

AIR FORCE



HUMAN RESOURCES

AD-A212 763

**FIELD-OF-VIEW VARIATIONS AND STRIPE-
TEXTURING EFFECTS ON ASSAULT LANDING
PERFORMANCE IN THE C-130 WEAPON
SYSTEM TRAINER**

**Robert S. Kellogg
David C. Hubbard**

University of Dayton Research Institute
300 College Park Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45469

Michael J. Sieverding, Major, USAF

ASD/YWB Program Manager
Training Systems Development
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433-6503

**OPERATIONS TRAINING DIVISION
Williams Air Force Base, Arizona 85240-6457**

August 1989
Final Technical Report for Period February 1986 - December 1988

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

LABORATORY

**AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS 78235-5601**

89 9 18 033

NOTICE

When Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than in connection with a definitely Government-related procurement, the United States Government incurs no responsibility or any obligation whatsoever. The fact that the Government may have formulated or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data, is not to be regarded by implication, or otherwise in any manner construed, as licensing the holder, or any other person or corporation; or as conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

The Public Affairs Office has reviewed this report, and it is releasable to the National Technical Information Service, where it will be available to the general public, including foreign nationals.

This report has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

DEE H. ANDREWS, Technical Advisor
Operations Training Division

HAROLD G. JENSEN, Colonel, USAF
Commander

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No 0704-0188

1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS			
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			
2b DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE						
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) AFHRL-TR-89-3			
6a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION University of Dayton Research Institute		6b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		7a NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Operations Training Division		
6c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 300 College Park Dayton, Ohio 45469			7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Air Force Human Resources Laboratory Williams Air Force Base, Arizona 85240-6457			
8a NAME OF FUNDING SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Air Force Human Resources Laboratory		8b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) HQ AFHRL		9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER F33615-87-C-0012		
8c ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235-5601			10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS			
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO 62205F	PROJECT NO 1123	TASK NO 03	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO 83
11 TITLE (Include Security Classification) Field-of-View Variations and Stripe-Texturing Effects on Assault Landing Performance in the C-130 Weapon System Trainer						
12 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Kellogg, R.S., Hubbard, D.C., & Sieverding, M.J.						
13a TYPE OF REPORT Final		13b TIME COVERED FROM Feb 86 TO Dec 88		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) August 1989		15 PAGE COUNT 24
16 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION						
17 COSATI CODES			18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)			
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	C-130 flight training, simulation			
01	02		data base texturing, landing visual displays			
05	09		field of view pilot performance			
19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Two experiments were conducted using the C-130 Weapon System Trainer (WST) located at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas. These experiments were the first of a series of research and development efforts designed to provide input to specification of the visual requirements for the C-17 flight simulator. Both studies assessed the effect of an experimental manipulation upon pilot performance of an assault landing. The basic experimental design for each was a randomized block repeated measures. For each study, ten experienced C-130 pilots served as subjects. The first study investigated the effect of limiting the field of view (FOV) of the WST by reducing the five-channel, six-window visual system to two channels and two windows. The second study investigated the effect of data base texturing upon pilot performance. No strongly significant FOV effects were obtained in the first study. However, the results of the second study indicated that data base texturing improved the pilots' ability to fly at lower altitudes and place the aircraft closer to the center line during landing and touchdown.						
20 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS PPT ☐ DTIC USERS			21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			
22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Nancy J. Allin, Chief, STINFO Branch			22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (512) 536-3877		22c OFFICE SYMBOL AFHRL/SCV	

SUMMARY

The objectives of the present effort were twofold: (a) to determine the effects of variations in window configurations on pilot performance in the C-130 Weapon System Trainer (WST) and (b) to study the differences in pilot performance as a function of the new stripe color texturing as compared to color with no texturing. These objectives were accomplished by using the existing on-board computer systems and hardware available in the C-130 WST located at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas. Much of the impetus for conducting these studies derived from the need to determine future visual system requirements for the C-17 flight simulator currently under development. The C-130 is considered a generic wide-bodied aircraft; thus, the findings from this aircraft may be considered relevant to the new C-17. It has already been determined that the C-17 will have window configurations and mission profiles nearly identical to those of the C-130. In both part (a) and part (b) of this study, experienced C-130 instructor pilots and fully qualified operational pilots served as subjects. In each case, they were required to fly standard combat assault landings and to adhere as closely as possible to the optimum flight parameters. The experimental manipulations involved two different window configurations and two texture conditions. The results showed no strongly significant differences in the two window conditions; however, there were statistically significant differences in the texture condition versus the no texture condition.

