-Hand Turning Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Dry Glove).




Figure 3. Mean O'Connor Finger Dexterity Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Dry Glove).






Figure 4. Mean Cord and Cylinder Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Dry Glove).




Figure 5. Mean Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Dry Glove).




Figure 6. Mean digital temperature as a function of handwear and task (Dry Glove).

- X— —X IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/BUILT-IN INSULATION
- —□ IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- △— —△ LEATHER GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- —■ IMPERMEABLE GLOVE
- ▲— —▲ LEATHER GLOVE
- —● BARE HANDS




Figure 7. Mean Torque Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Wet Glove).

- X--X IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/BUILT-IN INSULATION
- IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- △--△ LEATHER GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- IMPERMEABLE GLOVE
- ▲--▲ LEATHER GLOVE
- BARE HANDS




Figure 8. Mean Two Hand Turning Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Wet Glove).

- X--X IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/BUILT-IN INSULATION
- IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- △--△ LEATHER GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- IMPERMEABLE GLOVE
- ▲--▲ LEATHER GLOVE
- BARE HANDS




Figure 9. Mean O'Connor Finger Dexterity Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Wet Glove).

- X—X IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/BUILT-IN INSULATION
- IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- △—△ LEATHER GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- IMPERMEABLE GLOVE
- ▲—▲ LEATHER GLOVE
- BARE HANDS




Figure 10. Mean Cord and Cylinder Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Wet Glove).

- X—X IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/BUILT-IN INSULATION
- IMPERMEABLE GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- △—△ LEATHER GLOVE W/WOOL INSERTS
- IMPERMEABLE GLOVE
- ▲—▲ LEATHER GLOVE
- BARE HANDS




Figure 11. Mean Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test scores for each day and handwear condition (Wet Glove).






Figure 12. Mean digital temperature as a function of handwear and wet vs. dry gloves.

TABLE 1

Analysis of Variance of Torque Test  
Performance Data  
(Dry Glove)

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Groups (G)	1	13201.070	13201.070	4.629	
Ss/G	8	22811.719	2851.464	—	
Days (D)	13	15080.758	1160.058	8.255	.001
DxG	13	1083.094	83.315	<1.00	
SsxD/G	104	14614.484	140.523	—	
Handwear (H)	5	82819.695	16563.939	31.290	.001
HxG	5	5194.129	1038.826	1.962	
SsxH/G	40	21174.512	529.362	—	
HxD	65	5034.070	77.447	1.355	
HxDxG	65	3663.105	56.355	<1.00	
SsxHxD/G	520	29700.488	57.116	—	

TABLE 2

Analysis of Variance of Two-Hand Turning  
 Test Performance Data  
 (Dry Glove)

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Groups (G)	1	0.237	0.237	<1.00	
Ss/G	8	10.506	1.313	—	
Days (D)	13	47.105	3.623	59.393	.001
DxG	13	0.606	0.046	<1.00	
SsxD/G	104	6.366	0.061	—	
Handwear (H)	5	19.056	3.809	48.215	.001
HxG	5	0.127	0.025	<1.00	
SsxH/G	40	3.160	0.079	—	
HxD	65	5.418	0.083	5.187	.001
HxDxG	65	1.376	0.021	1.312	
SsxHxD/G	520	8.831	0.016	—	

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance of O'Connor Finger  
Dexterity Test Performance Data  
(Dry Glove)

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Groups	1	0.030	0.030	<1.00	
Ss/G	8	21.630	2.70	—	
Days	13	171.896	13.222	55.08	.001
DxG	13	1.963	0.151	<1.00	
SsxD/G	104	25.300	0.24	—	
Handwear (H)	5	93.941	18.788	60.61	.001
HxG	5	0.324	0.065	<1.00	
SsxH/G	40	12.540	0.31	—	
HxD	65	20.284	0.312	3.59	.001
HxDxG	65	3.839	0.059	<1.00	
SsxHxD/G	520	45.050	0.087	—	

TABLE 4

Analysis of Variance of Cord and Cylinder  
Test Performance Data  
(Dry Glove)

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Groups (G)	1	2.847	2.847	<1.00	
Ss/G	8	47.540	5.94	—	
Days (D)	13	306.750	23.596	71.52	.001
DxG	13	3.347	0.257	<1.00	
SsxD/G	104	34.210	0.33	—	
Handwear (H)	5	201.575	40.315	76.08	.001
HxG	5	1.737	0.347	<1.00	
SsxH/G	40	21.110	0.53	—	
HxD	65	64.370	0.990	6.35	.001
HxDxG	65	7.593	0.117	<1.00	
SsxHxD/G	520	80.870	0.156	—	

**TABLE 5**  
**Analysis of Variance of Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity**  
**Test Performance Data**  
**(Dry Glove)**

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Groups (G)	1	12.625	12.625	<1.00	
Ss/G	8	259.310	32.41	—	
Days (D)	13	616.892	47.453	34.14	.001
DxG	13	4.763	0.366	<1.00	
SsxD/G	104	144.210	1.39	—	
Handwear (H)	5	61.788	12.358	29.89	.001
HxG	5	3.162	0.632	1.17	
SsxH/G	40	21.69	0.54	—	
HxD	65	16.152	0.248	1.19	
HxDxG	65	11.716	0.180	<1.00	
SsxHxD/G	520	108.16	0.21	—	

TABLE 6

Mean Score for Each Task Under  
Each Handwear Condition  
(Dry Glove)

Task	Handwear					
	C	E	F	A	B	D
Torque Test	68.00	64.80	64.80	54.60	48.40	40.60
Two-Hand Turning Test	A 0.67	B 0.88	C 0.92	E 0.99	D 1.02	F 1.16
O'Connor Fine Finger Dexterity Test	A 1.40	B 2.07	C 2.13	E 2.25	D 2.30	F 2.44
Cord and Cylinder Test	A 1.02	B 1.93	C 2.02	E 2.13	D 2.34	F 2.58
Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test	A 2.94	B 3.25	C 3.46	D 3.51	E 3.57	F 3.80

NOTE: A = Bare Hands, B = Leather Glove, C = Impermeable Glove, D = Leather Glove w/Wool Inserts, E = Impermeable Glove w/Wool Inserts, F = Impermeable Glove w/Built-In Insulation. Handwear conditions not connected by same line are significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ).

