

AD-TR-82-68

FINAL REPORT

EJECTION SEAT TESTING
FOR FEMALES

TEST TRACK DIVISION
6585TH TEST GROUP
HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE.
UNLIMITED.

DISTRIBUTION

ARMAMENT DIVISION

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND • UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA




AD A 122870

FILE COPY

82 12 30 031

REVIEWED AND APPROVED

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'A. V. Zaborowski', written in dark ink.

ALBERT V. ZABOROWSKI, Lt Colonel, USAF
Chief, Test Track Division
6585th Test Group (AFSC)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER AD-TR-82-68	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. A122 870	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Ejection Seat Testing for Females		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED November 1981-March 1982
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) C.D. Gragg Charles B. Evans, Maj, USAF Windell L. Gilliam		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) Technical Report (TR) AD-TR-82-68
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS 6585th Test Group (AFSC) Test Track Division Holloman AFB, New Mexico 88330		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS JON: 99930000
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 6585th Test Group (AFSC) Holloman AFB, New Mexico 88330		12. REPORT DATE 1 Nov 82
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) Same as item #11		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release. Distribution Unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) Same as item #16		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) anthropometry ejection seat female Test Track Chi-Squared ejection system testing statistical distributions		
20. ☒ ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Anthropometric data from a recent survey of female pilots was analyzed and compared with available DoD anthropometric surveys. The comparison showed the two populations to be of different distributions, pointing out the deficiency in using the DoD survey in designing escape system tests covering female aviators. Further, analysis of two existing anthropometric surveys of male aviators taken in 1950 & 1967 found a considerable change in seventeen years, indicating a need for a		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Block #20 (continued)

→ new survey of the contemporary population. Recommendations were made to change Military Standards and Specifications on ejection system and ejection systems testing to reflect inclusion of female aviators. ↑

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	



PREFACE

The authors are deeply grateful for the help and cooperation of the Air Training Command. Without their assistance this entire study would have ended inconclusively. We especially want to thank the Director of Professional Services, Col Richard S. Malone, also Major Rodger W. Dennes, and SMS Joseph Mitchell, all of Headquarters Air Training Command, Randolph AFB.

We are also most thankful for the help of those personnel who prepared the field reports. In particular: SSgt Michael A. Samuel, NCOIC, Flight Medicine, Mather AFB; TSgt Ronald S. MacLelland, NCOIC, Aeromedical Services, Williams AFB; the USAF Clinic, Vance AFB; Mr Lawrence Walker, Health Technician, Laughlin AFB; the USAF Hospital, Columbus AFB; and the USAF Hospital, Reese AFB.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE	2
APPROPRIATE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DOCUMENTS	2
SURVEYS	3
DISCUSSION	6
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	10
REFERENCES	11
APPENDIX A - GRAGG/ATC SURVEY	A-1
APPENDIX B - COMPARISON 1950/1967 MALE SURVEYS	B-1
APPENDIX C - COMPARISON GRAGG/1968 FEMALE SURVEY	C-1
DISTRIBUTION LIST	
FIGURE 1 - B-1 MAX DRI VS EJECTION VELOCITY	8
TABLE 1 - FEMALE PILOT PARAMETERS	4

INTRODUCTION

MIL-S-9479B (ref 1) provides USAF agencies with design specifications for the design, development, and qualification testing of ejection and extraction seats for USAF aircraft. Further guidance for testing is available in MIL-STD-846C (ref 2). Both documents explicitly require the system meet performance specifications when tested with dummies simulating fifth and ninety-fifth percentile personnel.

The gender of the personnel is not specified in either document. At the time of publication of each document, all pilots who flew in aircraft with ejection/extraction systems were male. With the admission of females to Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT), this is no longer valid. Female pilots ultimately destined for other types of aircraft are being trained in T-37 and T-38 aircraft. Class III crew members of both sexes, who are permitted a wider range of weights and heights than pilots, are flying in other high performance aircraft with ejection seat systems.

In addition, the standards need an updated data base from which to determine weights for flying personnel - of either gender.

