https://ntrs.nasa.gov/search.jsp?R=19930091801 2020-06-17T02:38:00+00:00Z

NACATH 123

36

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

REPORT No. 723

WIND-TUNNEL INVESTIGATION OF NACA 23012, 23021 AND 23030 AIRFOILS EQUIPPED WITH 40-PERCENT-CHORD DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

By THOMAS A. HARRIS and ISIDORE G. RECANT



AERONAUTIC SYMBOLS

1. FUNDAMENTAL AND DERIVED UNITS

		Metric		English			
	Symbol	Unit	Abbrevia- tion	Unit	Abbrevia- tion		
Length Time Force	l t F	meter second weight of 1 kilogram	m s kg	foot (or mile) second (or hour) weight of 1 pound	ft (or mi) sec (or hr) lb		
Power Speed	P V	horsepower (metric) ∫kilometers per hour meters per second	kph mps	horsepower miles per hour feet per second	$egin{array}{c} \mathbf{hp} \ \mathbf{mph} \ \mathbf{fps} \end{array}$		

2. GENERAL SYMBOLS v

Weight=mgStandard acceleration of gravity=9.80665 m/s² or 32.1740 ft/sec² Mass= $\frac{W}{c}$

W

g

m

T

μ

2626°

- Kinematic viscosity
- ρ Density (mass per unit volume) Standard density of dry air, 0.12497 kg-m⁻⁴-s² at 15° C and 760 mm; or 0.002378 lb-ft⁻⁴ sec² Specific weight of "standard" air, 1.2255 kg/m³ or 0.07651 lb/cu ft

3. AERODYNAMIC SYMBOLS

a	A	•	
S	Area	v_w	Angle of setting of wings (relative to thrust line)
S_w	Area of wing	i_t	Angle of stabilizer setting (relative to thrust
G	Gap	с	line)
Ь	Span	0	Resultant moment
с	Chord	Ω	Resultant angular velocity
$oldsymbol{A}$	Aspect ratio, $\frac{b^2}{S}$	R	Reynolds number, $\rho \frac{Vl}{\mu}$ where l is a linear dimen-
$V_{ m off}$	True air speed		sion (e.g., for an airfoil of 1.0 ft chord, 100 mph,
	\mathbf{D} · 1 \mathbf{T}^{2}		standard pressure at 15° C, the corresponding
q	Dynamic pressure, $\overline{2}^{\rho V^2}$		Reynolds number is 935 400: or for an airfoil
	T_{L}		of 10 m chord 100 mps the corresponding
L	Lift, absolute coefficient $C_L = \frac{1}{aS}$		Bernalda number is 6.865.000)
	- <u>48</u> 7	, ć	Reynolds number is 6,865,000)
D	Drag, absolute coefficient $C_{p} = \frac{D}{\alpha}$	a	Angle of attack
	qs	e	Angle of downwash
Л.	Profile drag absolute coefficient $C_{-} = \frac{D_0}{D_0}$	a	Angle of attack, infinite aspect ratio
\mathcal{D}_0	From curag, absolute coefficient $O_{D_0} - qS$	a	Angle of attack, induced
	T D D D	~	Angle of attack absolute (measured from zero-
D_i	Induced drag, absolute coefficient $C_{D_i} = \overline{aS}$	~a	lift nogition)
	$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{n}}$		Interposition)
D_{p}	Parasite drag, absolute coefficient $C_{D_p} = \frac{D_p}{\pi \Omega}$	$\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime}$	Flight-path angle
	$\sim qs$		
0	Cross-wind force, absolute coefficient $C_{-}=\frac{U}{C_{-}}$		
-	c_{qS}		

REPORT No. 723

WIND-TUNNEL INVESTIGATION OF NACA 23012, 23021 AND 23030 AIRFOILS EQUIPPED WITH 40-PERCENT-CHORD DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

By THOMAS A. HARRIS and ISIDORE G. RECANT Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory

I a

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

HEADQUARTERS, NAVY BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Created by act of Congress approved March 3, 1915, for the supervision and direction of the scientific study of the problems of flight (U. S. Code, Title 50, Sec. 151). Its membership was increased to 15 by act approved March 2, 1929. The members are appointed by the President, and serve as such without compensation.

VANNEVAR BUSH, Sc. D., Chairman, ROBERT E. DOHERTY, M. S., Washington, D. C. Pittsburgh, Pa. GEORGE J. MEAD, Sc. D., Vice Chairman, ROBERT H. HINCKLEY, A. B., Washington, D. C. Assistant Secretary of Commerce. JEROME C. HUNSAKER, Sc. D., CHARLES G. ABBOT, Sc. D., Secretary, Smithsonian Institution. Cambridge, Mass. HENRY H. ARNOLD, Major General, United States Army, SYDNEY M. KRAUS, Captain, United States Navy, Deputy Chief of Staff, Chief of the Air Corps, War Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department. Department. FRANCIS W. REICHELDERFER, Sc. D., GEORGE H. BRETT, Major General, United States Army, Chief, United States Weather Bureau. JOHN H. TOWERS, Rear Admiral, United States Navy, Acting Chief of the Air Corps, War Department. LYMAN J. BRIGGS, Ph. D., Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department. Director, National Bureau of Standards. EDWARD WARNER, Sc. D., DONALD H. CONNOLLY, B. S., Washington, D. C. Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. ORVILLE WRIGHT, Sc. D., Dayton, Ohio.