Accession For
 1971-1972
 1973-1974
 1975-1976
 1977-1978
 1979-1980
 1981-1982
 1983-1984
 1985-1986
 1987-1988
 1989-1990
 1991-1992
 1993-1994
 1995-1996
 1997-1998
 1999-2000
 2001-2002
 2003-2004
 2005-2006
 2007-2008
 2009-2010
 2011-2012
 2013-2014
 2015-2016
 2017-2018
 2019-2020
 2021-2022
 2023-2024
 2025-2026
 2027-2028
 2029-2030
 2031-2032
 2033-2034
 2035-2036
 2037-2038
 2039-2040
 2041-2042
 2043-2044
 2045-2046
 2047-2048
 2049-2050
 2051-2052
 2053-2054
 2055-2056
 2057-2058
 2059-2060
 2061-2062
 2063-2064
 2065-2066
 2067-2068
 2069-2070
 2071-2072
 2073-2074
 2075-2076
 2077-2078
 2079-2080
 2081-2082
 2083-2084
 2085-2086
 2087-2088
 2089-2090
 2091-2092
 2093-2094
 2095-2096
 2097-2098
 2099-2100
 2101-2102
 2103-2104
 2105-2106
 2107-2108
 2109-2110
 2111-2112
 2113-2114
 2115-2116
 2117-2118
 2119-2120
 2121-2122
 2123-2124
 2125-2126
 2127-2128
 2129-2130
 2131-2132
 2133-2134
 2135-2136
 2137-2138
 2139-2140
 2141-2142
 2143-2144
 2145-2146
 2147-2148
 2149-2150
 2151-2152
 2153-2154
 2155-2156
 2157-2158
 2159-2160
 2161-2162
 2163-2164
 2165-2166
 2167-2168
 2169-2170
 2171-2172
 2173-2174
 2175-2176
 2177-2178
 2179-2180
 2181-2182
 2183-2184
 2185-2186
 2187-2188
 2189-2190
 2191-2192
 2193-2194
 2195-2196
 2197-2198
 2199-2200
 2201-2202
 2203-2204
 2205-2206
 2207-2208
 2209-2210
 2211-2212
 2213-2214
 2215-2216
 2217-2218
 2219-2220
 2221-2222
 2223-2224
 2225-2226
 2227-2228
 2229-2230
 2231-2232
 2233-2234
 2235-2236
 2237-2238
 2239-2240
 2241-2242
 2243-2244
 2245-2246
 2247-2248
 2249-2250
 2251-2252
 2253-2254
 2255-2256
 2257-2258
 2259-2260
 2261-2262
 2263-2264
 2265-2266
 2267-2268
 2269-2270
 2271-2272
 2273-2274
 2275-2276
 2277-2278
 2279-2280
 2281-2282
 2283-2284
 2285-2286
 2287-2288
 2289-2290
 2291-2292
 2293-2294
 2295-2296
 2297-2298
 2299-2300
 2301-2302
 2303-2304
 2305-2306
 2307-2308
 2309-2310
 2311-2312
 2313-2314
 2315-2316
 2317-2318
 2319-2320
 2321-2322
 2323-2324
 2325-2326
 2327-2328
 2329-2330
 2331-2332
 2333-2334
 2335-2336
 2337-2338
 2339-2340
 2341-2342
 2343-2344
 2345-2346
 2347-2348
 2349-2350
 2351-2352
 2353-2354
 2355-2356
 2357-2358
 2359-2360
 2361-2362
 2363-2364
 2365-2366
 2367-2368
 2369-2370
 2371-2372
 2373-2374
 2375-2376
 2377-2378
 2379-2380
 2381-2382
 2383-2384
 2385-2386
 2387-2388
 2389-2390
 2391-2392
 2393-2394
 2395-2396
 2397-2398
 2399-2400
 2401-2402
 2403-2404
 2405-2406
 2407-2408
 2409-2410
 2411-2412
 2413-2414
 2415-2416
 2417-2418
 2419-2420
 2421-2422
 2423-2424
 2425-2426
 2427-2428
 2429-2430
 2431-2432
 2433-2434
 2435-2436
 2437-2438
 2439-2440
 2441-2442
 2443-2444
 2445-2446
 2447-2448
 2449-2450
 2451-2452
 2453-2454
 2455-2456
 2457-2458
 2459-2460
 2461-2462
 2463-2464
 2465-2466
 2467-2468
 2469-2470
 2471-2472
 2473-2474
 2475-2476
 2477-2478
 2479-2480
 2481-2482
 2483-2484
 2485-2486
 2487-2488
 2489-2490
 2491-2492
 2493-2494
 2495-2496
 2497-2498
 2499-2500
 2501-2502
 2503-2504
 2505-2506
 2507-2508
 2509-2510
 2511-2512
 2513-2514
 2515-2516
 2517-2518
 2519-2520
 2521-2522
 2523-2524
 2525-2526
 2527-2528
 2529-2530
 2531-2532
 2533-2534
 2535-2536
 2537-2538
 2539-2540
 2541-2542
 2543-2544
 2545-2546
 2547-2548
 2549-2550
 2551-2552
 2553-2554