We asked the Air Training Command to provide us the statures, weights, and sitting heights, where available, of their female flying personnel. We understood that these measurements already existed and that it was only a matter of assembling them.

We received excellent cooperation from the Air Training Command as we have previously acknowledged. They sent us the statures and weights of the 109 females which constituted their entire female flying population. Also, they provided us with 40 of the sitting heights. These data were obtained from Columbus, Laughlin, Mather, Reese, Vance, and Williams Air Force Bases using both rated and student personnel.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to address the validity of current test methods vis-a-vis the inclusion of females in the flying population and the inadequacy of current anthropometric surveys in representing the present flier of either gender. As a test agency, the 6585 Test Group will use the results to specify and procure anthropometric dummies for use in testing aircraft emergency egress systems.

APPROPRIATE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DOCUMENTS

There are many DoD documents which address different aspects of this problem. Several which appear most germane are listed below.

1. MIL-STD-846C is the previously mentioned document governing testing of ejection/extraction systems.

2. MIL-S-9479B is actually a specification for designing an ejection seat. This specification and MIL-STD-846C both specify use of 5th and 95th percentile dummies in testing.

3. AFSC Design Handbook 1-3 (ref 3) is a human factors engineering document which is designated in MIL-S-9479B as the reference document for anthropometric data on Air Force personnel. It contains results from anthropometric surveys for measurements of population parameters such as stature, sitting height, weight and other parameters relevant to system design.

4. DoD Handbook 743 (ref 4) is a summary and bibliography of several anthropometric surveys and points to two other official Department of Defense anthropometric data documents - MIL-STD-1472 (ref 5) and MIL-Handbook 759 (ref 6).

5. MIL-STD-1472 is the only official DoD source which contains anthropometric data on female personnel. It is limited to the 5th and 95th percentile values for selected body dimensions.

6. AFR 160-43 (ref 7) specifies the maximum and minimum dimensions which personnel must meet in order to be accepted into pilot training.

SURVEYS

Of the many anthropometric surveys available, four are most germane to the question at hand.

1. In 1954 Hertzberg, et al., published the results of a 1950 survey of 4063 male fliers, including all crew members of different types of aircraft (cargo, bombers, fighters, etc) (ref 8).
2. In 1967 Churchill, et al. conducted another survey of male fliers with a sample population of 2420. The unpublished USAF Systems Command anthropometric data was summarised in later publications (refs 9 and 10).
3. In 1972 Clauser published the results of a survey of 1905 female Air Force personnel including officers, enlisted and basic trainees (ref 11).
4. In 1982 Mr. Gragg requested data from the Air Training Command on the stature, weight and sitting height of females currently flying in T-37 and T-38 aircraft, either as trainees in UPT or flying as Instructor Pilots. ATC responded by sending data on the entire population at that time - 109 women. The raw data of that population is presented in Appendix A. Results of calculating the frequency ogive are presented in Table I.

To determine the effect of time on changes in population parameters, one anthropometric dimension (weight) was chosen and compared using a Chi-squared test to determine if the distribution of that parameter remained constant. The procedures used were:

1. Data from DoD Handbook 743 were used to construct the frequency ogives for the 1950 and 1967 male surveys. (Neither variable distribution was Gaussian.) These ogives are shown in Appendix B.
2. The percentage of the population falling in six selected weight classes were determined from the ogives.
3. The number of expected and observed occurrences were determined by arbitrarily selecting a population of 100 from each survey. The 1967 survey was labelled the reference (expected) frequency and the 1950 survey was the observed.