GEORGE W. LEWIS, Director of Aeronautical Research

S. PAUL JOHNSTON, Coordinator of Research

JOHN F. VICTORY, Secretary

HENRY J. E. REID, Engineer-in-Charge, Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory, Langley Field, Va.

SMITH J. DEFBANCE, Engineer-in-Charge, Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEES

AERODYNAMICS Power plants for Aircraft Aircraft Materials

Coordination of Research Needs of Military and Civil Aviation

Preparation of Research Programs

Allocation of Problems

Prevention of Duplication

Consideration of Inventions

LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY

LANGLEY FIELD, VA.

Conduct, under unified control, for all agencies, of scientific research on the fundamental problems of flight,

OFFICE OF AERONAUTICAL INTELLIGENCE

WASHINGTON. D. C.

Collection, classification, compilation, and dissemination of scientific and technical information on aeronautics

TT

AMES AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY

MOFFETT FIELD, CALIF.

AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS INVENTIONS AND DESIGNS

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

HEADQUARTERS, NAVY BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Created by act of Congress approved March 3, 1915, for the supervision and direction of the scientific study of the problems of flight (U. S. Code, Title 50, Sec. 151). Its membership was increased to 15 by act approved March 2, 1929. The members are appointed by the President, and serve as such without compensation.

VANNEVAR BUSH, Sc. D., Chairman, ROBERT E. DOHERTY, M. S., Washington, D. C. Pittsburgh, Pa. GEORGE J. MEAD, Sc. D., Vicc Chairman, ROBERT H. HINCKLEY, A. B., Washington, D. C. Assistant Secretary of Commerce. CHARLES G. ABBOT, Sc. D., JEROME C. HUNSAKER, Sc. D., Secretary, Smithsonian Institution. Cambridge, Mass. HENRY H. ARNOLD, Major General, United States Army, SYDNEY M. KRAUS, Captain, United States Navy. Deputy Chief of Staff, Chief of the Air Corps, War Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department. Department. FRANCIS W. REICHELDERFER, Sc. D., GEORGE H. BRETT, Major General, United States Army, Chief, United States Weather Bureau. Acting Chief of the Air Corps, War Department. JOHN H. TOWERS, Rear Admiral, United States Navy, LYMAN J. BRIGGS, Ph. D., Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department. Director, National Bureau of Standards. EDWARD WARNER, Sc. D., DONALD H. CONNOLLY, B. S., Washington, D. C. ORVILLE WRIGHT, Sc. D., Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. Dayton, Ohio.

GEORGE W. LEWIS, Director of Aeronautical Research

S. PAUL JOHNSTON, Coordinator of Research

JOHN F. VICTORY, Secretary

HENRY J. E. REID, Engineer-in-Charge, Langley Memorial Aeronautical Laboratory, Langley Field, Va.

SMITH J. DEFRANCE, Engineer-in-Charge, Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEES

AERODYNAMICS Power plants for Aircraft Aircraft Materials

Coordination of Research Needs of Military and Civil Aviation

Preparation of Research Programs

Allocation of Problems

Prevention of Duplication

Consideration of Inventions

LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY

LANGLEY FIELD, VA.

Conduct, under unified control, for all agencies, of scientific research on the fundamental problems of flight.

OFFICE OF AERONAUTICAL INTELLIGENCE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Collection, classification, compilation, and dissemination of scientific and technical information on aeronautics

п

AMES AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY

AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS INVENTIONS AND DESIGNS

MOFFETT FIELD, CALIF.

REPORT No. 723

WIND-TUNNEL INVESTIGATION OF NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS EQUIPPED WITH 40-PERCENT-CHORD DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

By THOMAS A. HARRIS and ISADORE G. RECANT

SUMMARY

An investigation was conducted in the NACA 7- by 10-foot wind tunnel to determine the effect of the deflection of main and auxiliary slotted flaps on the aerodynamic section characteristics of large-chord NACA 23012, 23021, and 23030 airfoils equipped with 40-percent-chord double slotted flaps. The complete aerodynamic section characteristics and envelope polar curves are given for each airfoilflap combination. The effect of airfoil-thickness is shown, and comparisons are made of single slotted flaps with double slotted flaps on each of the airfoils.

The maximum section lift coefficient of an airfoil with a 40-percent-chord double slotted flap was found to increase slowly with increasing thickness, reaching a value of 3.7 for the 30-percent-thick airfoil. For any airfoil thickness, the double slotted flap gave a higher value of section maximum lift coefficient than either the 40-percent-chord or the 25.66-percent-chord single slotted flaps. The large lift coefficients for the double slotted flaps were accompanied by large pitching-moment coefficients. The section profiledrag coefficient of an airfoil with a double slotted flap increased with an increase in thickness at all except very high lift coefficients. For a given airfoil thickness, the double and the single slotted flaps gave about the same secion profile-drag coefficients for section lift coefficients less han 2.0; above this value the double slotted flap gave the ower section profile-drag coefficients.

INTRODUCTION

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has undertaken an extensive investigation of various airfoil-flap combinations to furnish information applicable to the aerodynamic design of high-lift devices for mproving the safety and the performance of airplanes. A high-lift device capable of producing high lift with variable drag for landing and high lift with low drag or take-off and initial climb is believed to be desirable. Other desirable aerodynamic features are no increase n drag with the flap neutral; small change in pitching noment with flap deflection; low forces required to perate the flap; and freedom from possible hazard due o icing.