PREFACE

The work was performed in support of the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory's Technical Planning Objective 3, the thrust of which is Aircrew Tactics and Training. The general objective of this thrust is to identify and demonstrate cost-effective training strategies and training equipment capabilities for use in developing and maintaining the combat effectiveness of Air Force aircrew members. This particular study was conducted under Work Unit 1123-03-83, Flying Training Research Support, Contract No. F33615-87-C-0012, and is responsive to a need expressed by the Air Force Deputy for Simulators for empirical data that relate aircrew training effectiveness to those simulator design factors which significantly impact overall system costs. The results obtained here give some indication as to the visual system requirements in the emerging C-17 aircraft, and may apply to other aircraft as well.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. FIELD-OF-VIEW STUDY.....	1
Method.....	2
Results.....	4
III. TEXTURE STUDY.....	10
Method.....	11
Results.....	11
IV. DISCUSSION.....	17
REFERENCES.....	18

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1 C-130 WST Window Configuration	2
2 Top View of Pilot's Total Horizontal Field of View	4

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 FOV Multivariate Tests (MANOVA)	5
2 FOV Univariate Tests - 1/2 Mile Out	6
3 FOV Univariate Tests - Threshold	7
4 FOV Univariate Tests - Touchdown.....	8
5 FOV Means	9
6 Texture Multivariate Tests.....	12
7 Texture Univariate Tests - 1/2 Mile Out.....	13
8 Texture Univariate Tests - Threshold	14
9 Texture Univariate Tests - Touchdown	15
10 Texture Means.....	16

FIELD-OF-VIEW VARIATIONS AND STRIPE-TEXTURING
EFFECTS ON ASSAULT LANDING PERFORMANCE IN THE
C-130 WEAPON SYSTEM TRAINER

I. INTRODUCTION

The present effort examines the effects of field of view (FOV) and stripe texturing on assault landing performance in the C-130 Weapon System Trainer (WST), which can be looked upon as representative of Air Force wide-bodied aircraft. The C-130 WST located at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas, has been identified as an excellent test platform on which to carry out research and development (R&D) on simulator characteristics and training methods. This system has been used to investigate both training procedures and visual display qualities. The trainer, because it represents a state-of-the-art visual system, offers an effective tool for pursuing R&D on visual system characteristics such as FOV and stripe texturing.