TABLE 1. FEMALE PILOT PARAMETERS

GRAGG/ATC SURVEY

STATURE		WEIGHT		SITTING HEIGHT	
%	INCHES	%	POUNDS	%	INCHES
5	64.0	5	114.5	5	33.6
10	64.0	10	116.9	10	34.0
15	64.1	15	120.4	15	34.0
20	64.5	20	122.8	20	34.0
25	64.9	25	123.3	25	34.5
30	65.0	30	125.0	30	34.5
35	65.0	35	126.0	35	34.5
40	65.5	40	128.0	40	34.5
45	65.5	45	129.0	45	34.8
50	66.0	50	130.0	50	34.9
55	66.0	55	131.0	55	35.0
60	66.5	60	134.0	60	35.0
65	67.0	65	135.0	65	35.0
70	67.0	70	138.3	70	35.4
75	67.5	75	141.0	75	35.8
80	68.0	80	142.2	80	36.0
85	68.5	85	144.0	85	36.3
90	69.0	90	149.5	90	36.8
95	70.0	95	155.0	95	37.1
Mean: 66.2		Mean: 131.8		Mean: 35.0	
Std Dev: 1.94		Std Dev: 12.19		Std Dev: 1.07	
Range: 63.0 to 72.0		Range: 102 to 166		Range: 33.0 to 37.5	
N=109		N=109		N=40	

4. The Chi-squared statistic was used to test the hypothesis that $H_0: \text{Distr}(1967) = \text{Distr}(1950)$. Work sheets for these calculations are shown in Appendix B. The result of the test indicates that the hypothesis must be rejected at all levels of statistical significance. The populations as characterized by this parameter are statistically different and decisions for one population cannot be inferred by using statistics from the other.

A similar comparison for females was performed between the 1968 survey by Clauser and the Gragg/ATC survey of 1982. The same procedures were used except:

1. The observed frequencies are those reported in the Gragg/ATC survey.
2. The expected frequencies are based on the ogive for the Clauser survey. (Source data were found in DoD Handbook 743.)

Work sheets are provided in Appendix C. Again both populations were non-Gaussian distributed.

The test result again indicates that the hypothesis that the populations are the same must be rejected. The only available official anthropometric data on women does not represent the current female flying population.

This is not a surprising conclusion, because besides the 14 year difference in the surveys, the Gragg/ATC survey includes women who are required to meet AFR 160-43 which would tend to eliminate women who are small and slender. (In the current population, there were a few women flying with waivers for minimum weight or height.) In fact, if the 1968 survey is used, only women exceeding the 55th percentile in stature and 60th percentile in sitting height would be admitted into UPT, per AFR 160-43. The minimum weight permitted by AFR 160-43 corresponds to a 6th percentile in the 1968 survey. (Note that there is no such thing as a "fifth percentile female". The percentiles refer to population parameters and an individual who is 50th percentile in stature would only coincidentally be 50th percentile in any other parameter.)

DISCUSSION

The principal questions addressed in this report actually lead to a number of questions implicit to the issues. For example, given that MIL-STD-846C and MIL-S-9479B specify testing with 5th and 95th percentile dummies, does this imply that it is only cost effective to include the middle 90 per cent of the population? If so, 90 percent of what? From AFR 160-43, Class III fliers can be as tall as 80 inches with weights as high as 265 lb. Or they may be as short as 60 inches and as light as 92 lb. For Class I, IA or II, the range of weights is from a 103 lb female to a 241 lb male. As shown above, the weights found in AFSC DH 1-3 reflect a 1967 population and probably are not representative of a 1982 population (as indicated by the difference between 1950 and 1967 plus the inclusion of female fliers). The weights given in Section 2B11 of AFSC DH 1-3 are 140 lb for a 5th percentile and 211 lb for a 95th.

The ramification of considering the middle 90 per cent when testing ejection systems is best considered in light of failure mechanisms or more specifically, the phenomena that cause a system to fail to meet specifications. As mentioned above, weight is considered the most critical parameter in ejection testing, relative to stature, sitting height, etc. This is because the weight of the seat/dummy mass directly effects the acceleration of the system when the catapult or rocket is burning, whereas stature or sitting height affect only the location of the center of gravity of the seat/dummy mass. Small variations in stature or sitting height make almost negligible variations in the location of the c.g.

For light dummies, the most common failure mode found in testing is exceeding the Dynamic Response Index (DRI). The DRI is a model of expected compression of the spine due to acceleration along the spine.

For heavier occupants, the most critical point is being able to clear the tail of the aircraft. This failure phenomenon is not normally seen in track testing due to the relatively benign environment (zero sink/rise rate, zero roll and pitch, etc), but is a critical design factor in ejection systems. This end of the weight range is not changed significantly by addition of females.

So, this leaves only the low end of the weight spectrum which needs attention. The point to be resolved becomes how much of the light end of the spectrum to consider. If only the center 90 per cent of the population is to be considered in testing, over 70 percent of the current Air Force Class I/II female fliers would be below the minimum weights tested. Further, it seems imprudent to not anticipate a day when females are allowed in combat. If and when this eventuality occurs, the proportion of female aviators can be expected to increase substantially. The ejection systems being designed and tested today are the systems that will be in the field for the next two decades. So, if the females are not considered now, an untenable situation could result in the future. This leads to two further questions: 1) Are any additional costs incurred by considering lighter personnel, where costs can reflect technological risks as well as capital outlay? and 2) If the cost is sufficiently low, what data should be used to determine proper weights to test?

To address the cost question each aircraft with lightweight fliers needs to be checked individually to determine the effect of decreasing the Total Ejected Weight of an ejection system by 20 to 25 lbs. Now, in addition to the T-37 and T-38, this includes a few models such as the F-4 which carry Class III fliers as photographers, etc. To determine the effects on lighter fliers in existing aircraft requires more data than is available to the Test Track. Results of such a study might ultimately require retesting of some systems.

In the near future the T-46A will be introduced to replace the T-37 and T-38 as the prime USAF trainer so it should be given special attention. Current plans for the T-46A call for use of an ACES II ejection system, specifically one identical to or very similar to one tested here for the B-1 project. Data from those B-1 tests indicate a remarkable insensitivity of the DRI to the Total Ejected Weight for dummy weights from 135 to 210 lbs. This can be seen in Figure 1, a plot of maximum DRI's versus nominal ejection speed. Using the three weights tested (5th, 50th and 95th percentiles), as sample groups, the means were compared to determine if there was a significant difference. The test failed, i.e., there was no statistical difference in the sample means. (Sample sizes: 5th - 11, 50th - 2, 95th - 14)

B-1 MAX DRI VS EJECTION VELOCITY




Figure 1

Given this finding, it would seem that the technological risk of considering lighter fliers may be acceptably low if the B-1 data does not have to be extrapolated very far below the 135 lb 5th percentile male weight. This leads to the second major question, 90 percent of what?

The answer we propose is to test for 90 percent of the male pilots and 90 percent of the female pilots, considering the populations as separate and overlapping - 5th percentile female to 95th percentile male. Given that the data in AFSC DH 1-3 represents the most current survey of the male flying population, those data should be used to determine the upper end for testing. As a population for determining female parameters, we recommend that the results of the Gragg/ATC survey be used. This is a rather small sample as anthropometric surveys go (109 samples), but is a better indicator than the Clauser survey which included a random sample from a general Air Force female population, not just aviators.

This results in testing for pilots with weights from 114.5 lb to 211 lb, statures from 64 inches to 73.9 inches and sitting heights from 33.6 inches to 38.8 inches. This is a reduction of approximately 20 lbs in low-end weight from the B-1 data (25 from DH 1-3), 1.9 inches in stature, and 1.1 inches in sitting height. This degree of extrapolation is certainly the limit of prudence.

This approach results in testing for more than 90 percent of the flying population. But, this is applaudable if the technological risk is as low as may be indicated.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. AFSC Design Handbook 1-3, the current document governing anthropometric parameters to which ejection systems should be tested, needs updating in two ways: first, it reflects only male parameters when there is an increasing female flying population; and second, the parameters listed for males are results of a survey taken fifteen years ago.

2. Our statistical tests indicate substantial changes in population parameters occurred in the seventeen years prior to the survey reflected in AFSC DH1-3. Given the potential for like changes since 1967, we recommend that a new survey of the flying population be made and that governing anthropometric documents be changed to reflect the contemporary population.

3. Given the inclusion of female pilots flying in ejection systems, we recommend that all future ejection system testing be conducted with anthropometric dummies which reflect stature and weight parameters ranging from the ninety fifth percentile male defined by AFSC DH 1-3 (until a new survey can be conducted) to fifth percentile females as defined by the Gragg/ATC survey of 1982.

REFERENCES

1. Military Specification, Seat System, Upward Ejection, Aircraft, General Specification For, MIL-S-9479B, 27 June 1973.
2. "Military Standard Escape System Testing: Ground, Track and Flight Test", MIL-STD-846C, 22 January 1974.
3. "Human Factors Engineering", AFSC Design Handbook 1-3, Third Edition, Revision 1, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, June 80.
4. "Anthropometry of U.S. Military Personnel (Metric)", DOD Handbook 743, 3 October 1980.
5. "Human Engineering Design Criteria For Military Systems, Equipment and Facilities", MIL STD 1472, 9 February 1968.
6. "Human Factors Engineering Design For Army Materiel", MIL HDBK 759, 12 March 1975.
7. "Medical Examination and Medical Standards", AF Regulation 160-43 Department of the Air Force, Headquarters US Air Force, Washington DC, 19 November 1979. Also be sure to obtain a copy of Interim Message Change (IMC) 80-3, 1 October 1980.
8. Hertzberg, H.T.E., G.S. Daniels, and E. Churchill, "Anthropometry of Flying Personnel-1950", WADC Technical Report 52-321, Aero Medical Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, September 1954.
9. "Anthropometric Source Book, Volume II: A Handbook of Anthropometric Data", NASA Reference Publication 1024, Scientific and Technical Information Office, 1978.
10. Grunhofer, H.J., et al, "A Review of Anthropometric Data of German Air Force and United States Air Force Flying Personnel 1967-1968", AGARD, AD-A010 674, Paris, France, April 1975.
11. Clauser, Charles E., Pearl E. Tucker, Joan A. Reardon, John T. McConville, E. Churchill, and Lloyd L. Lauback, "Anthropometry of Air Force Women", AMRL-TR-70-5, Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, April 1972.

APPENDIX A
GRAGG/ATC SURVEY

SUBJECT NO.	STATURE (IN.)	WEIGHT (LB.)	SITTING HEIGHT (IN.)
1	72.0	166	
2	71.0	144	
3	71.0	130	37.25
4	70.0	155	
5	70.0	140	36.25
6	70.0	126	
7	69.5	150	
8	69.0	155	
9	69.0	155	
10	69.0	149	
11	69.0	144	36.5
12	69.0	138	37.5
13	69.0	130	37.0
14	69.0	125	
15	68.75	128	
16	68.5	141	37.0
17	68.5	130	36.0
18	68.5	123	35.0
19	68.0	148	
20	68.0	145	
21	68.0	143	34.5
22	68.0	129	34.75
23	68.0	124	
24	68.0	120	35.0
25	67.5	165	36.25
26	67.5	156	
27	67.5	142	
28	67.5	135	
29	67.5	120	
30	67.0	152	35.0
31	67.0	146	34.5
32	67.0	136	
33	67.0	134	
34	67.0	128	
35	67.0	127.5	34.5
36	67.0	126	34.0

37	67.0	125	
38	67.0	123	
39	66.75	111	35.0
40	66.5	150	36.0
41	66.5	150	
42	66.5	144	35.5
43	66.5	137	35.0
44	66.5	129	
45	66.5	124	35.5
46	66.0	140	
47	66.0	139	
48	66.0	135	
49	66.0	135	
50	66.0	131	
51	66.0	130	
52	66.0	129	
53	66.0	126	
54	66.0	123	
55	66.0	122	34.5
56	66.0	121	
57	66.0	116	
58	65.5	147	36.0
59	65.5	144	
60	65.5	142	34.75
61	65.5	141	
62	65.5	135	
63	65.5	130	
64	65.5	128	
65	65.5	126	
66	65.5	117	
67	65.5	113	
68	65.25	142	
69	65.0	144	35.0
70	65.0	142	
71	65.0	140	