The results of an investigation of a 25-percent-chord ingle-slotted flap on airfoils of 12-, 21-, and 30-percent hickness are reported in references 1 to 3; results of a 40-percent-chord single-slotted flap on the same airfoils are reported in references 3, 4, and 5. The Fowler and the venetian-blind flaps have also been investigated on the 12-percent-thick airfoil, and the results are reported in references 1 and 6. Data are presented in reference 7 for split flaps of various chord on 12-, 21-, and 30-percent-thick airfoils. The results of tests of a 25-percent-chord double-slotted flap on the 12-percent thick airfoil are reported in reference 8.

The data presented in reference 8 indicated that the double slotted flap was superior to the single slotted flap for high lift and for low drag at the high section lift coefficients. In the present report are given the results of the tests of the NACA 23012, 23021, and 23030 airfoils, each equipped with a 40-percent-chord double slotted flap.

MODELS

PLAIN AIRFOILS

Three basic models, or plain airfoils, were used in these tests; each had a chord of 3 feet and a span of 7 feet. The models were constructed of laminated wood and were built to the NACA 23012, 23021, and 23030 profiles. The thickness of each of these airfoils is, respectively, 12, 21, and 30 percent of the airfoil chord. The airfoil ordinates are given in table I. These airfoils had previously been used for the split-flap investigation reported in reference 7.

SLOTTED FLAPS

Slot shapes.—The slot shapes used were the same as those used for the single slotted flaps reported in references 1 to 5. The piece forming the slot shape for the main slotted flap was attached directly to the main portion of the airfoil; for the auxiliary flap the slot shape was formed by cutting the trailing edge of the main flap. The slot shapes for the three airfoils are shown in figure 1.

Flaps.—The flap contours were the same as those used in the investigation of the single slotted flaps reported in references 1 to 5. The main flap was hinged to the main portion of the airfoil by special fittings, and the auxiliary flap was hinged to the main flap. The flap shapes are shown in figure 1 and the flap ordinates are given in table II. The deflection of the main flap is measured between the flap chord and the chord of the

main airfoil; whereas, for the auxiliary flap the deflection is measured between its chord and the chord of the main flap.

The models were made to a tolerance of ± 0.015 inch.

TESTS

The models were mounted vertically in the closed test section of the NACA 7- by 10-foot wind tunnel so as to span the jet completely except for small clearances at each end. (See references 1 and 9.) The main airfoil was rigidly attached to the balance frame by torque



(a) NACA 23012 airfoil with double slotted flap.



(b) NACA 23021 airfoil with double slotted flap.



(c) NACA 23030 airfoil with double slotted flap. FIGURE 1.-Sections of NACA 23012, 23021, and 23030 airfoils with 40 percent-chord double slotted flaps.

tubes, which extended through the upper and the lower boundaries of the tunnel. The angle of attack of the model was set from outside the tunnel by rotating the torque tubes with a calibrated electric drive. Approximately two-dimensional flow is obtained with this type of installation and the aerodynamic section characteristics of the model under test can be determined.

A dynamic pressure of 16.37 pounds per square foot was maintained for all the tests, which corresponds to a velocity of about 80 miles per hour under standard atmospheric conditions and to an average test Reynolds number of about 2,190,000. Because of the turbulence in the wind tunnel, the effective Reynolds number R_{\bullet} was approximately 3,500,000. (See reference 10.) For all tests, R_{ϵ} is based on the chord of the airfoil with the flap retracted and on a turbulence factor of 1.6 for the tunnel.

No tests were made of the plain airfoils because they

were the same airfoils used in the investigation of the split flaps reported in reference 7. Tests were made, however, to determine the effects of the breaks in the surface of the airfoil with the flaps undeflected.

Because of the large number of tests involved in determining the optimum paths for the main and the auxiliary flaps on each airfoil, it was assumed that the optimum paths for the single slotted flaps (references 1 to 5) would be the optimum paths for the combination. Tests were therefore made for each position and deflection of the main flap as previously determined. For each position and deflection of the main flap, the auxiliary flap was tested at its previously determined optimum positions and deflections. For each airfoilflap combination, the flaps were deflected through a sufficient range to obtain the maximum lift coefficient.

An angle-of-attack range from -6° to the angle of attack for maximum lift was covered in 2° increments for each test. Lift, drag, and pitching moment were measured at each angle of attack.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

COEFFICIENTS

All test results are given in standard section nondimensional coefficient form corrected for tunnel-wall effect and turbulence as explained in reference 1.

 c_l section lift coefficient (l/qc)

section lift

section profile-drag coefficient (d_0/qc)

> section pitching-moment coefficient about aerodynamic center of plain airfoil $(m_{(a,c)}/qc^2)$

section effective maximum lift

coefficient
$$\left(c_{l_{max}} + \frac{\left[c_{m(a,c)}\right]_{c_{l_{max}}}}{l_{t}}\right)$$

d_0	section profile drag
$m_{(a.c.)_0}$	section pitching moment
q	dynamic pressure $(1/2\rho V^2)$
С	chord of basic airfoil with flapfully retracted
C _{lmax}	section maximum lift coefficient
$\left[c_{m(a.c.)_{0}}\right]_{c_{l_{max}}}$	section pitching-moment coefficient at maximum lift coefficient
l,	distance from aerodynamic center of airfoil to center of pressure of tail,

expressed in airfoil chords

 c_{d_0}

C_{le}max

where

α_0	angle of attack for infinite aspect ratio
δ_{f_1}	main flap deflection
δ_{f_2}	auxiliary flap deflection

and

PRECISION

The accuracy of the various measurements in the tests is believed to be within the following limits:

α ₀	$\pm 0.1^{\circ}$	$C_{d_0}(c_1 = 1.0)$	± 0.0	0006
c _{lmax}	± 0.03	$c_{d_{0}(c_{l}=2,5)}$	±0. (002
C _{m(a,c,)0}	\pm 0. 003	δ_{f_1} and δ_{f_2}	± 0.2	2°
C d _{0min}	± 0.0003	Flap position	$\pm 0.$	001 <i>c</i>

The data from the tests with the main and the auxiliary flaps retracted and undeflected have been corrected both for the effect of breaks in the surface at the





slot entries and exits and for the effect of the flap hinges. No such corrections were applied when the flaps were deflected because of the large number of tests required, but it is believed that the relative merits of the various arrangements are inappreciably affected.

AERODYNAMIC SECTION CHARACTERISTICS

Plain airfoils.—The complete aerodynamic section characteristics of the three basic airfoils tested are

given in figures 2, 3, and 4. Because these data have already been discussed in reference 7, no further comment is believed necessary.

Effect of breaks in surface.—The effect on the section profile-drag coefficient of the breaks in the airfoil surfaces at the slot entries and exits when the flaps are retracted is shown in figure 5. In these tests the slots were sealed so that there was no air flow through them. The breaks in the surface of the NACA 23012 airfoil cause an increase in the section profile-drag coefficient from 0.003 to 0.004 throughout the lift range. For the NACA 23021 airfoil, the increment of the section



FIGURE 3.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23021 plain airfoil.

profile-drag coefficient is 0.0055 at a section lift coefficient of 0, increases to 0.0072 at $c_i=0.75$, and then decreases to 0.0048 at $c_i=1.2$. For the NACA 23030 airfoil, the increment of the section profile-drag coefficient decreases from about 0.012 at low section lift coefficients to about 0.008 at $c_i=0.8$. With properly designed doors and flaps to close the breaks in the lower surface of the airfoils, all or most of the drag increment may be eliminated

Airfoils with double slotted flaps.—The aerodynamic section characteristics of the airfoils tested with 40percent double slotted flaps are presented in figures 6 to 10 for the NACA 23012 airfoil, in figures 11 to 15 for the NACA 23021 airfoil, and in figures 16 to 20 for the NACA 23030 airfoil. These figures show the effect of variation of auxiliary flap deflection δ_{f2} for a given main flap deflection δ_{f_1} . As has been previously pointed out, a complete investigation of all the combinations of flap deflection and position for the main and the auxiliary flaps on each airfoil would require a prohibitive number of tests. It was therefore decided to move and to deflect the main and the auxiliary flaps of each airfoil along the optimum paths determined in previous tests of each flap as a single slotted flap. The follow-



FIGURE 4.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23030 plain airfoil.

ing table gives the source from which each flap path was obtained.

NACA airfoil	Flap	Flap designation in reference	Refer- ence
23012 23021 23030	{Main {Auxiliary Main Auxiliary {Main Auxiliary	0.40c flap 1-b 0.2566c flap 2-h 0.40c flap 1-b 0.2566c flap 2-b 0.40c flap 1-b 0.40c flap 1-b 0.2566c flap 1-b	4 1 5 2 3 3

The path of the auxiliary flap on the NACA 23012 airfoil is the optimum indicated by reference 1 only for a main flap deflection of 0°. For other values of δ_{f_1} , the auxiliary flap was moved along a path as close to the optimum as the hinge fittings permitted. This procedure was necessitated by the fact that the fittings had been altered after the single slotted flap had been tested. In any case, the actual paths followed by the flaps are shown on the figures.

Inspection of figures 6 to 20 shows that deflection of either auxiliary or main flaps affects the slopes of the lift curves to some degree, which is determined by the flap deflection and the airfoil thickness. Any deflection of the auxiliary flap, in general, increases the slope of the lift curve over that of the plain airfoil. This effect is apparently a function of airfoil thickness, the increase in slope being about 5 percent, 13 percent, and 60 percent for the NACA 23012, 23021, and 23030 airfoils, respectively. (See figs. 6, 11, and 16.) It may be noted, however, that the slopes of the lift curves for the three airfoils with the auxiliary flaps deflected are about the same. Deflection of the main flaps for all but the 30-percent-thick airfoil tends to decrease the lift-curve slope although the slope still remains higher than for the plain airfoils.

At a given section lift coefficient and main flap deflection, the negative pitching-moment coefficient increases with auxiliary flap deflection for all the airfoils. The section pitching-moment coefficient also increases rapidly with main flap deflection. The change in slope of the pitching-moment curves for large flap deflections may be undesirable. It should be noted, however, that the destablizing effect at these large flap deflections and high lift coefficients is not very pronounced for flap deflections below the optimum for maximum lift coefficients, except for the 30-percent-thick airfoil.

Polar envelope curves for each main flap deflection, obtained from figures 6 to 20, are plotted in figures 21,



FIGURE 5.—Increment of section profile-drag coefficient due to breaks in the surfaces of the airfoils at the slot entrances and exits for the NACA 230 series with 0.40c double slotted flaps. $\delta_{f_1} = \delta_{f_2} = 0$.

22, and 23 for the NACA 23012, 23021, and 23030 airfoils, respectively. These polars show the lowest section profile-drag coefficient obtainable at a given section lift coefficient for a constant main flap deflection.

In the case of the NACA 23012 airfoil (fig. 21) it is shown that, for section lift coefficients less than 1.2, the plain airfoil gives the lowest section profile-drag coefficients. At higher section lift coefficients, a main flap deflection of 30° gives the lowest section profile-drag coefficient. In reference 4 it is pointed out that the drag for $\delta_{f_1}=30^\circ$ at $\delta_{f_2}=0^\circ$ is erratic, and it is believed that the values of c_{d_0} over the lift range from $c_l=1.4$ to $c_l=1.9$ should be disregarded. The 30° deflection is optimum for maximum section lift coefficient.



NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

 $\mathbf{5}$









airfoil chord.

NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

 $\mathbf{7}$





FIGURE 9.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23012 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. $\delta_{I_1}=30^\circ$; $x_1=1.50$; $y_1=3.50$. x_1 , y_1 , x_2 , y_2 are given in percent airfoil chord.

.



NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS



Section pitching-moment coefficient, c_{m(ac)o} -.2 800 ы .36 x_2 y_{z} yÐ 7 Sfz V .32 .28 Section profile-drag coefficient, c_{do} $\begin{vmatrix} \circ & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 10 & 20 & 30 & 40 & 50 \\ 8.33 & 5.00 & 3.50 & 0.50 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\ 4.85 & 6.00 & 5.00 & 3.00 & 2.50 & 2.50 & 2.00 \\ \end{vmatrix}$ δ_{f_2} , deg x_z $-y_z$.24 .20 .16 .12 .08 0 .04 0 16 Angle of attack, do, deg 8 0 -8 - 4 0 .4 1.2 1.6 2.0 Section lift coefficient, **c**1 .8 2.4 2.8 3.2 3.6





NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

FIGURE 12.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23021 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. $\delta_{f_1} = 10^\circ$; $x_1 = 8.50$; $y_1 = 9.50$. x_1 , y_1 , x_2 , y_2 are given in percent airfoil chord.

1000 ĕ Ś Ŷ 5 ¢ P J д 7 δ 47
 0
 10
 20
 30
 40

 8:33
 5:00
 3:50
 0:50
 0:00
 20

 4:85
 6:00
 5:00
 3:00
 2:50
 2:50
 1:50
 ç 1 ł 5 \sim Į ะ Y 9 1 $\delta_{f_{z}}, deg \\ x_{z}^{x}$ -2 1.6 0.1-0 4.1 θ.-.36 .32 28 .24 20 . 16 .12 08 04 16 Ø 0 9 פכנוסט מוזכעוטל-שמשטן כספונוכופען' כ^{שוש שי}י Section profile-drag coefficient, ca لام و مړمېود ۲[°] مو

-Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23021 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. $\delta_{fI} = 20^{\circ}$; $x_1 = 4.50$; $y_1 = 8.50$. x_1 , y_1 , x_2 , y_2 are given in percent airfoil chord.

3.6

3.2

2.8

2.4

1.2 1.6 2.0 Section lift coefficient, $oldsymbol{c}_{l}$

Ø

4

0

4.1

FIGURE 13.

-

-NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS REPORT NO. 723-

12



NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS





FIGURE 15.—Aerodynamic section characteristics of NACA 23021 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap. $\delta_{f_1} = 40^\circ; x_1 = 1.50; y_1 = 4.50. x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2$ are given in percent airfoil chord.















REPORT NO. 723-NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS









FIGURE 21.-Envelope polar curves for NACA 23012 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap.



FIGURE 22.-Envelope polar curves for NACA 23021 airfoil with 40-percent-chord double slotted flap.



FIGURE 23.-Envelope polar curves for NACA 23030 airfoil with 40-percent chord double slotted flap.





The polar envelopes for the NACA 23021 airfoil (fig. 22) show that the plain wing gives the lowest value of section profile-drag coefficient for section lift coefficients less than 1.0. From $c_i=1.0$ to about $c_i=2.4$, the lowest section profile-drag coefficient is given by a main flap deflection of 0° ; whereas, for section lift coefficients above 2.4, the minimum section profile-drag coefficient is given by $\delta_{f_1}=20^{\circ}$. The section maximum lift coefficient is given by $\delta_{f_1}=30^{\circ}$.

As in the case of the other two airfoils, the plain NACA 23030 airfoil (fig. 23) gives the lowest section profile-drag coefficient at low section lift coefficients. From $c_i=0.5$ to $c_i=1.9$, the section minimum profile-drag coefficients are obtained with a main flap deflection of 0°. In the lift range of 1.9 to 3.2, a 20° main flap deflection is required for optimum section profile-drag conditions, while a main flap deflection of 30° gives the lowest section profile-drag coefficients above 3.2. Maximum section lift is obtained with $\delta_{f_1}=40^\circ$.

