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Wind-tunnel tests were made of a 42° swept-back wing to determine low-speed aerodynamic characteristics in pitch and in yaw at high Reynolds numbers. The characteristics in pitch were obtained over a Reynolds number range from 1,700,000 to 9,500,000 and the characteristics in yaw, from 1,700,000 to 5,300,000. The wing had an aspect ratio of 4, a taper ratio of 0.625, and NACA 641-112 airfoil sections normal to the 0.273-chord line.

The wing characteristics at high angles of attack were greatly influenced by Reynolds number in the range from 1,700,000 to 5,300,000 but were little affected in the range from 5,300,000 to 9,500,000. The principal effect of increasing the value of Reynolds number was to delay wing stalling to higher angles of attack. The maximum lift coefficients in the higher range of Reynolds numbers were about 1.1 without flaps and about 1.3 with half-span split flaps deflected 60°. Abrupt tip stalling caused unstable changes in the pitching moment at maximum lift. The effective dihedral parameter \( C_\psi \) varied approximately linearly with lift coefficient at a Reynolds number of 5,300,000 and reached a maximum value near maximum lift of about 0.0040 without flaps and 0.0050 with flaps.

At Reynolds numbers greater than 1,700,000 roughness in the form of carborundum grains applied to the wing leading edge had a large adverse effect on lift, drag, and pitching-moment characteristics. Roughness also reduced the maximum values of \( C_\psi \).
INTRODUCTION

Highly swept-back wings are being employed as a means of minimizing compressibility effects at high subsonic and supersonic speeds. Large amounts of sweep have, however, presented problems in obtaining adequate maximum lift and satisfactory stability and control characteristics at low speeds. Low-scale tests (see, for example, references 1 and 2) have shown that unsatisfactory variations in the low-speed aerodynamic characteristics may be obtained, which result to a large extent from the spanwise flow of the air in the boundary layer. Because of the dependence of boundary-layer behavior on Reynolds number, the need for aerodynamic data at large values of Reynolds number is apparent. Accordingly, wind-tunnel tests have been made in the Langley 19-foot pressure tunnel of a particular swept-back wing to determine its low-speed characteristics up to reasonably high values of Reynolds number.

The wing had a sweepback angle of 45°, an aspect ratio of 4, and NACA 641-112 airfoil sections normal to the 0.273-chord line. Aerodynamic characteristics in pitch were determined over a Reynolds number range from 1,700,000 to 9,500,000 and aerodynamic characteristics in yaw, from 1,700,000 to 5,300,000. Tests were made of the plain wing, the wing with partial-span split flaps, and the wing with a spoiler-type lateral-control device for conditions of leading edge smooth and leading edge rough.

COEFFICIENTS AND SYMBOLS

The data are referred to a system of stability axes shown in figure 1. Moments are referred to the quarter-chord point of the mean aerodynamic chord.

\[ C_L \] lift coefficient \( \frac{\text{Lift}}{\text{qS}} \)

\[ C_D \] drag coefficient \( \frac{\text{D}}{\text{qS}} \)

\[ C_X \] longitudinal-force coefficient \( \frac{\text{X}}{\text{qS}} \)

\[ C_Y \] lateral-force coefficient \( \frac{\text{Y}}{\text{qS}} \)
\( C_L \)  rolling-moment coefficient \( \left( \frac{L}{qSb} \right) \)

\( C_m \)  pitching-moment coefficient \( \left( \frac{M}{qSb} \right) \)

\( C_n \)  yawing-moment coefficient \( \left( \frac{N}{qSb} \right) \)

\( R \)  Reynolds number \( \left( \frac{\rho Vc}{\mu} \right) \)

\( M_0 \)  free-stream Mach number \( (V/a) \)

\( \alpha \)  angle of attack measured in plane of symmetry, degrees

\( \psi \)  angle of yaw, degrees; positive when right wing is back

\( C_{L,\psi} \)  rate of change of rolling-moment coefficient with angle of yaw, per degree \( \left( \frac{\partial C_L}{\partial \psi} \right) \)

\( C_{n,\psi} \)  rate of change of yawing-moment coefficient with angle of yaw, per degree \( \left( \frac{\partial C_n}{\partial \psi} \right) \)