72	65.0	135	34.5
73	65.0	135	
74	65.0	130	34.75
75	65.0	127	
76	65.0	125	34.0
77	65.0	123	
78	65.0	123	34.5
79	65.0	122	
80	65.0	114	34.0
81	65.0	104	
82	64.75	102	35.25
83	64.5	141	
84	64.5	136	34.5
85	64.5	133	
86	64.5	131	
87	64.5	125	34.0
88	64.5	122	
89	64.5	122	
90	64.5	120	
91	64.5	113	35.0
92	64.25	129	
93	64.0	134	
94	64.0	133	34.0
95	64.0	131	33.0
96	64.0	131	
97	64.0	130	33.5
98	64.0	126	34.0
99	64.0	123	
100	64.0	119	
101	64.0	119	
102	64.0	116	
103	64.0	116	
104	64.0	113	
105	63.5	125	
106	63.25	115	
107	63.0	134	34.5
108	63.0	129	
109	63.0	125	33.75

APPENDIX B

COMPARISON OF 1967 SURVEY AND 1950 SURVEY OF
MALE USAF FLYING PERSONNEL

1. 1950 SURVEY RESULTS

Upper Bound Of Interval	Relative Percentage	Cumulative Percentage	Frequency Of Occurrence
70 kg	0.35	0.35	$100 \times .35 = 35$
75 kg	0.20	0.55	20
80 kg	0.19	0.74	19
85 kg	0.11	0.85	11
90 kg	0.09	0.94	9
infinity	<u>0.06</u>	1.00	<u>6</u>
Total	1.00		100

2. 1967 SURVEY RESULTS

Upper Bound Of Interval	Relative Percentage	Cumulative Percentage	Frequency Of Occurrence
70 kg	0.19	0.19	$100 \times .19 = 19$
75 kg	0.21	0.40	21
80 kg	0.19	0.59	19
85 kg	0.16	0.75	16
90 kg	0.11	0.86	11
infinity	<u>0.14</u>	1.00	<u>14</u>
Total	1.00		100

3. Calculate the Chi-squared statistic by the formula

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \frac{(o_i - e_i)^2}{e_i}$$

where k = number of intervals

o_i = observed

e_i = expected

$$\chi^2_c = 20.02$$

Note: Degrees of freedom to be used with this determination is

$$\text{d.f.} = (k-1) - p$$

where k = number of intervals

p = number of parameters
estimated from data.

$$\text{d.f.} = (6-1) - 1 = 4$$

$\chi^2_c > \chi^2_{\alpha, 4}$ for all values of α of statistical interest.
Therefore, reject the hypothesis that the two distributions
are equal.

APPENDIX C

USAF WOMEN (1968) COMPARED TO

GRAGG/ATC SURVEY OF WOMEN FLIERS (1982)

1. The data for the USAF Women (1968) survey is taken from reference 4, page 441. This is used as the reference to determine the "expected" values for use in the Chi-squared evaluation.

2. The "observed" values are those values found in the Gragg/ATC survey of women fliers. The raw data for that survey are in Appendix A.

3. Evaluation of the hypothesis

$$H_0: D_o = D_e$$

Upper Bound Of Interval	Cum Freq	Rel Freq	Expected	Observed
50 kg	0.155	0.155	16.895	2
56 kg	0.445	0.290	31.61	26
60 kg	0.650	0.205	22.345	34
66 kg	0.865	0.215	23.432	33
70 kg	0.940	0.075	8.175	8
infinity	1.000	<u>0.060</u>	<u>6.540</u>	<u>6</u>
Total		1.000	109.000	109

$$\chi^2_c = 24.2$$

$$d.f. = 4$$

Reject H_0 at all levels of significance. The distribution of weights obtained by polling the existing population of female fliers in Air Training Command is significantly different from the distribution of female weights contained in MIL-STD-1472 (or DoD Handbook 743).