The C-130 WST is especially important as a research device in that the findings from this system may be generalized to the C-17 now under development by the Air Force because the C-17 will have a mission profile which is almost identical to that of the C-130 as well as a very similar window configuration. Such research using the C-130 WST will allow determination of C-17 simulator visual system requirements to be accomplished well in advance of the aircraft's inclusion in the Air Force inventory, and also provide Air Force procurement agencies with useful design characteristics for future wide-bodied simulators.

II. FIELD-OF-VIEW STUDY

The WST visual system provides computer-generated imagery of out-of-the-window visual cues. The system can provide day, dusk, and night scenes and presents imagery using a six-window, five-channel, color cathode-ray tube (CRT) display system with infinity optics. The visual data base currently contains more than 300,000 square miles of real-world terrain and cultural features, with over 80 hand-modeled airfields, airdrop/assault landing zones, and low-altitude parachute extraction zones throughout the world. The image generator is capable of generating 8,000 visible edges and 4,000 point lights simultaneously. Other features include surface (stripe) texturing and the capability to generate several moving models (aircraft, missiles, or land vehicles) simultaneously. With this visual system, simulator training has been expanded to include: visual approaches and landings; engine-out go-arounds; low-level navigation; visual slowdown, run in, airdrop, and escape; visual formation flying; night vision goggles procedures; hostile environment training; and special operations training.

Any combination of the six visual windows may be used for research purposes, allowing great flexibility in experimental design. In addition, the system has the capacity to record and document various flight parameters which may be needed for the development of performance measures. In short, the C-130 WST is an excellent test bed for wide-bodied simulator research. For a more detailed description of this system, see the C-130 Flight Simulator Operating Instructions (1982 & 1983).

Method

Subjects. The 10 subjects for this phase of the study were experienced C-130 operational and instructor pilots.

Approach. Each subject performed a series of 16 assault landings using two alternative window configurations (i.e., FOV conditions). Figure 1 shows a top-view diagram of the windows and crew positions in the C-130 WST. The six windows receive five channels of visual information with the two forward windows, A and A', sharing the same visual channel. The two FOV conditions used were: condition 1, all windows operational; condition 2, only windows A and B operational. The only crew position occupied was that of the pilot. The experimenter was seated at the aft console and monitored the data results on each run.




Figure 1. C-130 WST Window Configuration.

Figure 2 shows a top view of the total horizontal FOV that is available to the pilot in the WST. The forward window, window A, has a horizontal width of 43° , with a 2.5° blank space separating it from window B. Window B and window D are each 47° , and they are separated by a 3° blank space. The height of each window is 35 feet. The pilot's FOV is quite limited on the right side due to the optical effects produced by the arrangement of the windows: To the right of window A, there is a 33° blank space, followed by an 11.3° window of visibility, followed by an 11.3° blank space and finally an 11.3° far-side view.

The assault landing was chosen as the experimental task because it represents a high workload, high performance demand procedure for even the most experienced pilots. The pilot must successfully land the aircraft on a short, usually rugged runway while maintaining very precise flight parameters (see C-130 Flight Simulator Operating Instructions 1982 & 1983).

The experimental procedure was to initialize the simulation at 2.2 nautical miles on a final approach to the assault landing. The pilot was instructed to fly the aircraft and attempt at all times to approach as closely as possible the optimum flight parameters for the landing. On each successive run, the window configuration was changed. Half of the subjects began in FOV condition 1, and the other half began with FOV condition 2. The subjects alternated between the two conditions for a total of 16 trials (8 in each condition). Each run was conducted under unobscured daylight conditions, with no crosswinds, no turbulence, and no aircraft system malfunctions.

For each run, the C-130 WST on-board system was programmed by the experimenter to reset the aircraft at 2.2 miles, change window conditions and release the system for the next run. The on-board computer automatically recorded and printed out a hard copy of performance data for the following critical flight parameters at 1/2 nautical mile out, at threshold, and at touchdown: (a) airspeed, (b) rate of descent, (c) angle of attack (AOA), (d) altitude above ground level (AGL), (e) distance from runway threshold, and (f) distance to right or left of runway center line.