TABLE 7

Analysis of Variance of Temperature Data  
(Dry Glove)

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Groups (G)	1	4218.000	4218.000	<1.00	
Ss/G	8	164254.680	20531.84	—	
Days (D)	13	11499.812	884.601	1.81	
DxG	13	3585.906	275.839	<1.00	
SsxD/G	104	50790.120	488.37	—	
Handwear (H)	5	4567.625	913.525	3.70	.01
HxG	5	294.594	58.919	<1.00	
SsxH/G	40	9872.500	246.81	—	
HxD	65	19419.219	298.757	1.17	
HxDxG	65	23434.656	360.533	1.41	.05
SsxHxD/G	520	133034.380	255.84	—	
Tasks (T)	4	7192.781	1798.195	29.16	.001
TxG	4	139.437	34.859	<1.00	
SsxT/G	32	1973.310	61.66	—	
TxD	52	820.531	15.779	<1.00	
TxGxD	52	772.062	14.847	<1.00	
SsxTxD/G	416	7293.880	17.53	—	
TxH	20	960.406	48.020	3.36	.001
TxGxH	20	189.817	9.459	<1.00	
SsxTxH/G	160	2284.090	14.28	—	
TxDxH	260	2789.031	10.727	1.06	
TxGxDxH	260	3256.656	12.526	1.24	.05
SsxTxDxH/G	2080	21053.840	10.12	—	



**TABLE 8****Mean Digital Temperature for Each Handwear  
Condition and Each Task  
(Dry Glove)**

<b>Handwear</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Bare Hands	64.2°F
Leather Glove	62.8
Impermeable Glove	64.3
Leather Glove w/Wool Inserts	62.8
Impermeable Glove w/Wool Inserts	65.2
Impermeable Glove w/Built-In Insulation	65.4
<b>Task</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Torque Test	65.8°F
Two-Hand Turning Test	65.4
O'Connor Finger Dexterity Test	64.0
Cord and Cylinder Test	62.7
Bennett Hand Tool Test	62.6

TABLE 9

Questionnaire Results:  
 Mean Rankings of Handwear Conditions  
 (Dry Glove)

Question No.	Handwear Condition						
	Bare Hands	Leather Glove	Impermeable Glove	Leather Glove w/Inserts	Impermeable Glove w/Inserts	Impermeable Glove w/Insulation	
1	6	4	4	3	1	1	
2	4	6	1	5	2	3	
3	1	4	2	3	5	6	
4	1	3	2	4	4	6	
5	1	4	2	5	3	6	
6	1	3	2	5	4	6	
7	6	5	4	2	1	3	

NOTE: The smaller numbers indicate a higher ranking. When handwear conditions were tied, both were assigned the higher ranking and the next ranking was not assigned.

TABLE 10

Analysis of Variance of Torque Test  
Performance Data  
(Wet Glove)

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Ss	6	16605.75	2767.625	—	
Days (D)	3	933.500	311.167	4.481	.025
SsxD	18	1249.500	69.417	—	
Handwear (H)	5	14526.00	2905.200	21.921	.001
SsxH	30	3975.750	132.525	—	
DxH	15	1878.500	125.233	2.236	.025
SsxDxH	90	5038.500	55.983	—	

TABLE 11

Analysis of Variance of Two-Hand Turning  
Test Performance Data  
(Wet Glove)

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Ss	6	2.386	0.398	—	
Days (D)	3	0.399	0.133	12.090	.001
SsxD	18	0.201	0.011	—	
Handwear (H)	5	1.614	0.323	19.000	.001
SsxH	30	0.521	0.017	—	
DxH	15	0.138	0.009	1.500	
SsxDxH	90	0.552	0.006	—	

TABLE 12

Analysis of Variance of O'Connor Finger  
Dexterity Test Performance Data  
(Wet Glove)

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Ss	6	4.338	0.723	—	
Days (D)	3	0.721	0.240	3.470	.05
Ssx D	18	1.249	0.069	—	
Handwear (H)	5	10.359	2.072	20.313	.001
Ssx H	30	3.070	0.102	—	
Dx H	15	1.034	0.069	1.604	
Ssx Dx H	90	3.852	0.043	—	

TABLE 13

Analysis of Variance of Cord and Cylinder  
 Test Performance Data  
 (Wet Glove)

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Ss	6	3.056	0.509	—	
Days (D)	3	1.117	0.372	5.095	.01
SsxD	18	1.316	0.073	—	
Handwear (H)	5	0.168	3.366	42.075	.001
SsxH	30	2.412	0.080	—	
DxH	15	0.948	0.063	1.465	
SsDxH	90	3.885	0.043	—	

TABLE 14

Analysis of Variance of Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity  
 Test Performance Data  
 (Wet Glove)

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Ss	6	42.043	7.007	—	
Days (D)	3	5.139	1.713	7.546	.005
SsxD	18	4.097	0.227	—	
Handwear (H)	5	8.188	1.638	13.650	.001
SsxH	30	3.597	0.120	—	
DxH	15	2.218	0.148	1.947	.05
SsxDxH	90	6.848	0.076	—	

TABLE 15

Mean Test Score for Each Task  
on Each Day  
(Wet Glove)

Task	Day			
	1	4	3	2
Torque Test	60.00	58.40	58.40	53.70
Two-Hand Turning Test	0.72	0.73	0.82	0.83
O'Connor Fine Finger Dexterity Test	1.69	1.74	1.83	1.86
Cord and Cylinder Test	1.50	1.54	1.64	1.71
Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test	2.57	2.68	2.89	3.02

NOTE: Mean scores on days not connected by same line are significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ).



TABLE 16

Mean Score for Each Task Under  
Each Handwear Condition  
(Wet Glove)

Task	Handwear					
	C	E	F	A	B	D
Torque Test	68.00	66.70	64.50	54.50	46.50	45.40
Two-Hand Turning Test	A 0.58	B 0.75	C 0.76	E 0.81	D 0.87	F 0.88
O'Connor Fine Finger Dexterity Test	A 1.2B	B 1.73	C 1.77	E 1.89	D 1.98	F 2.03
Cord and Cylinder Test	A 0.98	B 1.48	C 1.62	E 1.71	D 1.81	F 1.98
Bennet Hand Tool Dexterity Test	A 2.40	B 2.64	C 2.84	D 2.87	E 2.89	F 3.11

NOTE: A= Bare Hands, B= Leather Glove, C= Impermeable Glove, D= Leather Glove w/Wool Inserts, E= Impermeable Glove w/Wool Inserts, F= Impermeable Glove w/Built-In Insulation. Mean scores not connected by same line are significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ).

TABLE 17

Mean Scores on Two Tasks for Each Handwear  
and Day Combination  
(Wet Glove)

Handwear and Day Combinations																													
Torque Test																													
C1	C4	E4	F4	F1	E1	F3	C3	E3	C2	E2	A1	A3	A4	F2	D3	B1	A2	B4	B2	D2	D1	B3	D4						
71.14	70.14	69.85	69.57	68.57	67.86	67.43	66.71	65.28	64.00	63.86	58.14	57.14	53.00	52.43	52.00	50.28	49.86	47.42	46.43	45.57	43.86	42.00	40.28						

Bennett Hand Tool Test

A1	B1	A4	A3	B4	C1	D1	A2	F1	D4	F4	C3	C4	E4	B2	B3	E3	E2	E1	D3	D2	C2	F3	F2						
2.19	2.34	2.35	2.39	2.48	2.62	2.62	2.68	2.74	2.78	2.80	2.82	2.83	2.84	2.85	2.88	2.90	2.90	2.90	3.01	3.06	3.06	3.32	3.57						

The letters refer to handwear conditions and the numbers refer to days. A= Bare Hands; B= Leather Glove; C= Impermeable Glove; D= Leather Glove w/Wool Inserts; E= Impermeable Glove w/Wool Inserts; F= Impermeable Glove w/Built-In Insulation. Day 1 and Day 4 refer to the pre- and post-immersion days, respectively. Day 2 and Day 3 refer to the first and second immersion days. Those means connected by a single line are not significantly different (p=0.05).

**TABLE 18**  
**Analysis of Variance of Digital**  
**Temperature Data**  
**(Wet Glove)**

SV	df	SS	MS	F-ratio	P
Ss	6	28609.191	4768.199	—	
Tasks (T)	4	1323.031	330.758	12.340	.001
SsxT	24	643.285	26.803	—	
Days (D)	3	17721.156	5907.052	10.772	.001
SsxD	18	9870.418	548.356	—	
DxT	12	95.254	7.938	<1.000	
SsxDxT	72	615.297	8.546	—	
Handwear (H)	5	9769.805	1953.961	5.978	.001
SsxH	30	9805.753	326.858	—	
HxT	20	433.426	21.671	2.720	.01
SsxTxH	120	956.059	7.967	—	
HxD	15	11782.352	785.490	3.408	.001
SsxHxD	90	20742.523	230.472	—	
HxTxD	60	478.348	7.972	1.097	
SsxHxTxD	360	2614.902	7.264	—	

TABLE 19

Questionnaire Results:  
Mean Rankings of Handwear Conditions  
(Wet Glove)


Question No.	Handwear Condition					
	Bare Hands	Leather Glove	Impermeable Glove	Leather Glove w/Inserts	Impermeable Glove w/Inserts	Impermeable Glove w/Insulation
1	4	6	3	4	2	1
2	4	5	1	6	2	3
3	1	4	2	5	3	6
4	1	4	2	5	3	6
5	1	4	2	5	3	6
6	1	4	2	6	3	5
7	6	4	3	5	1	2

NOTE: The smaller numbers indicate a higher ranking. When handwear conditions were tied, both were assigned the higher ranking and the next ranking was not assigned.

**APPENDIX A**  
**Photographs of Handwear Conditions**



A1. Standard Leather Glove



A2. Impermeable Glove



A3. Leather Glove with Wool Inserts





A4. Impermeable Glove with Wool Inserts



A5. Impermeable Glove with Built-In Insulation

Appendix B

GLOVE STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

The following handwear conditions were used in this experiment:

A	B	C	D	E	F
Bare hands	Leather shells	Impermeable shells	Leather shells w wool inserts	Impermeable shells w wool inserts	Impermeable shells w built insulation

Which handwear condition was warmest? Print its letter under "1", Warmest.  
 Which was next warmest? Place its letter under 2. Next warmest.  
 Which was coldest? Place its letter under 5. Next coldest.  
 Of the two remaining handwear conditions, place the letter of the warmer under 3 and that of the colder under 4.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Warmest	Next warmest			Next coldest	Coldest

Which handwear condition gave the best grip? Place its letter under 1.  
 Which gave the next best grip? Place its letter under 2.  
 Which gave the poorest grip? Place its letter under 6 and the letter for the next poorest grip under 5. Of the two remaining conditions, place the one with the better grip under 3 and the one with the poorer grip under 4.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Best grip	Next best			Next poorest	Poorest grip

FILL IN THE FOLLOWING SPACES AS YOU DID THOSE ABOVE.

Which handwear condition was the best for turning over the blocks?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Best	Next best			Next poorest	Poorest

Which handwear condition was best for placing the small pins in the holes?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Best	Next best			Next poorest	Poorest

Which handwear condition was best for stringing the cylinders?

1	2	3	4	5	6

Which handwear condition was best for working with hand tools?

1	2	3	4	5	6

Which do you think would be best for general army use under cold-wet conditions?