\( C_{Y,\psi} \)  rate of change of lateral-force coefficient with angle of yaw, per degree \( \left( \frac{\partial C_Y}{\partial \psi} \right) \)

\( \frac{\partial C_L}{\partial C_L} \)  rate of change of effective dihedral parameter with lift coefficient, per degree

\( \text{Lift} = -Z \)

\( D \)  drag \( (-X \) at zero yaw\)

\( X \)  longitudinal force

\( Y \)  lateral force

\( Z \)  vertical force

\( L \)  rolling moment

\( M \)  pitching moment
The plan form of the wing is shown in figure 2. The angle of sweep of the leading edge is $42^\circ$ and the wing sections perpendicular to the 0.273-chord line are NACA 641-112 airfoil sections. The 0.273-chord line of each wing panel is the quarter-chord line of a straight panel which has been rotated $40^\circ$ about the quarter-chord point.
point of its root chord. The airfoil sections parallel to the plane of symmetry have a maximum thickness of 9.6 percent chord located at approximately 38 percent chord. The aspect ratio is 4.01 and the taper ratio is 0.625. The tips are rounded off beginning at 0.975b in both plan form and cross section. The wing has no geometric dihedral or twist.

The span of the split flaps is 50 percent of the wing span. (See fig. 2.) The flap chord is 18.4 percent of the wing chord and the flap deflection with respect to the hinge line is 60° measured between the wing lower surface and the flap.

The installation of the spoiler is shown in figure 3. The height of the spoiler, 0.052 chord, is equal to the wing thickness at the chordwise station where the spoiler is located.

The wing was constructed of laminated mahogany and the flaps and the spoiler were of sheet metal. The wing was lacquered and sanded to obtain a smooth surface. A leading-edge roughness was obtained by application of No. 60 (0.011-inch mesh) carborundum grains to a thin layer of shellac over a surface length of 8 percent chord measured from the leading edge on both upper and lower surfaces. The grains covered 5 to 10 percent of the affected area.

APPARATUS AND TESTS

The tests were made in the Langley 19-foot pressure tunnel. The mounting of the wing for the pitch tests is shown in figure 4 and for the yaw tests in figure 5. For the yaw tests the end of the support strut was shielded by a fairing formed by a part of a sphere to which was attached an afterbody. The fairing was 20 inches long, 14 inches wide, and extended 4 inches below the wing surface.

The pitch characteristics of the smooth and rough wings with and without split flaps were determined at zero yaw through an angle-of-attack range at the following Reynolds numbers and Mach numbers:
Six-component data were obtained for the wing with spoiler at a Reynolds number of 5,300,000. Stall characteristics were studied at Reynolds numbers of 1,700,000 and 6,800,000 by means of tufts attached to the upper surface of the wing beginning at 20 percent chord for the wing smooth and 10 percent chord for the wing rough; however, only data at a Reynolds number of 6,800,000 are presented herein.

The aerodynamic characteristics of the wing with the leading edge both smooth and rough were obtained through an angle-of-yaw range of -10° to 25° at several angles of attack for a Reynolds number of 5,300,000. The lateral-stability parameters of the smooth wing with and without flaps were determined from tests made through an angle-of-attack range for yaw angles of ±5° at several values of Reynolds number between 1,700,000 and 5,300,000. Similar tests were made with the leading edge rough at a Reynolds number of 5,300,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>M&lt;sub&gt;o&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Tunnel pressure (absolute) (lb/sq in.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,720,000</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,350,000</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,300,000</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,800,000</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,100,000</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,500,000</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CORRECTIONS TO DATA

The effects of the two-support system (fig. 4) on lift, drag, and pitching moment were determined by tare tests and the data at zero yaw have been corrected for these effects. No tare tests were made to determine the effects of the single support (fig. 5), but approximate corrections to the lift, drag, and pitching moment in yaw have been applied. The data have also been corrected for airflow misalignment.
The jet-boundary corrections to the angle of attack and drag coefficient, which were calculated at zero yaw from reference 3, are as follows:

$$\Delta \alpha = 0.99C_L$$

$$\Delta C_D = 0.0149C_L^2$$

The correction to the pitching-moment coefficient due to the tunnel-induced distortion of the loading is

$$\Delta C_m = 0.004C_L$$

The correction to the rolling-moment coefficient due to the spoiler, as determined from reference 4 for an unswept wing, is

$$\Delta C_I = -0.012C_L$$

All these corrections were added to the uncorrected data.