The 6-degree-of-freedom motion system was operative on each experimental run so that the pilot received proprioceptive, kinesthetic and vestibular cues during the assault landings. In addition, each pilot wore a headset which supplied realistic auditory cues during experimental runs.

The full set of experimental runs for each pilot took approximately 1 hour, including stops, resets, and reconfiguration of the system at the on-board console.




Figure 2. Top View of Pilot's Total Horizontal Field of View.

Results

A separate analysis was conducted on the data at each of the three points of the course: 1/2 mile out, threshold, and touchdown (see Tables 1 through 5). Of the six parameters recorded, five were analyzed at each location. Airspeed, rate of descent, AOA, center line deviation, and altitude AGL were analyzed at 1/2 mile out and at threshold. At touchdown, distance from threshold replaced the AGL parameter for analysis purposes.

The data were analyzed using a split-plot analysis of variance approach. Subjects were grouped according to the FOV each received first. The two FOV conditions were compared within subjects. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed first, followed by a univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) on each of the five performance variables.

The FOV by subjects-within-groups interaction term (the split-plot error term used to test FOV and FOV-by-group effects) was first tested by the replication error term with MANOVA and ANOVA analyses to determine whether or not it would be appropriate to pool these terms into a single error term for the split-plot effects. These tests were not significant; so, the pooled error term was formed to test for FOV effects. No significant FOV effects were discovered with the MANOVA or ANOVA tests for 1/2 mile out or threshold. A significant univariate group-by-FOV interaction was found for descent rate, as well as a significant

Table 1. FOV Multivariate Tests (MANOVA)

Effect	Wilks' Lambda	F	df	p
<u>1/2 Mile Out</u>				
Group	.492	0.83	(5,4)	.590
FOV	.982	0.53	(5,144)	.750
Group by FOV	.984	0.16	(5,144)	.803
<u>Threshold</u>				
Group	.242	2.50	(5,4)	.197
FOV	.975	0.74	(5,144)	.592
Group by FOV	.972	0.82	(5,144)	.536
<u>Touchdown</u>				
Group	.343	1.53	(5,4)	.350
FOV	.967	0.98	(5,144)	.434
Group by FOV	.934	2.05	(5,144)	.076

Table 2. FOV Univariate Tests--1/2 Mile Out

Effect	F	df	p
Group		(1,8)	
Airspeed	0.01		.932
Descent Rate	1.12		.320
AOA	0.40		.543
AGL	0.65		.444
Center Line Deviation	1.41		.269
FOV		(1,148)	
Airspeed	1.48		.226
Descent Rate	1.04		.310
AOA	0.44		.509
AGL	1.49		.225
Center Line Deviation	0.25		.616
Group by FOV		(1,148)	
Airspeed	0.09		.770
Descent Rate	0.54		.464
AOA	0.86		.355
AGL	0.35		.557
Center Line Deviation	1.06		.305

Table 3. FOV Univariate Tests--Threshold

Effect	F	df	p
Group		(1,8)	
Airspeed	2.96		.124
Descent Rate	0.04		.843
AOA	3.72		.090
AGL	0.24		.638
Center Line Deviation	3.78		.088
FOV		(1,148)	
Airspeed	0.01		.925
Descent Rate	0.99		.321
AOA	1.52		.220
AGL	1.45		.230
Center Line Deviation	0.74		.392
Group by FOV		(1,148)	
Airspeed	1.06		.304
Descent Rate	3.71		.056
AOA	0.03		.860
AGL	0.66		.418
Center Line Deviation	0.02		.880