COMPARISON OF AIRFOILS OF DIFFERENT THICKNESS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

Effect of thickness on profile drag.—Envelopes of the envelope polar curves of figures 21 to 23 are given in figure 24. These envelopes show the minimum section profile-drag coefficient that may be obtained with the three airfoils at any section lift coefficient. As has been previously noted, the profile-drag data for the NACA 23012 airfoil with $\delta_{f_1}=30^\circ$ and $\delta_{f_2}=0^\circ$ were erratic; the values of c_{d_0} over the lift range of $c_i=1.4$ to $c_i=1.9$ have been disregarded in drawing the envelope of the envelopes. The section profile-drag coefficient increases with the airfoil thickness throughout the lift range except above a section lift coefficient of about 3.2, where the 30-percent thick airfoil gives a lower section profile-drag coefficient than the others.

Effect of thickness on maximum lift.—The effect of the auxiliary flap deflection on the increment of section maximum lift coefficient with various main flap deflections is shown in figure 25 for the three airfoils. The increment of the section maximum lift increases not only with the auxiliary and the main flap deflections but also with the airfoil thickness. The maximum increment of section maximum lift coefficient $\Delta c_{l_{max}}$ is obtained with the NACA 23012 and 23030 airfoils when $\delta_{f_2} = 40^\circ$; the NACA 23021 airfoil gives the maximum $\Delta c_{l_{max}}$ when $\delta_{f_2} = 30^\circ$.

The effect of the main flap deflection on the increment



FIGURE 25.-Effect of auxiliary flap deflection on the increment of section maximum lift coefficient for the various airfoils.

of section maximum lift coefficient is shown in figure 26. The highest $\Delta c_{l_{max}}$ for the NACA 23012 and 23021 airfoils was given by a main flap deflection of 30° and, for the NACA 23030 airfoil, by a deflection of 40°. The maximum increments increase with airfoil thickness, and this effect becomes more marked as δ_{f_1} is increased. The rapid increase in the increment of the section maximum lift coefficient with airfoil thickness





is not readily apparent in the final section maximum lift coefficient, which (as can be seen from fig. 27) is not greatly affected by thickness; and, whereas values of $\Delta c_{l_{max}}$ increase about 40 percent with an increase in airfoil thickness from 12 to 30 percent, the section maximum lift coefficient increases by only about 7 percent over the same thickness range. In view of the fact, however, that the section maximum lift coefficient of the plain airfoils decreases 30 percent with the increase in thickness, the small magnitude of the increase in maximum lift for the flapped airfoils is expected. It is of interest to note that similar results have been obtained with split flaps (reference 7) and single slotted flaps (reference 3).

COMPARISON OF VARIOUS SLOTTED FLAPS ON EACH AIRFOIL

Comparisons of a 25.66-percent slotted flap, a 40 percent slotted flap, and a 40-percent double slotted flap



FIGURE 27.—Effect of airfoil thickness on section maximum lift coefficient of NACA 230 airfoils with and without slotted flaps.

on the NACA 23012, 23021, and 23030 airfoils are presented in figures 28, 29, and 30, respectively. At section lift coefficients below about 2.0, the double slotted flaps have about the same section profile-drag coefficients as the single slotted flaps for all three airfoils. For the higher section lift coefficients, the double slotted flaps give less section drag than the single slotted flaps.













On the basis of the maximum obtainable section lift coefficient, the double slotted flaps show a considerable gain over the single slotted flaps on the airfoils (fig. 27). On the NACA 23012 airfoil, the increase in section maximum lift coefficient over that of the plain airfoil is 81 percent, 87 percent, and 123 percent for the 25.66-percent slotted flap, the 40-percent slotted flap, and the 40-percent double slotted flap, respectively. In the case of the NACA 23021 airfoil, the respective increases are 107 percent, 110 percent, and 162 percent;



FIGURE 31.—Section effective maximum lift coefficients for slotted flaps on NACA 23012 airfoil.

while the increases for the NACA 23030 airfoil are 160 percent, 182 percent, and 260 percent.

Although the section maximum lift coefficients obtained with the double slotted flaps are greater than the coefficients obtained with either of the single slotted flaps regardless of airfoil thickness, it must be remembered that the pitching-moment coefficients are also greater. Thus, a double-slotted-flap installation will require a greater negative tail load to balance the pitching moment than will a single-slotted-flap installation, and it therefore appears desirable to take the tail load into consideration when the maximum lift coefficients are compared. Accordingly, section effective maximum lift coefficients were computed for each airfoil-flap combination for various tail lengths by the [c 1 formula-

$$c_{l_{e_{max}}} = c_{l_{max}} + \frac{\left[\sum_{l_{max}} c_{l_{max}} \right] c_{l_{max}}}{l_{l}}$$

These data are presented in figures 31, 32, and 33. For



FIGURE 32.—Section effective maximum lift coefficients for slotted flaps on NACA 23021 airfoil.





REPORT NO. 723-NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

each of the airfoils, the effective maximum lift coefficient obtained with the double slotted flap is greater than the coefficient obtained with either of the single slotted flaps. The superiority of the double slotted flaps in this respect increases with tail length.

The pitching-moment coefficients plotted in figures 28 to 30 are those obtained when the flaps are moved and deflected to the positions that give minimum values of section profile-drag coefficient at a given section lift coefficient. The difference in pitchingmoment coefficients of the various slotted flaps is most marked for the NACA 23012 airfoil. On that airfoil the 25.66-percent-chord single slotted flap gives the lowest values of pitching-moment coefficient while the double slotted flap gives the highest values throughout the lift range. On the NACA 23021 airfoil the lowest values of pitching-moment coefficient are given by the 40-percent-chord single slotted flap while the 25.66percent single slotted flap and the double slotted flap give about the same pitching-moment coefficients below $c_1 = 1.2$. In the case of the NACA 23030 airfoil there is little difference in the pitching-moment coefficients given by the three flaps for lift coefficients up to 1.6. For lift coefficients less than 1.6, the 40-percent single slotted flap gave the lowest pitching-moment coefficients while, at higher lift coefficients, the 25.66-percent single slotted flap gives the lowest value of pitching-moment coefficient.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The effect of increasing the airfoil thickness on the aerodynamic characteristics of airfoils with double slotted flaps was to increase the section profile drag through most of the lift range although, at very high section lift coefficients, the section profile drag was reduced by an increasing thickness. The section maximum lift coefficient increased slowly with increasing airfoil thickness.

For a given airfoil thickness, the section profile drag of the 40-percent-chord single slotted flap, the 25.66percent-chord single slotted flap, and the 40-percentchord double slotted flaps was about the same at section lift coefficients less than 2.0. For higher section lift coefficients, the double slotted flap gave the lowest section profile-drag coefficient regardless of airfoil thickness. The section maximum lift coefficients of the airfoils with double slotted flaps were considerably higher than those of the airfoils with single slotted flaps for all airfoil thicknesses. The large lift coefficients for the double slotted flaps were accompanied by large pitching-moment coefficients.

LANGLEY MEMORIAL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY,

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS, LANGLEY FIELD, VA., August 6, 1940.

REFERENCES

- Wenzinger, Carl J., and Harris, Thomas A.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23012 Airfoil with Various Arrangements of Slotted Flaps. Rep. No. 664, NACA, 1939.
- Wenzinger, Carl J. and Harris, Thomas A.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23021 Airfoil with Various Arrangements of Slotted Flaps. Rep. No. 677, NACA, 1939.
- Recant, I. G.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23030 Airfoil with Various Arrangements of Slotted Flaps. T. N. No. 755, NACA, 1940.
- Harris, Thomas A.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23012 Airfoil with Two Arrangements of a Wide-Chord Slotted Flap. T. N. No. 715, NACA, 1939.
- Duschik, Frank: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23021 Airfoil with Two Arrangements of a 40-Percent-Chord Slotted Flap. T. N. No. 728, NACA, 1939.
- Wenzinger, Carl J., and Harris, Thomas A.: Preliminary Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23012 Airfoil with Various Arrangements of Venetian-Blind Flaps. Rep. No. 689, NACA, 1940.
- Wenzinger, Carl J., and Harris, Thomas A.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of N. A. C. A. 23012, 23021, and 23030 Airfoils with Various Sizes of Split Flap. Rep. No. 668, NACA, 1939.
- Wenzinger, Carl J., and Gauvain, William E.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of an N. A. C. A. 23012 Airfoil with a Slotted Flap and Three Types of Auxiliary Flap. Rep. No. 679, NACA, 1939.
- Harris, Thomas A.: The 7 by 10 Foot Wind Tunnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Rep. No. 412, NACA, 1931.
- Jacobs, Eastman N., and Sherman, Albert: Airfoil Section Characteristics as Affected by Variations of the Reynolds Number. Rep. No. 586, NACA, 1937.

TABLE I

ORDINATES FOR NACA 230 AIRFOILS

[Stations and ordinates in percent of airfoil chord]

	NAC	A 23012	NACA	23021	NACA 23030		
Station	Upper surface	Lower surface	Upper surface	Lower surface	Upper surface	Lower surface	
$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1, 25 \\ 2, 5 \\ 7, 5 \\ 7, 5 \\ 10 \\ 15 \\ 20 \\ 25 \\ 30 \\ 40 \\ 50 \\ 60 \\ 70 \\ 80 \\ 90 \\ 95 \\ 100 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.\ 67\\ 3.\ 61\\ 4.\ 91\\ 5.\ 80\\ 6.\ 43\\ 7.\ 19\\ 7.\ 50\\ 7.\ 50\\ 7.\ 55\\ 7.\ 14\\ 5.\ 47\\ 4.\ 36\\ 3.\ 08\\ 1.\ 68\\ 92\\ .\ 13 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ -1.23\\ -2.61\\ -2.26\\ -2.26\\ -2.92\\ -3.50\\ -3.50\\ -3.97\\ -4.28\\ -4.48\\ -4.48\\ -4.48\\ -4.48\\ -4.48\\ -2.16\\ -1.23\\ -7.70\\13\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 4.87\\ 6.14\\ 7.93\\ 9.13\\ 10.03\\ 11.19\\ 12.05\\ 12.06\\ 11.49\\ 10.40\\ 8.90\\ 7.09\\ 5.05\\ 2.76\\ 1.53\\ .22\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ -2.08\\ -3.14\\ -4.52\\ -5.55\\ -6.32\\ -7.51\\ -8.30\\ -8.76\\ -8.83\\ -8.84\\ -7.07\\ -5.72\\ -4.13\\ -2.30\\ -1.30\\ -1.30\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 4.82\\ 7.37\\ 8.90\\ 11.05\\ 12.57\\ 13.68\\ 15.20\\ 16.07\\ 16.46\\ 16.57\\ 15.89\\ 14.38\\ 12.34\\ 9.86\\ 7.03\\ 3.87\\ 3.215\\ 32\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0\\ -2.63\\ -4.27\\ -6.54\\ -8.28\\ -9.65\\ -11.52\\ -12.61\\ -13.46\\ -13.10\\ -13.46\\ -13.12.11\\ -10.47\\ -8.42\\ -6.09\\ -3.40\\ -1.86\\32\end{array}$	
L. E. radius	1.	58	4.	85	9.90		