1	2	3	4	5	6

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCCG Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1	<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCRD (Comm.-Elec. Ofc.) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1
<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCDL (Mr. N. Klein) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1	<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCRD (Weapons Ofc.) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1
<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCRD-T (Dr. El-Bisi) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1	<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCRD-F (Air Mobility Ofc.) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1
<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCRD-G (Mr. C. Gardner) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	4	<p>Office of Chief of Staff Department of the Army ATTN: CSAVCS-W-TIS Washington, D.C. 20314</p>	1
<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCRD-TE (Mr. Crellin) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1	<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command Dir. of Materiel Requirements ATTN: AMCMR-TA (Army Personnel Support Branch) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1
<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCRD-RL (Research Div.) R&amp;D Directorate, Bldg. T-7 Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1	<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command Dir. of Materiel Requirements ATTN: AMCMR-BF (Fixed Wing Br.) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1
<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCRD (Air Defense &amp; Missile Ofc.) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1	<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command Dir. of Materiel Requirements ATTN: AMCMR-BR (Rotary Wing Br.) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1
<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCRD (Dr. Kaufman) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1	<p>Commanding General US Army Materiel Command Dir. of Materiel Requirements ATTN: AMCMR-T (Troop Support Div.) Washington, D.C. 20315</p>	1

DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)

Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCSA-ND Washington, D.C. 20315	1	Directorate for Subs. Mgmt. Policy Office of Ass't. Sec. of Def. (I&L) ATTN: LTC J. L. Welbourn Room 2B 323, The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301	2
US Army Materiel Command Chief, Administrative Office ATTN: AMCAD-S (Safety Div.) Washington, D.C. 20315	1	Defense Director Technical Information Office of Director of Defense, Research and Engineering Room 3D 1040, The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301	1
Commanding General US Army Materiel Command Operational Readiness Office ATTN: AMCOR-TM (Materiel Spt. Br.) Washington, D.C. 20315	1	COL William S. Augerson MC USA Military Assistant for Medical and Life Sciences OAD/F&LS Room 3B 129, The Pentagon DDRE, Washington, D.C. 20301	1
Commanding General US Army Materiel Command ATTN: AMCPM-MO Washington, D.C. 20315	1	Assistant Secretary of Defense (I&L) ATTN: Mr. M. Marshall Room 3D 767, The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301	1
Commanding General US Army Materiel Command Operational Readiness Office ATTN: AMCOR-TS (Special Field Activities Branch) Washington, D.C. 20315	1	Commandant Hq., US Marine Corps Code COE-2 (MAJ E.B. Cox) Washington, D.C. 203B0	1
The Army Library ATTN: Procurement Section Room 1A522 The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301	1	Commandant Hq., US Marine Corps Code COE-2 (Miss Joan C. Niland) Washington, D.C. 203B0	1
Chief, Biomedical Sciences Div. Office of Assistant Director Chemical Technology Room 30-129, The Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20301	1	Commandant Hq., US Marine Corps Code AX4E5 (LTC T.P. Gray) Washington, D.C. 20380	1

DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)

Quartermaster General Hq., US Marine Corps ATTN: COB-2 (LT F. Towers) Washington, D.C. 20380	1	Director Naval Research Lab Code 6140 Washington, D.C. 20390	1
Commandant Hq., US Marine Corps Code A03H ATTN: Close Combat Office Washington, D.C. 20380	1	Commanding Officer Navy Subsistence Office Washington Navy Yard - Bldg. 166 Washington, D.C. 20390	1
Commandant Hq., US Marine Corps Code A04D Washington, D.C. 20380	1	Department of the Navy Special Projects Office Washington, D.C. 20360	1
Commandant Hq., US Marine Corps Code AX ATTN: COL J.P. McNeil Washington, D.C. 20380	1	Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics Department of the Army Washington, D.C. 20310	1
Director Naval Research Lab Code 5143A Washington, D.C.	1	Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics HODA (DALO-TSS) ATTN: Mr. J. Carrol Washington, D.C. 20310	1
Office of Naval Research Code 455 Washington, D.C.	1	Commander Science and Technology Division Hq., US Air Force (AF/RDPS) Washington, D.C. 20330	1
Office of Naval Research Code 458 ATTN: Pers. and Tng. (Dr. Farr) Washington, D.C.	1	Commander Hq., US Air Force ATTN: Mr. John Earl (AFPRED) Bldg. 626, Room 269 Bolling AFB Washington, D.C. 20330	1
Mr. W. Ferguson Naval Research Lab. Technical Information Div. (for Code 6214) Washington, D.C. 20370	1		

**DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)**

Headquarters US Air Force ATTN: AFRDDG Washington, D.C. 20330	1	US Dept. of Commerce National Bureau of Standards ATTN: Dr. A. Rubin Washington, D. C. 20230	1
Chief, Status & Support Branch Maintenance Readiness Div. US Army Supply & Maint. Command Washington, D.C. 20315	1	The Surgeon General Department of the Army ATTN: MEDDH-M Medical R&D Command 19th & Constitution Av. Washington, D.C. 20315	1
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel Department of the Army Personnel Research Div. Washington, D.C. 20314	1	Harry Diamond Laboratories Conn. Ave. & Van Ness St. Washington, D.C.	1
Army Audiology & Speech Center Forest Glen Section Walter Reed General Hospital Washington, D.C. 20012	1	US General Accounting Office ATTN: Robert G. Rockwell Defense Division, Room 6470 4416 Street, Northwest Washington, D.C. 20548	1
Commanding General US Army Medical R&D Command Behavioral Sciences Res. Br. Main Navy Building Washington, D.C. 20360	1	Director of Research Labs. US Army Personnel Research Office ATTN: Tech. Library 2nd and T St., SW Washington, D.C. 20315	1
Chief of R&D Department of the Army ATTN: Behavioral Sciences Div. Washington, D.C. 20314	1	Director US Army Advanced Materiel Concepts Agency Washington, D.C. 20315	1
Federal Aviation Administration 800 Independence Avenue, SW ATTN: Admin Stds. Div. (MS-110) Washington, D.C. 20590	1	Commander Naval Facilities Engineering Command Y-D Annex ATTN: Mr. Jesse Rocha Room 2-C-370 Washington, D.C. 20390	1
Director Walter Reed Army Institute of Res. ATTN: Neuropsychiatry Div. Washington, D.C. 20012	1		

DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)

HQDA (DAEN-2A/Mr. William Holmes) Forrestal Bldg. Washington, D.C. 20315	1	6570 AMRL (MRHER/Bates) Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio 45433	1
Psychological Abstracts 1200 17th Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20038	1	6570 AMRL (MRHE/Warrick) Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio 45433	1
Commanding Officer Aeronautical Systems Div. ATTN: ENCCE Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio 45433	1	AFFDL-FDCR (CDIC) Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio 45433	1
Commanding Officer Aeronautical Systems Div. Wright-Patterson AFB ATTN: ASWL Ohio 45433	1	Commanding General US Army Mobility Command ATTN: AMSMO-RR Warren, MI 48089	1
Director Bare Base Equipment SPO ATTN: ASD/SMB Wright Patterson, AFB Ohio 45433	1	Commanding General US Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-R Warren, Michigan 480B9	1
Hq., Air Force Logistics Command AFLC/DP5B Wright-Patterson, AFB Ohio 45433	1	Commanding General US Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-RHFL Warren, Michigan 4B089	2
US Army NLABS Liaison Office ASDL-8 (Mr. Hogan) Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio 45433	1	Commanding General US Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-RKAE Warren, Michigan 480B9	1
6570 AMRL (MRHE) Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio 45433	2	Commanding General US Army Weapons Command ATTN: AMSWE-RDR Rock Island, Il. 61201	1
		Commanding General US Army Weapons Command ATTN: AMSWE-RDT Rock Island, Ill. 61200	1



DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)

Commanding General US Army Weapons Command ATTN: AMSWE-SMM-P Rock Island, Ill. 61200	1	Commanding General US Army Aviation Command ATTN: AMCPM-LOH (Light Observation Helicopter) 12th & Spruce St. St. Louis, Mo. 63102	1
Commanding General US Army Weapons Command ATTN: SWERI-RDD-PD Rock Island, Ill. 61200	2	Commanding Officer US Army Aviation Command ATTN: AMSAV-D-L (Aircraft Systems Life Support/Air Del Equip. Mgmt.) 12th & Spruce St. St. Louis, Mo. 63102	1
Commanding General US Army Aviation Command ATTN: AMSAV-EGGA 12th & Spruce St. St. Louis, Mo. 63102	1	Commanding General USASCOM P.O. Box 209 ATTN: AMSAV-R-F (Mr. Moreland) St. Louis, Mo. 63102	1
Commanding General US Army Aviation Command ATTN: ACMPM (Heavy Lift Helicopter System) 12th & Spruce St. St. Louis, Mo. 63102	1	Director of Graduate Studies & Res. US Army Command & General Staff Coll. ATTN: Behavioral Sciences Rep. Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027	1
Commanding General US Army Aviation Command ATTN: AMC-PM 12th & Spruce St. St. Louis, Mo. 63102	1	Commanding General US Army Combat Development Command ATTN: Combat Systems Grp. Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027	1
Commanding General US Army Aviation Command ATTN: AMCPM-HA (Utility Tactical Tspt Aircraft Systems) 12th & Spruce St. St. Louis, Mo. 63102	1	US Army Command & Gen. Staff College Library Div. Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027	1
Commanding Officer US Army Aviation Material Command ATTN: Tech. Library P.O. Box 209 St. Louis, Mo. 63166	2	Commanding Officer US Army Combat Dev. Command Artillery Agency Fort Sill, Oklahoma 73504	1
		President Hq. US Army Artillery Bd. Fort Sill, Oklahoma 73504	1

**DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)**

<p>Civil Aeromedical Institute                      Fed. Avn. Agency                      P.O. Box 250B2                      ATTN: Psychology Br. (AC-118)                      Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73125 1</p>	<p>Commanding General                      US Army Combat Dev. Command                      ATTN: CDCRE                      Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060 1</p>
<p>Commandant                      US Army Artillery &amp; Missile School                      ATTN: USAAMS Tech. Library                      Fort Sill, Oklahoma 73504 1</p>	<p>Commanding General                      US Army Combat Dev. Command                      ATTN: CDCCS-DS-Q                      Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060 1</p>
<p>Commanding Officer                      Engr. Topographic Labs                      ATTN: Mr. Sidney Presser                      Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060 1</p>	<p>Commanding Officer                      US Army Combat Dev. Command                      Engineer Agency                      Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060 1</p>
<p>Commanding General                      USA Combat Dev. Command                      ATTN: CDCMR-O                      Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060 1</p>	<p>Director, Development Center                      Marine Corps Development &amp; Ed. Cmd.                      ATTN: Chief, Combat Service                      Suppt. Div.                      Quantico, Va. 22134 1</p>
<p>Commanding Officer                      US Army Mobility Equip. R&amp;D Center                      ATTN: Human Factors Engr.                      Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060 1</p>	<p>Director, Development Center                      Marine Corps Development &amp; Ed. Cmd.                      ATTN: LTC H.L. Barrett, S&amp;R Div.                      Quantico, Va. 22134 1</p>
<p>Commanding Officer                      US Army Mobility Equipment R&amp;D Center                      ATTN: Tech. Documents Center                      Bldg. 315                      Fort Belvoir, Va. 22060 1</p>	<p>Director, Development Center                      Marine Corps Development &amp; Ed. Cmd.                      ATTN: Chief, Ground Combat Div.                      Quantico, Va. 22134 1</p>
<p>Commanding General                      US Army Combat Dev. Command                      ATTN: CDCCD-C                      Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060 1</p>	<p>Commander                      Defense                      General Supply Center                      CODE: DGSC/TSA (David H. Freedman)                      Defense Supply Agency                      Richmond, Va. 23219 1</p>
<p>Commanding General                      US Army Combat Dev. Command                      ATTN: CDCMR                      Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060 1</p>	<p>Commanding Officer                      US Army Combat Dev. Command                      ATTN: CDCQMA-F                      Fort Lee, Virginia 23801 1</p>

**DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)**

Commanding Officer US Army Combat Dev. Command Combat Service Support Group Fort Lee, Va. 23801	1	Director US Army Research Office ATTN: Human Factors & Operations Research Div. 3045 Columbia Pike Arlington, Va. 22202	1
Commandant US Army Quartermaster School ATTN: Quartermaster Library Fort Lee, Va. 23801	2	Director Army Tech Information US Army Research Office OCD Room 209A Arlington, Va. 22200	1
Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange Fort Lee, Va. 23801	2	US Army Behavior & Systems Res. Lab. Arlington, Virginia	1
Commandant U.S.A. Logistics Management Center Fort Lee, Va. 23801	1	Commander US Army Inst. for Behav. & Soc. Sciences 1300 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, Virginia 22209	4
Commanding Officer US Army Combat Dev. Command Supply Agency Fort Lee, Virginia 23801	1	The George Washington University Human Resources Research Office Remote Area Training Div. 300 North Washington St. Alexandria, Va. 22314	1
Commanding General US Continental Army Command ATTN: DSCLOG, Maintenance Div. Fort Monroe, Va. 23351	1	Administrator Defense Documentation Center ATTN: DDC-TCA Cameron Station, BG5 Alexandria, Va. 22314	12
Commanding General US Continental Army Command ATTN: ATIT-RD-RD Fort Monroe, Virginia 23351	1		

**DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)**

Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Va. 23314	20	Commanding Officer US Army Research Office, Durham ATTN: CRD-AA-IP Box CM, Duke Station Durham, NC 27706	1
Technical Library USACDC Institute of Land Combat 301 Taylor Drive Alexandria, Va. 22314	1	Library School of Textiles North Carolina State Univ. P. O. Box 5006 Raleigh, NC 27607	1
US Department of Commerce NTIS Springfield, Virginia	2	Commanding Officer US Army Combat Dev. Command Military Police Agency Fort Gordon, Georgia 30905	1
Commanding Officer Naval Medical Field Research Lab. ATTN: Personnel Protection Div. Camp Lejeune, NC 28542	1	Commanding Officer US Army Combat Dev. Command Infantry Agency ATTN: Central Files Fort Benning, Georgia 31905	1
Commanding Officer Naval Medical Field Research Lab. Camp Lejeune, NC 28542	1	Commandant US Army Infantry School ATTN: AJIIS-A Fort Benning, Ga. 31905	1
Marine Corps Liaison Office Naval Medical Field Research Lab. Camp Lejeune, NC 28542	1	President US Army Infantry Board Ft. Benning, Ga. 31905	1
Library US Army Airborne, Electronics & Special Welfare Bd. Fort Bragg, NC 28307	1	Commanding Officer Naval Training Center ATTN: Tech. Library Orlando, Florida 32183	1
Commanding Officer US Army Combat Dev. Command Inst. of Strategic & Stability Operations Fort Bragg, NC 28307	1	Commanding Officer US Army Medical Res. Lab. Fort Knox, Kentucky 40121	1
US Army Special Warfare School ATTN: Assistant Secretary Director of Instruction Fort Bragg, NC 28307	1		

DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)

Commanding Officer US Army Combat Dev. Command Armor Agency Fort Knox, Kentucky 40121	1	Director of Research USA Avn HRU P.O. Box 428 ATTN: Librarian Fort Rucker, Alabama 36362	1
President US Army Maintenance 8d. ATTN: Adjutant Fort Knox, Kentucky 40121	1	Commanding General US Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-R8LD Redstone Arsenal Alabama 35808	1
Commandant US Army Armor School ATTN: Chief, Pol & Tng Lit Div. Fort Knox, Ky. 40121	1	Commanding General US Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-RLH (Chaikin) Redstone Arsenal Alabama 35808	1
US Army Armor HRU ATTN: Library Fort Knox, Kentucky 40121	1	Commanding General US Army Missile Command ATTN: AMSMI-PC Redstone Aresenal, Al 35808	1
Commanding Officer US Army Aeromedical Research Unit ATTN: Tech. Library Fort Rucker, AL 36362	1	Redstone Scientific Information Center US Army Missile Command ATTN: Ch, Documents Section Redstone Arsenal, Al. 35808	2
Commanding Officer US Army Combat Dev. Command Aviation Agency Fort Rucker, Alabama 36362	1	Director Air University Library ATTN: AUL3T-7575 Maxwell Air Force Base Alabama 36112	1
US Army Aviation School Library 8ldg. 5313 Fort Rucker, Al. 36362	2	Commanding Officer US Army Combat Dev. Command C8R Agency Fort McClellan, Alabama 36201	1
President US Army Aviation Test 8d. Fort Rucker, Al 36362	1	USA 8d. for Avn. Acadt. Rsch. Lab. ATTN: Gail Bankston (Bldg. 5504) Fort Rucker, Alabama 36360	1
Commanding Officer US Army Bureau of Aviation Accident Research ATTN: Tech. Library Fort Rucker, Al 36362	2		

**DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)**

Hq., 4442d Combt Crew Tng Wing (TAC) Little Rock AFB Jacksonville, Arkansas 72076	1	Commanding General ATTN: STEWS-TE-Q (Mr. Courtney) White Sands Missile Range New Mexico 88002	1
AMD (AMRH) Brooks AFB Texas 78235	1	Commanding General US Army Elec. Proving Ground ATTN: Mr. Abraham (Test Director) Fort Huachuca, Arizona 85613	1
Aerospace Medical Div. ATTN: Tech. Library Brooks AFB Texas 78235	2	Commanding Officer Ft. Huachuca Spt Comd, USA ATTN: Tech. Ref. Div. Fort Huachuca, Arizona 85613	1
Commander US Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine ATTN: USAFSAM (SME) Brooks AFB, San Antonio Texas 78235	1	Commanding Officer Yuma Proving Ground ATTN: Tech Library Yuma, Arizona 85364	1
Headquarters AMD-RD Brooks Air Force Base San Antonio, Texas 78235	1	US Army Combat Dev. Command Experimentation Command ATTN: Tech Library (Box 22) Fort Ord, California 93941	1
Commanding Officer Hq., Medical Field Service Library Brooke Army Medical Center Fort Sam Houston, Texas 78234	1	Dept. of Operations Analysis Naval Postgraduate School ATTN: Prof. J.K. Arima Monterey, California 93940	1
Commanding Officer US Army Combat Dev. Command Medical Service Agency Fort Sam Houston, Texas 78234	1	Human Factors Division G-2/3 USACDCEC Fort Ord, California 93941	1
Director of Research HumRRO Div. No. 5 (Air Defense) P.O. Box 6021 Fort Bliss, Texas 79916	1	ACOFs, G3 Hq. US Army Combat Dev. Command Experimentation Center Fort Ord, Ca. 93941	2
Commanding General ATTN: Tech. Library White Sands Missile Range New Mexico 88002	1	Commander US Naval Ordnance Test Station ATTN: Code 12 China Lake, Ca. 93557	1

**DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)**

Commanding General Hq., USARPAC ATTN: COL Hawthorne APO, San Francisco 96558	1	Headquarters ESD (ESTI) L.G. Hanscom Field Bedford, Mass. 01730	1
US Navy Elec Lab ATTN: Ch., Human Factors Div. Code 3400 (W.B. Welch) San Diego, California 92152	1	Director US Army Mechanics & Materiel Research Center ATTN: Ch, Dev. & Eng. Lab AMXMR-E Watertown, Mass. 02172	1
Commanding Officer US Army Arctic Test Center APO Seattle, Wa. 98733	2	Commanding Officer US Army Mechanics & Materiel Research Center ATTN: Tech. Library Watertown, Mass. 02172	1
Hqs., US Army Alaska ATTN: ARACD Fort Richardson, Ak APO Seattle 98749	2	Director US Army Mechanics & Materiel Research Center ATTN: Project Manager - Armor AMXMR-A Watertown, Mass. 02172	1
Commanding Officer Cold Weather & Mountain Indoctrination School Fort Greeley, AK APO Seattle 98749	2	US Naval Submarine Medical Center ATTN: Library Box 600 US Navy Submarine Base Groton, Conn. 06340	1
Commanding Officer US Army Tropic Test Center P.O. Drwr 942 ATTN: Behavioral Scientist Fort Clayton, Canal Zone	2	Commanding Officer ATTN: SWEWV-RDT Watervliet Arsenal, NY 12189	1
Commanding Officer USAF Tropical Survival School Albrook Air Force Base Canal Zone	1	Commanding Officer US Army Medical Equipment R&D Lab Fort Totten Flushing, New York	1
Senior Standardization Representative US Army Standardization Group, Canada Attn: US Army Standardization Representative c/o Directorate of Interservice Development 138 Queen Street Ottawa, Ontario, Canada	2		

## DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)

<p>Commanding General Hq., US Army Europe and Seventh Army ATTN: COL J.L. Thayer Chief, Services Division, DCSLOG APO, New York 09403 1</p>	<p>Commanding General US Army Electronics R&amp;D Labs ATTN: Tech. Information Div. Fort Monmouth, N.J. 07703 1</p>
<p>Director Military Psychology &amp; Leadership US Military Academy West Point, New York 10996 1</p>	<p>Chief, Supply Div. Logistics Services Hq., Fort Monmouth Vail Hall, Bldg. 1150 Fort Monmouth, N.J. 07703 2</p>
<p>US Army Standarization Grp. UK ATTN: Research/Gen Materiel Rep Box 65 FPO, New York 1</p>	<p>Commanding Officer Picatinny Arsenal ATTN: SMUPA-VC1 (Mr. Carlock) Dover, N.J. 07801 1</p>
<p>RADC (EMEDI) Griffiss Air Force Base New York 13440 1</p>	<p>Commanding Officer Frankford Arsenal ATTN: SMUFA-N/6400/202-4 (HF) Philadelphia, Pa. 19124 1</p>
<p>Commanding General US Army Electronics R&amp;D Labs. ATTN: Tech. Library Fort Monmouth, N.J. 07703 1</p>	<p>Commanding Officer Frankford Arsenal ATTN: Library (C2500, B1 51-2) Philadelphia, Pa. 19124 1</p>
<p>Commanding Officer US Army Combat Dev. Command Comm-Elec Agency Fort Monmouth, N.J. 07703 1</p>	<p>Naval Air Development Center ATTN: ACLE-P2 (Mr. Bellavin) Johnsville Warminster, Pa. 18974 1</p>
<p>Commanding General US Army Electronics Command ATTN: AMSEL-RD-GDA Fort Monmouth, N.J. 07703 1</p>	<p>Director Aerospace Crew Equipment Dept. Naval Air Engr. Center Warminster, Pa. 18974 1</p>
<p>Commanding General US Army Electronics Command ATTN: AMSEL-VL-I Fort Monmouth, N.J. 07703 1</p>	<p>Defense Personnel Support Center ATTN: Mr. Armand Paci US Army NLABS Representative 2800 South 20th Street Philadelphia, Pa. 19101 1</p>



DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)

<p>Chief, Programs &amp; Policy Office                      Directorate of Technical Operations                      Defense Personnel Support Center                      2800 South 20th Street                      Philadelphia, Pa. 19101</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Commanding General                      US Army Edgewood Arsenal                      ATTN: Directorate of Commodity                      Management                      Edgewood Arsenal, Md. 21010</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Commander                      US Air Force Services Office                      ATTN: DPKFF (Mr. J. Dehart)                      2800 South 20th Street                      Philadelphia, Pa. 19101</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Director                      US Army Human Engineering Labs                      ATTN: Tech. Library                      Aberdeen Proving Ground                      Maryland 21005</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Director                      US Army War College                      ATTN: Library                      Carlisle Barracks, Pa. 17103</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Commanding General                      US Army Test &amp; Evaluation Command                      ATTN: AMSTE-TAA                      Aberdeen Proving Ground                      Maryland 21005</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Hq., Tobyhanna Army Depot                      ATTN: AMXTO-PR                      Tobyhanna, Pa. 18466</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Commanding Officer                      US Army Coating &amp; Chem. Labs                      Aberdeen Proving Ground                      Maryland 21005</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Marine Corps Supply Agency                      (Code 826)                      1100 South Broad Street                      Philadelphia, Pa. 19146</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>US Army Ballistic Research Lab                      ATTN: AMXBR-TC (Mr. B.F. Armendt)                      Aberdeen Proving Ground                      Maryland 21005</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Director                      US Army Limited Warfare Labs                      ATTN: Tech. Library                      Aberdeen Proving Ground                      Maryland 21005</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Director                      US Army Human Engineering Labs                      Aberdeen Proving Ground                      Maryland 21005</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Director                      Engineering &amp; Ind. Services                      ATTN: Directorate of Chemical Engr.                      Edgewood Arsenal, Md. 21010</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Commanding Officer                      Aberdeen Proving Ground                      ATTN: STFAP-DS-TU (Mr. W. Pless)                      Aberdeen Proving Ground                      Maryland 21005</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Commander                      US Army Chemical R&amp;D                      ATTN: Tech. Library                      Edgewood Arsenal, Md. 21010</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Commanding Officer                      Aberdeen Proving Ground                      ATTN: Tech. Library (Bldg. 305)                      Aberdeen Proving Ground                      Maryland 21005</p>	<p>1</p>

**DISTRIBUTION LIST (cont'd)**

Director  
Biomed. Lab  
ATTN: Psychology Section  
Edgewood Arsenal, Md. 21010 1

Director  
Biomed. Lab  
ATTN: Human Factors Group  
Edgewood Arsenal, Md. 21010 1

Commanding Officer  
US Army Environmental Hygiene Agency  
ATTN: Librarian (Bldg. 2400)  
Edgewood Arsenal, Md. 21010 2

Hq., Air Force Systems Command  
ATTN: DLH  
Andrews Air Force Base  
Maryland 20331 1

US Postal Service Lab  
ATTN: Mr. D.Y. Cornog  
11711 Parklawn Drive  
Rockville, Md. 20852 1

Commanding General  
Hq., First U.S. Army  
ATTN: AHABD-SQC  
Fort George G. Meade  
Maryland 20755 1

Commander  
US Army Biological Labs  
ATTN: Tech. Library  
Fort Detrick  
Frederick, Md. 21701 1

NASA Scientific & Tech. Info. Facility  
ATTN: Acquisitions Br. (S-AK/DL)  
P.O. Box 33  
College Park, Md. 20740 1

## INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

Commanding Officer	1
Scientific Director	1
Deputy Scientific Director for Engineering	1
Deputy Scientific Director for Research	1
Commanding Officer US Army Research Institute for Environmental Medicine	2
Commanding Officer, Airdrop Engineering Laboratory	1
Director, Clothing & Personnel Life Support Equipment Laboratory	3
Director, General Equipment & Packaging Laboratory	1
Director, Pioneering Research Laboratory	3
US Air Force Liaison Officer	3
Chief, Quality Assurance & Engineering Office	2
Technical Library	2
Operations Research & Systems Analysis Office	1
Technical Editor, Clothing & Personnel Life Support Equipment Laboratory	6
Officer-in-Charge Navy Clothing & Textile Rsch Unit, NLABS	2
Commanding Officer, Headquarters Company, ATTN: Library	1
Mathematician	1
Comptroller	1
Military Liaison Representatives	
US Army Representative	1
US Air Force Representative	1
US Navy Representative	1
US Marine Corps Representative	1

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

## DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R &amp; D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	
U.S. Army Natick Laboratories Natick, Massachusetts 01760		UNCLASSIFIED	
3. REPORT TITLE		2b. GROUP	
A Human Factors Evaluation of Cold-Wet Handwear			
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)			
5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name)			
John M. McGinnis, John M. Lockhart, Carolyn K. Bensel			
6. REPORT DATE		7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES	7b. NO. OF REFS
April 1972		64	3
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.		9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
b. PROJECT NO. LJ664713DL40		73-23-PR	
c. Task 02 P/N 1T062106A121		9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)	
d.			
10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT			
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY	
		Pioneering Research Laboratory U.S. Army Natick Laboratories Natick, Massachusetts 01760	
13. ABSTRACT Subjects performed a battery of manual performance tasks (Torque Test, Minnesota Two-Hand Turning Test, O'Connor Fine Finger Dexterity Test, Cord Manipulation and Cylinder Stringing Test, Bennett Hand Tool Dexterity Test) under six handwear conditions; bare-handed, standard leather glove, impermeable glove, leather glove with wool inserts, impermeable glove with wool inserts, and impermeable glove with built-in insulation. Each subject performed the tests under each handwear condition for 14 days at 35°F ambient temperature and this comprised the Dry Glove Investigation. An additional Wet Glove Investigation involved the same tests and handwear conditions and was of four days' duration. On Days 2 and 3, subjects immersed their gloved hands into 35°F water for two minutes prior to testing each glove condition while, on Days 1 and 4, there was no water immersion. During the Dry Glove Investigation, the impermeable gloves resulted in superior performance on the Torque Test. For the remaining tests, the bare hand condition resulted in superior performance and the impermeable gloves with built-in insulation resulted in inferior performance compared to the other handwear conditions. Performance level on all tasks decreased on the first day of water immersion, but performance on the Minnesota Two-Hand Turning Test only was adversely affected on both water immersion days. It was recommended that the impermeable glove with built-in insulation be given no further consideration and that the impermeable gloves, with and without wool inserts, be given serious consideration for field use under wet-cold conditions.			

DD FORM 1473  
1 NOV 66REPLACES DD FORM 1473, 1 JAN 64, WHICH IS  
OBSOLETE FOR ARMY USE.

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Human factors						
NLABS						
Handwear						
Handwear, Cold-Wet						
Manual dexterity						
Manual tasks						
Cold-wet conditions						
Leather glove						
Impermeable glove						