Table 4. FOV Univariate Tests--Touchdown

Effect	F	df	p
Group		(1,8)	
Airspeed	3.11		.116
Descent Rate	0.48		.507
AOA	0.65		.443
Distance From Threshold	0.01		.921
Center Line Deviation	3.61		.094
FOV		(1,148)	
Airspeed	0.17		.682
Descent Rate	1.05		.306
AOA	3.79		.053
Distance From Threshold	2.29		.132
Center Line Deviation	0.27		.604
Group by FOV		(1,148)	
Airspeed	3.16		.078
Descent Rate	6.55		.012
AOA	1.61		.206
Distance From Threshold	2.06		.153
Center Line Deviation	0.48		.489

Table 5. FOV Means

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Narrow FOV</u>	<u>Wide FOV</u>	<u>Standard error</u>
<u>1/2 Mile Out</u>				
Airspeed	115	117.4	117.0	0.2
Rate of Descent	800	779.3	755.7	16.3
AOA	2.5	3.39	3.45	0.07
AGL	150	178.5	174.8	2.1
Center Line Dev.	0.0	-11.2	-12.2	1.4

Threshold

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Narrow FOV</u>	<u>Wide FOV</u>	<u>Standard error</u>
Airspeed	115	112.0	112.0	0.2
Rate of Descent	400	502.8	480.9	15.6
AOA	2.5	4.49	4.31	0.10
AGL	17.5	9.4	10.0	0.4
Center Line Dev.	0.0	-5.4	-6.0	0.5

Touchdown

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Narrow FOV</u>	<u>Wide FOV</u>	<u>Standard error</u>
Airspeed	105	110.6	110.5	0.2
Rate of Descent	250	422.5	398.7	16.4
AOA *	4.5	4.9	4.6	0.1
Dist. from Thres.	250	230.7	256.1	11.8
Center Line Dev.	0	-5.6	-6.0	0.5

* Significant univariate difference in the absence of a multivariate effect

FOV effect for AOA. However, since none of the MANOVAs were significant, these results are considered tentative at best. If there is any FOV effect at all, it is that the mean AOA at touchdown is closer to the ideal of 4.5 with the wide FOV than it is with the narrow FOV (see Table 5).

III. TEXTURE STUDY

Previous research on texturing has indicated that surface texture patterns provide pilots with altitude maintenance information (Edwards, Pohlman, Buckland, & Stephens, 1981; McCormick, Smith, Lewandowski, Preskar, & Martin, 1983) and runway alignment information (Kraft, Anderson, & Elworth, 1982). Kraft and his associates studied two levels of scene complexity, which were designated as "simple" and "complex." The simple scene was a blue/black runway in a homogeneous surround. There were no markings on the runway for either level of complexity; however, in the complex scene, the surrounding area contained the details normally available in the Moses Lake, Washington, computer data base for flight crew training. Several performance measures were used in this study. Kraft found that the greater scene complexity significantly improved the quality of flight performance in that the pilot was able to achieve a much better lineup with the runway center line. He concluded that if cues such as those in the complex scene constitute an important aid to training and consequently result in shorter training time, the increased computer capacity needed to provide greater detail could well be worth the cost.

Sieverding (1984) described in detail the texturing capacity of the C-130 WST. He pointed out that texturing allows for a high density accumulation of individually discernible, two-dimensional, co-planar details without excessive computational overhead; this feature is especially valuable in edge- or face-limited systems. The C-130 visual system has 10 levels of detail, and as an observer moves toward a textured face, the texture pattern can become increasingly complex as it transitions to finer levels of detail. Texture can be applied to sloped or horizontally inclined faces and is specifically designed to give consistent cues at all levels of detail. Also, light and dark bands can be rotated about each other to yield texture patterns ranging from tartan plaid to pseudo-random. All face edges are straight lines; all texture patterns are composed of straight bands, although they may not be perceived as such. The C-130 WST system has the capability of being shifted rapidly from texture to non-texture presentation and vice-versa while maintaining full-color presentation.

Method

Subjects. As in the FOV study, the 10 subjects (different from the original 10) in this phase were fully qualified C-130 operational and instructor pilots.