No corrections have been applied to the side force, yawing moment, and rolling moment except for the rolling moment due to the spoiler.

No correction has been applied for wake blockage (reference 5). This correction which is dependent on the profile drag is negligible for most of the data presented. For conditions of leading edge rough or leading edge smooth at the lowest Reynolds number, correcting for wake blockage would reduce the absolute values of the coefficients by approximately 2 percent at high angles of attack.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Aerodynamic Characteristics in Pitch

The lift characteristics and the rolling-moment characteristics near maximum lift are presented in figure 6. At some of the high Reynolds numbers no test data were obtained beyond the stall because
of excessive model vibration. The maximum lift coefficients as a function of Reynolds number are plotted in figure 7. Results of tuft surveys at a Reynolds number of 6,800,000 are given in figures 8 and 9. The pitching-moment coefficients are presented in figure 10 as a function of lift coefficient and also, at high angles of attack, as a function of angle of attack. Drag coefficients are given in figure 11 and some information on the influence of the drag variations on glide characteristics is given in figure 12. The aerodynamic characteristics of the wing with spoiler are shown in figures 13 to 15.

Lift and stalling characteristics.- For the smooth wing, the lift-curve peaks (fig. 5) are smooth and well rounded at the lowest Reynolds number (1,700,000) but become sharper as the Reynolds number is increased. Up to a Reynolds number of 6,800,000 the value of $C_{l_{max}}$ increased with increasing Reynolds number. (See fig. 7.) The value of $C_{l_{max}}$ decreased slightly with further increase in Reynolds number. The maximum values of $C_{l_{max}}$ obtained were 1.12 at $\alpha = 19^\circ$ with flaps off and 1.33 at $\alpha = 17^\circ$ with flaps on.

For the rough wing, the lift-curve peaks are well rounded and Reynolds number has little effect on lift. The maximum lift coefficients of approximately 0.98 with flaps off and 1.02 with flaps on show the low effectiveness at $C_{l_{max}}$ of the flap on the rough wing. At Reynolds numbers greater than 4,350,000 the maximum lift coefficient of the rough wing with flaps on was even lower than the maximum lift coefficient of the smooth wing with flaps off.

The tuft surveys show that quite different stall progressions were obtained depending on the Reynolds number or surface condition of the wing leading edge. Stall studies for the smooth wing at $R = 6,800,000$ (fig. 8) show outflow along the rear part of the wing beginning at moderate lift coefficients. Beyond $C_{l_{max}}$ the wing stalls rather abruptly over the outer half of the wing. This type of stall may be dangerous in landing. Stalling was not always symmetrical, as can be seen by the stall studies in figure 8 and the rolling-moment data in figure 6. The asymmetrical stall results from asymmetries in the wing and/or tunnel air flow.

The stall progressions for the smooth wing at the lowest Reynolds number (1,700,000) and the progression for the rough wing at any Reynolds numbers were very similar. This similarity is also
borne out by the force data. For the rough wing (fig. 9) and for
the smooth wing at $R = 1,700,000$ (data not presented) appreciable
outflow was first obtained near the leading edge over the outer part
of the wing. As the angle of attack was increased the general
direction of the tufts on all parts of the wing moved in a clock-
wise direction on the left wing and counterclockwise on the right
wing. Any region where the direction of the tufts was forward of
the perpendicular to the wing center line was interpreted as a
stalled region. Stalling began near the leading edge ($0.10c$ to $0.20c$)
from 50 to 75 percent of the semispan. Stalling progressed gradually
rearward and fanned out until, at maximum lift, only the center third
of the wing was uninstalled. No large changes in rolling moment
occurred for the rough wing.

On the basis of the tuft surveys the stalling characteristics
of both the smooth and the rough wings are considered undesirable
because of tip stalling.