NACA 23012, 23021, AND 23030 AIRFOILS WITH DOUBLE SLOTTED FLAPS

TA DINATES FOR FLA

.

hord]	
of airfoil c	
percent c	
s in	
ordinate	
and	
[Stations	

	· II	ury flap	Lower surface	-0.55 -1.81 -2.30 -2.88 -2.88 -3.28 -3.28 -3.29 -3.34 -3.34 -3.34 -3.34 -3.34 -3.34 -3.34 -3.34 -3.34 -3.34 -3.34 -3.36 -3.28 3.28 2.28 28 28 	2.89
	021 airfo	Auxilia	Upper surface	-0.55 1.08 1.89 2.44 2.44 4.26 3.99 3.99 2.83 2.83 2.83 2.83 2.83 2.83 2.83 2.83 2.83 2.83 2.83 2.85 2.25 2.85 2.85 2.85 2.85 2.85 2.25 2.85 2.25 2.55	
	TACA 23	flap	Lower surface	-2.70 -6.14 -5.72 -5.72 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.73 -5.747 -5.74 -5.75	80
	4	Main	Upper surface	2.70 1.00 1.00 4.51 6.59 6.59 6.70 5.05 1.53 1.23 1.53 1.53 3.78 1.53 5.05 3.05 5.05 3.76 1.53 5.05 5.05 5.05 5.05 5.05 5.05 5.05 5	ŝ
•	-	ry flap	Lower surface	-1.29 -2.05 -2.16 -2.41 -2.41 -2.16 -2.16 -1.23	16
	012 airfoi	Auxilia	Upper surface	-1.29 .04 .04 1.94 1.94 2.63 2.63 2.63 2.63 2.63 2.63 2.63 2.63	0
	IACA 23	flap	Lower surface	-1.76 -3.17 -3.17 -3.16 -3.36 -3.36 -3.60 -3.60 -3.19 -3.10 -3.10 -3.10 -3.10 -3.17 -1.76	35
topool a	А	Main	Upper surface	1.76 31 .37 .37 .369 .1.36 .3.48 3.48 3.48 3.48 3.08 3.08 .3.08 .1.92 .1.92 .1.35 .1.1	
		Station		0	L. E. radi- us-

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1942



Positive directions of axes and angles (forces and moments) are shown by arrows

v	Axis		Mome	ent abou	ıt axis	Angle		Velocities		
	Designation	Sym- bol	Force (parallel to axis) symbol	Designation	Sym- bol	Positive direction	Designa- tion	Sym- bol	Linear (compo- nent along axis)	Angular
	Longitudinal Lateral Normal	$egin{array}{c} X \\ Y \\ Z \end{array}$	X Y Z	Rolling Pitching Yawing	L M N	$\begin{array}{c} Y \longrightarrow Z \\ Z \longrightarrow X \\ X \longrightarrow Y \end{array}$	Roll Pitch Yaw	ϕ θ ψ	น ข พ	p q r

Absolute coefficients of moment $C_m = \frac{M}{qcS}$ (pitching)

 $C_i = \frac{L}{qbS}$ (rolling)

Diameter

Pitch ratio

Geometric pitch

Inflow velocity

D,

p, p/D,

 $\overline{V'},$

 $C_n = \frac{N}{qbS}$ (yawing)

Angle of set of control surface (relative to neutral position), δ . (Indicate surface by proper subscript.)

4. PROPELLER SYMBOLS

ή,

n,

Φ,

Power, absolute coefficient $C_P = \frac{P}{\rho n^3 D^5}$ Speed-power coefficient $= \sqrt[5]{\frac{\overline{\rho V^5}}{P n^2}}$ Ρ,

Revolutions per second, r.p.s.

Effective helix angle= $\tan^{-1}\left(\frac{V}{2\pi rn}\right)$

- C_s ,
 - Efficiency

 V_{s} , Slipstream velocity Thrust, absolute coefficient $C_T = \frac{T}{\rho n^2 D^4}$ Ť,

Torque, absolute coefficient $C_q = \frac{Q}{\rho n^2 D^5}$ Q,

1 hp.=76.04 kg-m/s=550 ft-lb./sec. 1 metric horsepower=1.0132 hp.

1 m.p.h.=0.4470 m.p.s.

1 m.p.s.=2.2369 m.p.h.

- 5. NUMERICAL RELATIONS
 - 1 lb.=0.4536 kg.
 - 1 kg=2.2046 lb.
 - 1 mi.=1,609.35 m=5,280 ft.
 - 1 m = 3.2808 ft.

-32-