Approach. The experimental approach was identical to that used in the FOV study, except that instead of alternating C-130 window configurations, there was an alternation of texture and non-texture. The texture condition consisted of surface texture applied in and around the landing site. All windows were operative on all experimental runs. The total number of trials per subject varied from six to eight for each condition. Variations were due to occasional equipment malfunctions.

Results

A separate analysis was conducted on the data at each of the three points of the course: 1/2 mile out, threshold, and touchdown (see Tables 6 through 10). As in the FOV study, five parameters were recorded and analyzed at each location: Airspeed, rate of descent, AOA, center line deviation, and AGL were analyzed at 1/2 mile out and at threshold; at touchdown, distance from threshold replaced AGL.

The data were analyzed using a split-plot analysis of variance approach. Subjects were grouped according to the texture condition in which they began the sequence. The two texture conditions were compared within subjects. The various trials were treated as replications. Again, analysis consisted of a MANOVA, followed by a univariate ANOVA for each of the five performance variables.

The texture by subjects-within-groups interaction term (the split-plot error term used to test texture and texture-by-group effects) was first tested to determine whether or not it would be appropriate to pool these terms into a single error term for the split-plot effects. Since these tests were not significant, the pooled error term was formed to test for texture effects.

At 1/2 mile out, there were no significant multivariate effects. There was, however, a significant univariate effect for texture in terms of center line deviation; that is, pilots flying in the texture condition, came closer to the center than when in the no texture condition.

At threshold, there was a significant multivariate effect for texture. There were also significant univariate effects for texture in terms of AGL and center line deviation. In both conditions, the pilots tended to fly lower than the target AGL;

Table 6. Texture Multivariate Tests

Effect	Wilks' Lambda	F	df	p
<u>1/2 Mile Out</u>				
Group	.146	4.68	(5,4)	.080
Texture	.941	1.54	(5,123)	.183
Group by Texture	.960	1.03	(5,123)	.403
<u>Threshold</u>				
Group	.647	0.44	(5,4)	.806
Texture	.916	2.25	(5,122)	.054
Group by Texture	.975	0.62	(5,122)	.682
<u>Touchdown</u>				
Group	.741	0.28	(5,4)	.903
Texture	.885	3.19	(5,123)	.010
Group by Texture	.977	0.59	(5,123)	.709

Table 7. Texture Univariate Tests--1/2 Mile Out

Effect	F	df	p
Group		(1,8)	
Airspeed	0.59		.466
Descent Rate	0.16		.703
AOA	0.15		.711
AGL	0.01		.918
Center Line Deviation	0.21		.660
Texture		(1,127)	
Airspeed	1.54		.217
Descent Rate	1.83		.179
AOA	0.91		.342
AGL	0.06		.803
Center Line Deviation	4.94		.028
Group by Texture		(1,127)	
Airspeed	2.78		.098
Descent Rate	0.41		.522
AOA	0.01		.999
AGL	1.10		.297
Center Line Deviation	0.01		.947

Table 8. Texture Univariate Tests--Threshold

Effect	F	df	p
Group		(1,8)	
Airspeed	0.04		.847
Descent Rate	0.11		.750
AOA	0.05		.821
AGL	1.00		.347
Center Line Deviation	0.30		.596
Texture		(1,126)	
Airspeed	0.29		.593
Descent Rate	0.56		.456
AOA	0.56		.458
AGL	3.88		.051
Center Line Deviation	4.37		.039
Group by Texture		(1,126)	
Airspeed	0.46		.498
Descent Rate	0.44		.506
AOA	1.34		.250
AGL	0.39		.532
Center Line Deviation	0.90		.345

Table 2. Texture Univariate Tests--Touchdown

Effect	F	df	p
Group		(1,8)	
Airspeed	0.45		.521
Descent Rate	0.06		.815
AOA	0.02		.905
Distance From Threshold	0.73		.417
Center Line Deviation	0.01		.960
Texture		(1,127)	
Airspeed	0.63		.428
Descent Rate	2.33		.129
AOA	0.01		.936
Distance From Threshold	1.43		.233
Center Line Deviation	9.89		.002
Group by Texture		(1,127)	
Airspeed	0.21		.648
Descent Rate	0.79		.375
AOA	0.11		.741
Distance From Threshold	0.06		.812
Center Line Deviation	0.79		.376