Pitching-moment characteristics.- At $R = 1,700,000$ and at a
moderate value of lift coefficient, there is a decided increase in
stability as determined from the variation of pitching-moment
coefficient with lift coefficient (fig. 10). Then at angles of
attack several degrees below that for maximum lift unstable changes
in pitching-moment coefficient occur, which result in a pitching-
moment curve of a decided reflexed shape. The unstable variation
of the pitching-moment coefficient apparently results from separation
which occurred prematurely on the outer part of the wing. When the
Reynolds number is increased to 4,350,000 and to higher values, the
pitching-moment curves are more nearly linear up to the maximum lift
and, for these conditions, unstable changes in pitching moment
resulting from tip stalling occur after the maximum lift coefficient
has been attained. For Reynolds numbers of 6,800,000 to 9,500,000,
initial test results for the wing with no flaps, although limited,
indicate only small variations in pitching-moment coefficient at
high angles of attack; hence the wing for these conditions might be
considered to have marginal stability. Check tests, in which the
wing surface was observed to have deteriorated slightly, show that
the wing is definitely unstable at the stall. For design consid-
erations, it is more practical to consider the results of the check
tests as representative.

The wing with leading-edge roughness exhibits in general the
same type of pitching-moment characteristics at all Reynolds numbers
as were obtained with the smooth wing at $R = 1,700,000$. 
Drag characteristics. - At a Reynolds number of 1,700,000, the drag coefficient of the smooth wing increases rapidly with lift coefficient, beginning at moderate values of lift coefficient. (See fig. 11.) This effect may be attributed to premature stalling. At moderate to high values of Reynolds number, no large increase in drag coefficient occurs until after $C_{l_{\text{max}}}$ is reached. For the rough wing the large drag rise occurs prematurely over the whole range of Reynolds number, which results in extremely high values of drag coefficient in the vicinity of maximum lift.

Flight tests reported in reference 6 show that when the vertical velocity in approach exceeds about 25 feet per second the piloting technique required for landing becomes extremely difficult. Based upon the data in figure 11 and a wing loading of 40 pounds per square foot, the smooth wing with split flaps at moderate to high values of Reynolds number is calculated to have a vertical velocity of 23 feet per second for lift coefficients from $0.85C_{l_{\text{max}}}$ to $C_{l_{\text{max}}}$. For the rough wing with flaps, the vertical velocity varies from 30 to 50 feet per second between $0.85C_{l_{\text{max}}}$ and $C_{l_{\text{max}}}$. These variations are more clearly shown in figure 12.

Spoiler characteristics. - The spoiler produced a maximum value of $C_{l_{s}}$ of about 0.013 with flaps on at moderate angles of attack. This value is considered low. The data for the smooth wings (figs. 13 and 14) indicate that the spoiler effectiveness decreases as maximum lift is approached and that the loss in effectiveness is smaller when the flaps are on. Data for the rough wing with flaps off (fig. 15) show that the spoiler is ineffective at lift coefficients above 0.7. Data for the wing with flaps on (not presented) show that the spoiler is ineffective at lift coefficients greater than 0.95.

Aerodynamic Characteristics in Yaw

The lateral-stability parameters $C_{l_{\psi}}$ and $C_{n_{\psi}}$ of the smooth wing are plotted in figure 16 as a function of the lift coefficient for several values of Reynolds number. Similar data for the rough wing are given in figure 17 for a Reynolds number of 5,300,000. The lateral-stability parameters were obtained from the tests made at $0^\circ$ and $15^\circ$ yaw. Aerodynamic characteristics through a range of yaw angle at several angles of attack are presented in figures 18 and 19.
Rolling-moment characteristics.—The variation of the effective
dihedral parameter \( C_{\psi} \) with lift coefficient was greatly influenced
by Reynolds number, particularly when the Reynolds number was
increased from 1,720,000 to 3,000,000. (See fig. 16.) When the
Reynolds number was increased the linear part of the curve of \( C_{\psi} \)
extended over a greater lift-coefficient range and the maximum values
of \( C_{\psi} \) were increased. For the wing with flaps on, the slope of
the curve of \( C_{\psi} \) was increased also. The large scale effect shown
may be due to the particular airfoil section employed; hence, this
result should not be considered applicable to all wings.

At a Reynolds number of 1,720,000 and with flaps off (fig. 16(a)),
\( C_{\psi} \) increased linearly with \( C_L \) in the low lift-coefficient range
and reached a maximum value of 0.0020 at \( C_L = 0.5 \) to 0.7. The value
of \( C_{\psi} \) then decreased and finally reversed in sign; that is, a
negative dihedral effect was obtained. With flaps on and at the
same Reynolds number (fig. 16(b)), \( C_{\psi} \) increased with lift coeffi-
cient to a maximum value of 0.0084 at \( C_L = 1.05 \) and then decreased
rapidly. For \( R = 5,300,000 \), the curves were linear over most of
the lift range and the maximum values of \( C_{\psi} \) obtained were
about 0.0040 at \( C_L = 0.9 \) with flaps off and 0.0050 at \( C_L = 1.25 \)
with flaps on. The change in \( C_{\psi} \) per unit change in \( C_L \) is
approximately 0.0044 in the linear range of the curves for all
conditions except for the condition of flaps on and \( R = 1,720,000 \),
for which the change is 0.0026. For this wing, the almost blunt
wing tips may contribute as much as 15 percent to the value
of \( \partial C_{\psi}/\partial C_L \). (See reference 7.)

The variations of \( C_{\psi} \) with lift coefficient for the rough
wing at a Reynolds number of 5,300,000 (fig. 17) are similar to
those for the smooth wing at a Reynolds number of 1,720,000. The
maximum values for the rough wing are approximately 60 percent of
those for the smooth wing at a Reynolds number of 5,300,000. The
maximum values were obtained near the lift coefficient at which
stalling first began (fig. 9). Little scale effect on \( C_{\psi} \) is
expected for the rough condition inasmuch as there was only a small scale effect on the aerodynamic characteristics of the rough wing in pitch.

As an aid in interpreting the values of $C_{\psi}$ in terms of effective dihedral, it may be noted that a unit change in geometric dihedral angle on a $40^\circ$ swept-back wing caused a change in $C_{\psi}$ varying from 0.00018 at $C_L = 0.2$ to 0.00012 at $C_L = 1.0$ (reference 8).

The slope of the curve of rolling-moment coefficient against angle of yaw (fig. 16) decreased at angles of yaw above $10^\circ$ for the smooth wing at high angles of attack. For the rough wing, the curve of $C_{\psi}$ for the flaps-off, high angle-of-attack condition (fig. 19) has a negative slope (negative effective dihedral) at small angles of yaw but has a large positive slope at angles of yaw above $10^\circ$.

**Yawing-moment characteristics.** The values of $C_{n\psi}$ for the smooth wing at the higher Reynolds numbers increased negatively with lift coefficient, which indicates increasing directional stability. Maximum values of $C_{n\psi}$ were about -0.0008 at $C_L = 1.0$ with flaps off and -0.0013 at $C_L = 1.25$ with flaps on. For the smooth wing at $R = 1,720,000$ and for the rough wing at $R = 5,300,000$, irregular variations in $C_{n\psi}$ are shown in figures 16 and 17 at moderate to high lift coefficients.

As shown in figure 18 the yawing-moment curves of the smooth wing at high angles of attack show reversals at angles of yaw above $10^\circ$ and $15^\circ$.

CONCLUSIONS

An investigation was made of a $42^\circ$ swept-back wing of aspect ratio 4, taper ratio 0.625, and NACA $64_{1}-112$ airfoil sections to determine its low-speed aerodynamic characteristics in pitch and in yaw at high Reynolds numbers. The following conclusions were indicated:
1. The wing characteristics at high angles of attack were greatly influenced by Reynolds number in the range from 1,700,000 to 5,300,000 but were little affected in the range from 5,300,000 to 9,500,000. The principal effect of increasing the value of Reynolds number was to delay wing stalling to higher angles of attack.

2. The maximum lift coefficients in the higher range of Reynolds number were about 1.1 without flaps and about 1.3 with half-span split flaps deflected 60°. Abrupt tip stalling caused unstable changes in the pitching moment at maximum lift.

3. The effective dihedral parameter $C_{\psi}$ varied approximately linearly with lift coefficient at a Reynolds number of 5,300,000 and reached a maximum value near maximum lift of about 0.0040 without flaps and 0.0050 with flaps.

4. At Reynolds numbers above 1,700,000, roughness in the form of carborundum grains applied to the wing leading edge had a large adverse effect on lift, drag, and pitching-moment characteristics. Roughness also reduced the maximum values of $C_{\psi}$.

5. The maximum static rolling moment produced by a 0.475 semispan spoiler at 72 percent chord was only 0.013.
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Figure 1.- System of axes used.
Figure 2. - Plan form of wing. Aspect ratio, 4.01; area, 4643 square inches; mean aerodynamic chord, 34.71 inches.
Figure 3. - Spoiler installation.
Figure 4. - Wing mounted for pitch tests in the Langley 19-foot pressure tunnel.
Figure 5. - Wing mounted for yaw tests in the Langley 19-foot pressure tunnel.
Figure 6. Lift characteristics for various values of Reynolds number, 42° swept-back wing with and without roughness; $\gamma = 0^\circ$.
Figure 6.- Concluded.
Figure 7.- Variation of maximum lift coefficient with Reynolds number.
Figure 8.—Stalling characteristics of 42° swept-back wing with leading edge smooth. $R = 6,800,000$. 

(a) Flaps off.

(b) Normal split flaps on.
Figure 9.— Stalling characteristics of 42° swept-back wing with leading edge roughness. $R=6,800,000$. 

(a) Flaps off.

(b) Flaps on.
Figure 10a - Pitching-moment characteristics for various values of Reynolds number, $h/2\theta$ swept-back wing with and without leading-edge roughness; $\theta = 0^\circ$
Figure 10.— Concluded.
Figure 11a. Drag characteristics for various values of Reynolds number, 42° swept-back wing with and without leading-edge roughness. $\beta = 0°$.
Figure 12: Glide characteristics of $42^\circ$ swept-back wing for wing loading of 40 pounds per square foot. Experimental data for $R = 8,100,000$. 

- ○ Flaps off, leading edge smooth
- □ Flaps off, leading edge rough
- △ Flaps on, leading edge smooth
- ▼ Flaps on, leading edge rough
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Figure 13.—Aerodynamic characteristics of $42^\circ$ swept-back wing with spoiler. Leading edge smooth; $R = 5,300,000$; $\beta = 0^\circ$. 

- $C_n$ versus $\alpha$, deg
- $C_L$ versus $\alpha$, deg
- $C_m$ versus $\alpha$, deg

- o-Spoiler off
- o-Spoiler on
Figure 14: Aerodynamic characteristics of $42^\circ$ swept-back wing with spoiler. Leading edge smooth; flaps on; $R = 5,300,000$; $\beta = 0^\circ$.
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Figure 15.—Aerodynamic characteristics of 42° swept-back wing with spoiler. Leading edge rough; flaps off; \( R = 5,300,000; \gamma = 0^\circ \).
Figure 16.- Lateral-stability parameters of smooth wing at several values of Reynolds number.
Figure 16.- Concluded.

(b) Flaps on.
Figure 17. Lateral-stability parameters of wing with leading-edge roughness. $R = 5,300,000$. 
Fig. 18a

(a) $C_l$, $C_n$, $C_y$ against $\psi$.

Figure 18.- Aerodynamic characteristics in yaw of smooth wing. $R = 5,300,000$. 
Fig. 18b

(b) $C_m$, $C_x$, $C_L$ against $\psi$.

Figure 18. - Concluded.
Figure 19a - Aerodynamic characteristics in yaw of wing with leading-edge roughness. $Re = 5,500,000$. 

(a) $C_l$, $C_m$, $C_n$ against $\psi$. 

- $C_l$ plots show a decrease in lift coefficient with increasing yaw angle. 
- $C_m$ plots indicate a decrease in pitching moment coefficient as the yaw angle increases. 
- $C_n$ plots reveal an increase in rolling moment coefficient with increasing yaw angle.

Key: 
- ○ Flaps off, $\alpha = 5.4^\circ$ 
- □ Flaps off, $\alpha = 14.9^\circ$ 
- ▲ Flaps on, $\alpha = 11.1^\circ$
Fig. 19b
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(b) $C_m$, $C_x$, $C_L$ against $\psi$.

Figure 19—Concluded.