Table 10. Texture Means

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Criterion</u>	<u>No texture</u>	<u>Texture</u>	<u>Standard error</u>
<u>1/2 Mile Out</u>				
Airspeed	115	116.6	117.1	0.3
Rate of Descent	800	733.7	762.3	14.9
AOA	2.5	3.41	3.30	0.08
AGL	150	188.6	187.6	2.8
Center Line Dev. ^a	0.0	-14.0	-10.0	1.3
<u>Threshold</u>				
Airspeed	115	112.6	112.8	0.3
Rate of Descent	400	569.9	550.1	18.8
AOA	2.5	4.09	4.22	0.12
AGL	17.5	14.5	12.7	0.6
Center Line Dev. ^b	0.0	-7.6	-5.3	0.8
<u>Touchdown</u>				
Airspeed	105	110.5	110.7	0.2
Rate of Descent	250	497.8	450.5	21.9
AOA	4.5	5.18	5.16	0.16
Dist. from Thres.	250	309.2	283.5	15.1
Center Line Dev. ^b	0	-8.5	-6.0	0.6

^a Significant univariate difference in the absence of a multivariate effect.

^b Significant univariate difference in the presence of a multivariate effect.

in the texture condition, they tended to fly lower than in the no texture condition. Though the pilots tended to fly to the left of center line (as indicated by the negative mean center line deviations), they flew closer to the center line when in the texture condition than when in the no texture condition.

At touchdown, there was a significant multivariate effect for texture (see Table 10). The only significant univariate effect was center line deviation for the texture condition. Again, all pilots tended to fly to the left of center but flew closer to the center line when in the texture condition as compared to when they were in the no texture condition.

IV. DISCUSSION

Though the results of the FOV study provide no strong evidence that a wide field of view is essential for the performance of the assault landing, it would be a mistake to conclude, based on these results, that the wide FOV is not needed. Given the experience level of the subjects, and the fact that in the simulation they were initially aligned with the landing area, these results are not too surprising. The significant finding that subjects maintained a slightly higher angle of attack at touchdown in the narrow-FOV condition as compared to the wide-FOV condition (see bottom section of Table 5) could represent a compensation for the limited visual area in the narrow-FOV condition. In the absence of eye position data, it is impossible to tell what other types of compensation the subjects may have used.

The results from the texture study reinforce those obtained from previous studies (e.g., Kraft et al., 1982). Texture patterns around the landing area aid the pilot in the maintenance of center line positioning and altitude control. In the presence of texture patterns, pilots are able to detect the ground surface and thus are willing to fly at lower altitudes.

REFERENCES

- C-130 Flight Simulator Operating Instructions. (October 1982, with Section IV, Visual System, dated 1 August 1983). Little Rock AFB, AR: 34 TATG.
- Edwards, B.J., Pohlman, D.L., Buckland, G.H., & Stephens, C.W. (1981). Training low level terrain flight in a simulator. Proceedings of the 3rd Interservice/Industry Training Equipment Conference and Exhibition. Orlando, FL.
- Kraft, C.L., Anderson, C.D., & Elworth, C.L. (1982). Peripheral cues and color in visual simulation. Proceedings of the Human Factors Society 26th Annual Meeting, p. 906.
- McCormick, D., Smith, T., Lewandowski, F., Preskar, W., & Martin, E. (1983). Low-altitude database development evaluation and research. Proceedings of the 5th Interservice/Industry Training Equipment Conference. Washington, DC.
- Sieverding, M.J. (1984). Simulating speed and height cues in the C-130 Weapon System Trainer. Proceedings of the 1984 IMAGE III Conference (AFHRL-TR-84-36, AD-A148 636). Williams AFB, AZ: Operations Training Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory.