

TRISTAR I: Evaluation Methods for Testing Head-Up Display (HUD) Flight Symbolology



US Army
Aviation and Troop Command
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000
TR-94-A-019

R. L. Newman, L. A. Haworth, G. K. Kessler, D. J. Eksuzian,
W. R. Ercoline, R. H. Evans, T. C. Hughes, and L. F. Weinstein

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited



Department of the Navy
Naval Air Warfare Center
Aircraft Division
Patuxent River, MD 20670
NAWCADPAX-95-10-RTR

February 1995



National Aeronautics and
Space Administration



US Air Force
Armstrong Laboratory
Brooks AFB, TX 78235-5104
AL/CF-TR-1994-0159

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

20001221 162

CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	v
List of Figures	v
Nomenclature	vii
Acronyms	vii
Symbols	vii
Summary	1
Introduction	1
Purpose	2
Facility	2
Simulator Cab	2
Visual Model	2
Cockpit Hardware	2
Aircraft Mathematical Model	2
Model Validation	3
HUD Symbology	3
Basic Symbology	3
Climb-Dive Ladder Variations	3
Fixed Versus Moving Scales	4
Quickening and Caging Equations	4
Velocity vector	4
Climb-dive marker	4
Angle of attack	4
Quickener	4
ILS Symbology	4
Subjective Data Collection Techniques	5
Objective Data Collection Techniques	5
Conduct of the Experiments	5
Subjects	5
Maneuvering	5
Air-to-air tracking	5
Task description	5
Subjective data analysis	6
Objective data analysis	7
Results	7
Discussion	7

Low-level air-to-ground tracking.....	7
Task description.....	7
Subjective data analysis.....	7
Objective data analysis	8
Results.....	8
Discussion	8
ILS approach task	9
Task description.....	9
Subjective data analysis.....	9
Objective data analysis	9
Results.....	9
Discussion	9
Unusual attitude recovery	10
Task description.....	10
Subjective data analysis.....	10
Objective data analysis	10
Results.....	10
Discussion	10
Conclusions.....	11
References	12
Appendix A Subjective Questionnaires.....	31
A-1 Pilot Rating Card	37
A-2 Rating Card Used in UA Task	41
A-3 NASA TLX Rating Card	45
A-4 Initial Questionnaire.....	49
A-5 Final Questionnaire.....	53
Appendix B Tristar Trends Database Output	59
B-1 Wordscan Output Example.....	61
B-2 Item Definitions	65
B-3 Flight Descriptions.....	71
Appendix C Evaluation Pilots' Briefing Materials.....	95
C-1 A/A Dynamic Maneuvering Task.....	97
C-2 Low-Level and A/G Task	97
C-3 ILS Approach Task	97
C-4 UA Recovery Task.....	97
C-5 Performance Standards	98

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Effects and object models in the visual database	13
2	HUD symbologies tested	13
3	Recorded variables	14
4	Evaluation pilot experience.....	16
5	Workload distraction task: A/A task	16
6	Averages of subjective display ratings: A/G task	17
7	Averages of subjective display ratings: A/G task (reduced data table)	17
8	Unusual attitudes	17

List of Figures

Figure		Page
1	R-CAB cockpit used in simulation.....	18
2	R-CAB field of view	18
3	Experimental cockpit	19
4	View of HUD and instrument panel	20
5	Flight dynamics HUD installation	21
6	AV-8B Harrier simulation model structure.....	22
7	Basic HUD symbology.....	23
8	Climb-dive ladder with tapered lines (TO)	24
9	Climb-dive ladder with bent lines (BI).....	25
10	ILS guidance symbology	26
11	Subjective questionnaire responses averaged across subjects: A/A task	26
12	Reaction time as a function of HUD types: A/A task	27
13	Map of low-level route	28
14	Subjective responses: A/G task.....	29
15	Approach procedure flown during ILS task	30
A-1	Readability rating	34
A-2	Flyability rating	35

Nomenclature

Acronyms

A/A	Air-to-air
A/G	Air-to-ground
AFB	Air Force Base
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
AOA	Angle of attack
CDL	Climb-dive ladder
CDM	Climb-dive marker
cg	Center of gravity
CGI	Computer generated image
CRT	Cathode-ray tube
DH	Decision height
FOV	Field of view
FPM	Flightpath marker
FSWG	Flight Symbology Working Group
HUD	Head-up display
IC	Initial conditions
ILS	Instrument landing system
IMC	Instrument meteorological conditions
IP	Initial point
KIAS	Knots indicated airspeed
N/R	Not reported
NAS	Naval Air Station
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
RAE	Royal Aeronautical Establishment
RAF	Royal Air Force
RCS	Reaction control system
TLX	Task load index
TRENDS	Tiltrotor engineering database system
UA	Unusual attitude
USA	U.S. Army
USAF	U.S. Air Force
USN	U.S. Navy

VMC

Visual meteorological conditions

VV

Velocity vector

Symbols

az_{VV}	Azimuth component of velocity vector
el_{VV}	Elevation component of velocity vector
$F()$	Forces
F_J	Gross thrust
g	Normal acceleration
G	Quickener gain
h	Altitude
M	Mach number
P_{AMB}	Ambient pressure
P	Roll rate
q	Quickener term
q_1	Quickener term
q_2	Quickener term
Q	Pitch rate
R	Yaw rate
s	LaPlace variable
t	Time
$T()$	Moment
T_{AMB}	Ambient temperature
V	True airspeed, ft/sec
V_{EJ}	Equivalent jet velocity ratio
V_{RW}	True airspeed, knots
V_I	Indicated airspeed, knots
X_{CDM}	X location of CDM (HUD coordinates)
X_{FPM}	X location of FPM (HUD coordinates)
Y_{FPM}	Y location of FPM (HUD coordinates)
Y_{CDM}	Y location of CDM (HUD coordinates)
α	Angle of attack
α_F	Filtered angle of attack
β	Angle of sideslip
Θ	Pitch attitude

ρ	Air density, slugs/ft ³	τ_Q	Quickener time constant
τ	Time constant	ϕ	Roll attitude
τ_α	Time constant to filter a	Ψ	Heading

TRISTAR I: Evaluation Methods for Testing Head-Up Display (HUD) Flight Symbolology

R. L. NEWMAN,* L. A. HAWORTH,** G. K. KESSLER,† D. J. EKSUZIAN,‡ W. R. ERCOLINE,§
R. H. EVANS,§§ T. C. HUGHES,¶ AND L. F. WEINSTEIN§

Ames Research Center

Summary

A piloted head-up display (HUD) flight symbolology study (TRISTAR) measuring pilot task performance was conducted at the NASA Ames Research Center by the Tri-Service Flight Symbolology Working Group (FSWG). Sponsored by the U.S. Army Aeroflightdynamics Directorate, this study served as a focal point for the FSWG to examine HUD test methodology and flight symbolology presentations. HUD climb-dive marker dynamics and climb-dive ladder presentations were examined as pilots performed air-to-air (A/A), air-to-ground (A/G), instrument landing system, and unusual attitude recovery tasks. Symbolic presentations resembled pitch ladder variations used by the U.S. Air Force (USAF), U.S. Navy (USN), and Royal Air Force (RAF).

Investigations were conducted in a NASA fixed-base simulation cab. The cockpit of the simulation cab was configured to resemble a Harrier aircraft cockpit with fast-jet HUD flight symbolology dynamics and AV-8B Harrier aerodynamic equations of motion. Six HUD-experienced male fighter and attack pilots from the USAF, USN, and RAF participated in the study.

Time histories of 83 variables were recorded during the simulation. Four task maneuver performance methods were examined and both subjective and objective data were obtained for each task. Subjective questionnaires revealed several interesting trends based upon each task, such as the preference for a quickened climb-dive marker and a variable-compression pitch ladder for A/G tasks.

Objective data indicated decreased reaction times and increased spatial awareness with asymmetrical climb-dive ladders (CDLs).

The study was beneficial for working group researchers, providing a mechanism for exchange of test techniques and methods of presentations. Test techniques developed during the TRISTAR I simulation will be used during the TRISTAR II flight symbolology evaluation.

Introduction

The head-up display (HUD) is rapidly becoming the primary fixed-wing instrument flight reference for both visual and instrument meteorological conditions (VMC and IMC). This technology medium allows the presentation of flight-critical information in a plethora of formats and creates the potential for new and unique formats by which information critical to flight and mission success can be conveyed to the flight crew.

The HUD is an outgrowth of World War II reflecting gunsights. Gunsights, which had begun as simple iron rings, developed into collimated displays reflected from a semitransparent combiner glass. The benefit of a collimated virtual image for the pilot was that he could focus on both the target and the sight simultaneously. Essential flight information, such as airspeed and altitude, was added to aid the pilot in maintaining an eyes-out orientation, thus creating the HUD. The major advantages of HUDs are reduced pilot workload, increased flight precision, direct visualization of trajectory, and increased flight safety when overall piloting tasks require head-up, outside-the-cockpit flight references.

Since the late 1970s, a number of reports have been published citing significant deficiencies in HUD symbolology and installations. The U.S. Air Force (USAF) Instrument Flight Center found HUDs to be limited by serious drawbacks, including a lack of standardization and an increased tendency toward spatial disorientation (ref. 1).

Traditionally, HUDs and the associated symbolology have been procured as part of the airframe weapons systems, not as "aircraft instruments." Usually the HUD is

*Crew Systems Consultants, San Marcos, TX 78667.

**U.S. Army Aeroflightdynamics Directorate, NASA Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000.

†Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River Naval Air Station (NAS), MD 20670.

‡Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, PA 18974.

§Krug Life Sciences, Brooks Air Force Base (AFB), TX 78235.

§§Air Force Instrument Flight Center, Randolph AFB, TX 78150.

¶Aeronautical Systems Division, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433.

contractor furnished with little adherence to general military standards and specifications. Symbolology drive laws and dynamics documentation are also frequently missing with the HUD delivery. Since the HUD was not considered an "instrument display," no need was seen to establish suitability for use as a flight reference. Consequently, no flight procedures were developed and no training was provided to pilots on how to use the HUD in routine flight (ref. 2).

Purpose

The TRISTAR study grew primarily from the desire of the Tri-Service Flight Symbolology Working Group (FSWG) to address HUD flight symbolology deficiencies, standardization, issue identification, and test methodologies. The study provided the mechanism by which the USAF, U.S. Navy (USN), Royal Air Force (RAF), and U.S. Army (USA) could focus organizational ideas and differences for comparisons. Specifically, the TRISTAR investigation examined flight symbolology issues collectively identified by each organization and attempted to use objective and subjective test methodology and flight tasking proposed by the FSWG.

Facility

Simulator Cab

The TRISTAR investigations were conducted in the NASA Ames R-CAB fixed-base simulator. The R-CAB, shown in figure 1, is a single cab with three windows aligned in front of a centrally located pilot station. The cab also supports a fourth "chin window" that was not used for this simulation. The windows span a field of view (FOV) from +78 to -77 deg in azimuth and -17 to +12 deg in elevation, as shown in figure 2.

Visual Model

The image generator used with the R-CAB in the TRISTAR investigation was the Evans and Sutherland CT-5A. The CT-5A is a three-channel, single-eyepoint image generator; it is a raster-scan system with a 2:1 interlace ratio. The system operates at a field rate of 60 Hz. Each channel has a total of 1,024 raster lines, of which 1,003 are active video lines. Each line is composed of 875 pixels, so the pixel capacity is 877,625 pixels per channel or 3,510,500 total pixels. The visual system is described in detail in reference 3.

The system supports a number of visual databases. The TRISTAR investigation used a combined ocean database

with a Napa Valley land area for the low-level and air-to-ground (A/G) task, a MiG-27 target aircraft for the air-to-air (A/A) task, and Seymour Johnson AFB, North Carolina, for the Instrument Landing System (ILS) task. Table 1 summarizes the lighting conditions, special effects, and object models on the visual database.

Cockpit Hardware

The TRISTAR cockpit, shown in figure 3, was designed to simulate a limited number of cockpit instruments found in the Harrier cockpit. The instrumentation was used for the initial simulation setup, but it was later covered during the HUD simulation so the pilots would be forced to use the HUD for flight reference. The exhaust gas temperature, engine rpm, and normal acceleration (g) were available to the evaluation pilots since this essential information was not available on the HUD. Figure 4 shows the view of the instruments and HUD with the flight instruments blocked.

The HUD used in the evaluation was manufactured by Flight Dynamics, Inc., Raleigh, North Carolina. The HUD uses a holographic combiner with a FOV of 30 deg horizontal by 24 deg vertical. The horizontal FOV is symmetrical about a vertical plane through the eye reference point. The vertical FOV is centered on a depression angle of -4 deg. The eyebox is an approximately rectangular parallelepiped with dimensions 2.7 in. (height) $\times$ 4.7 in. (width) $\times$ 5.0 in. (length).

The collimation is variable and was adjusted to match the simulation visual scene. Figure 5 shows the HUD installation.

A Harrier power management console was installed along with a generic flight control stick and rudder pedals. Switches on the throttle and control stick were used as pilot event markers. The nozzle and flap controls were not active.

A video camera that monitored pilot status was installed on the right side of the cab. Since the cab was kept at a low light level, an adjustable light with a red cover was installed above the camera to provide lighting for the camera.

Aircraft Mathematical Model

The overall simulation software package is independent of aircraft type. The tasks include integration of the equations of motion, a standard atmosphere model, automatic trimming, stability analysis, graphics, and a user interface. The software is designed to allow easy modification of the aircraft model.

The specific airplane model used was an AV-8B Harrier, consisting of the following submodels:

1. Propulsion and reaction control system (RCS) model
2. Aerodynamic model, including ground effects
3. Control system model
4. Weight, center of gravity (cg), and inertia model

The data for the propulsion, RCS, cg, and inertia models are stored in function table format. This allows table lookups of functions of one to three arguments using linear interpolation between breakpoints. The aerodynamic model is implemented in algebraic formulae with all data included in the aerodynamics subroutine. Figure 6 is the block diagram of the airplane model.

The nonlinear model was valid from 0 through 0.9 Mach number. Additional details can be found in reference 4.

Model Validation

The aircraft model (including the HUD formats) was validated by experienced Harrier pilots who flew the simulator through the evaluation tasks and rated the level of fidelity of the simulation compared with the aircraft. During the same period, the validation of the HUD symbology, particularly the quickening algorithms, was conducted by pilots and engineers familiar with the quickening as implemented at the Royal Aeronautical Establishment (RAE) (ref. 5).

(This phase was planned for one week, but actually required more than two weeks.)

HUD Symbology

The basic HUD symbology was adapted from the RAE fast-jet format (ref. 5).

Basic Symbology

The basic symbology is shown in figure 7. The features common to all experimental symbologies are the counterpointer airspeed and altitude displays, which use a combination of digital readouts and analog needles; a 4:1 compressed heading scale at the top; and a winged and tailed circle showing the climb-dive angle.

The presentation of climb-dive angle is not common in most U.S. aircraft HUDs. It corresponds to a traditional flightpath marker, which is caged (i.e., constrained to the left-right center of the HUD FOV). The actual aircraft flightpath is shown by a small triangular velocity vector (FPM), which is free to move laterally. In figure 7, this

FPM symbol can be seen inside the winged and tailed airplane symbol.

For purposes of clarity, the airplane symbol (showing climb-dive angle) will be referred to as the climb-dive marker (CDM). The arrangement of lines showing the angle will be called the climb-dive ladder (CDL).

If the CDM was to be driven from the FOV because of excessive vertical motion, it was constrained to the FOV limits and this was indicated to the pilot by removing the tail.

Variations in HUD symbologies were primarily concerned with the pitch ladder, although the quickening concept was also studied.

Climb-Dive Ladder Variations

Several variations on construction of the CDLs were evaluated. These included the length of the lines, the orientation of the lines, and the use of vertical asymmetry.

All CDLs were constructed with solid lines above the horizon and dashed lines below. All lines displayed the angle on the left side only slightly above and inboard from the end. Leading minus signs were shown for below-horizon angles.

The lines incorporated horizon-pointing "ticks" to enhance spatial awareness. The location of the ticks was an experimental variable.

Four line arrangements were tried:

1. Tapered lines in which the lines decreased in length as the angle from the horizon increased. Two variations were examined with ticks at the inboard ends of the lines (TI) or at the outboard ends (TO);
2. Straight lines in which all lines were the same length. The ticks were located at the outboard ends of the lines (SO);
3. Bent lines in which the lines were angled to form a "V" as the angle from the horizon increased. The lines were rotated at an angle one-half of the angle from the horizon. The ticks were located at the inboard ends of the lines (BI);
4. Vertically asymmetric lines in which the lines below the horizon were bent as in (BI) and the lines above the horizon were straight (SO). The ticks were located at the inner edges below and the outer edges above the horizon. This CDL arrangement was denoted as VA.

The location of the ticks was varied because it was assumed, a priori, that the inboard tick location would

enhance any effect of the bent lines and that the outboard location would enhance any effect of the tapered lines.

Figure 8 shows the CDL with the tapered lines (TO) and figure 9 shows it with bent lines (BI).

Two ladder scalings (compressions) were evaluated: a full-time, 1:1 in which the ladder remained conformal to the real world. In this case, the line spacing remained 5 deg throughout. A variable compression was also tried in which the compression was 1:1 for angles within 5 deg of the horizon with a linear change to 4.4:1 when the climb–dive angle equals ± 90 deg. With variable compression, the line spacing was every 5 deg up to ± 30 deg and every 10 deg thereafter.

Fixed Versus Moving Scales

Since one of the experimental variables was to be quickened versus non-quickened CDM/FPM, it was necessary to ensure that motion of the scales would not influence this variable. Normally, the scales moved with the CDM. If this were permitted with the nonquickened CDM, there was concern that the nonquickened motion of the scales might make their influence too difficult to read. For this reason, the scales were to be fixed whenever the CDM and FPM were not quickened.

This configuration, however, introduced another variable: relative motion within the display. To accommodate this, a set of quickened-CDM, but fixed scales was included in the experimental matrix.

HUD symbologies were denoted by the abbreviation for the line construction (TO, TI, SO, BI, or VA), a colon, the compression ratio (1:1 or variable), and a description of the quickening and scale motion (QM, QF, or NQF). For example, HUD 1 can be described as TO: 1:1 QM. It has a tapered CDL with outboard ticks, 1:1 compression, a quickened CDM, FPM, and moving scales. This is shown in table 2.

Quickening and Caging Equations

The quickening and caging equations were adapted from the RAE fast-jet equations (ref. 5).

Velocity vector– The velocity vector was positioned in HUD axes by

$$Y_{FPM} = el_{VV} \cdot \cos(\phi) + az_{VV} \cdot \sin(\phi) + q \quad (1)$$

$$X_{FPM} = az_{VV} \cdot \cos(\phi) + el_{VV} \cdot \sin(\phi) \quad (2)$$

where el_{VV} and az_{VV} are the elevation and azimuth components of the aircraft velocity vector with respect to the

Earth (expressed in nonroll-resolved aircraft axes), ϕ is the roll attitude, and q is the quickener term described later.

Climb–dive marker– The CDM was positioned in HUD axes by

$$Y_{CDM} = el_{VV} \cdot \cos(\phi) + \alpha_F \cdot \sin^2(\phi) + q \quad (3)$$

$$X_{CDM} = 0 \quad (4)$$

where α_F is the filtered angle of attack (AOA).

Angle of attack– The filtered AOA α_F is given by

$$\alpha_F = \alpha / (1 + \tau_{\alpha}s) \quad (5)$$

where α is the angle of attack, τ_{α} is determined as the best compromise between noise suppression at large values of ϕ and the retention of horizon correlation in dynamic pitching maneuvers at moderate values of ϕ , and s is a LaPlace variable. After preliminary screening, a value of 0.04 sec was used. The filter is required to suppress noise on the display at large bank angles in turbulence.

Quickener– The quickener, q , is equal to q_1 for pitch attitudes, $|\Theta| < 10$ deg blending linearly with Θ to be equal to q_2 for $|\Theta| > 30$ deg.

$$q_1 = G \cdot \cos(\phi) \cdot [\tau_Q s / (1 + \tau_Q s)] \cdot \Theta \quad (6)$$

$$q_2 = G \cdot [\tau_Q / (1 + \tau_Q s)] \cdot Q \quad (7)$$

where the quickener gain $G = 0.7$ and Q is the pitch rate in aircraft body axes. The quickener time constant, τ_Q , varies with flight condition and must be matched to the wing loading, handling characteristics, and avionics fit of the specific aircraft. For the Harrier,

$$\tau_Q = 0.2252 + 1.1112 / (V \cdot \rho) \quad (8)$$

where V is the true airspeed and ρ is the air density.

ILS Symbology

The guidance symbology used for the approach and landing task was an ILS cross-pointer needle display as shown in figure 10. The needles were referenced to the CDM. In the vertical axis, full-scale deflection represented ± 1.4 -deg glideslope deviation. In the horizontal axis, full-scale deflection represented ± 6.0 -deg localizer deviation. The pitch ladder used had one-to-one scaling. The only HUD

variable evaluated during the ILS task was quickening/nonquickening of the CDM.

Subjective Data Collection Techniques

A questionnaire summarizing pilot experience was administered to each evaluation pilot at the beginning of his participation. In addition to general pilot experience, the questionnaire asked for a summary of HUD experience and current qualifications.

After each task, the evaluation pilot also completed a specific rating form designed to clarify differences in the HUD variables. A final debriefing questionnaire and interview were administered at the conclusion of each evaluation pilot's participation.

In addition, pilots completed task load index (TLX) questionnaires developed by NASA Ames (ref. 6). These questionnaires measure the subjective mental, physical, and temporal task demands, the task performance, and the levels of effort and frustration caused by the task.

Copies are shown in appendix A. This appendix includes the subject questionnaire.

Objective Data Collection Techniques

A total of 84 variables were recorded during the simulation. These were recorded directly from the simulation equations during each computational frame (a sampling interval of 33 msec. The variables are listed in table 3. These variables were the superset of all variables requested for each flight task to be studied. Additional variables (such as pitch rate and pitch rate acceleration) were included for validation and debugging purposes.

The variables were recorded in real time on magnetic tapes and stored in a VAX disk pack located on the Neptune VAX computer at Ames Research Center.

The large amount of data recorded required the use of a database management tool. The NASA TRENDS (Tilt-rotor engineering database system) program was used. TRENDS was developed to manage the data obtained in rotorcraft flight testing and it has been used in a variety of flight and simulation test activities (refs. 7 and 8). One of the advantages of TRENDS is that all analysts, regardless of location, could access the recorded data via telephone connections.

Both the objective data (from the VAX disk pack) and the subjective data (via transcription) were listed in the TRENDS TRISTAR database. This allowed the data analyst to review, for example, all A/A tasks flown by evaluation pilot 1 using HUD 5. Short flight segments, defined

by variables being within certain limits, could be examined or plotted on hard copy. TRENDS also allowed the analyst to use conventional statistical programs to determine if significant differences existed between HUD formats.

Appendix B shows the TRENDS database output.

Conduct of the Experiments

Subjects

Six HUD-experienced, male fighter pilots from the USAF, USN, and RAF served as evaluation pilots for this study. They had an average total flight time of 2,880 hours. The evaluation pilots' experience is summarized in table 4.

Each evaluation pilot was given a thorough briefing on the task to be performed and the rating forms to be used. Copies of the briefing materials for each task are shown in appendix C.

Maneuvering

Air-to-air tracking—

Task description: Each evaluation pilot "flew" 14 different HUD symbol sets. The primary task was to track a target aircraft through a set of acrobatic maneuvers similar to those required in A/A combat. The target, a computer generated image (CGI) silhouette of a MiG-27, moved in a cloverleaf type of pattern within the visual field. Movement was varied enough to be unpredictable to the evaluation pilot. The evaluation pilot was instructed to fly the simulator (own-ship) and keep the gun cross on the CGI target at all times. The HUD-referenced aiming symbol (gun cross) was a set of cross hairs resembling the aiming reference of an F-16 aircraft.

Both the target and own-ship commenced maneuvers around 15,000-ft indicated altitude, 300 knots indicated airspeed, and a northerly heading. The own-ship was situated about 2,000 ft directly behind and slightly below the target. Once the evaluation pilot acknowledged a state of readiness, the tracking task began. The target smoothly began a climb to about a 45-deg nose-up pitch attitude. Upon reaching this pitch attitude, the target would begin a gradual roll to an inverted position while tracking a path approximately 90 deg to the left or right (west or east) of the original northerly heading. Ideally, if the evaluation pilot completed a perfect track behind the target, the own-ship would now be in an inverted flight condition, 90 deg from the starting heading, about 2,000 ft behind the target and slightly above, since both would be in an inverted position.

The target would continue with a downward pull through the vertical (similar to a split-S maneuver) and complete the first leaf of the cloverleaf at an upright position about 90 deg of heading change from the beginning of the pull-up (or 180 deg from the inverted flight heading). If accomplished correctly, the conditions at this point should be similar to the beginning conditions (15,000 ft and 300 knots), except for the heading change of approximately 90 deg.

The difficulty with the task, as with any tracking task, was that the evaluation pilot did not know when the target would begin to climb, which direction the target would roll, nor how tight the target was pulling. Therefore, the target could very easily be changing flight parameters (i.e., loosening the pull either during the pull-up or during the pull-through), and transition below a predetermined minimum altitude (11,000 ft) or a predetermined minimum airspeed (200 knots).

The evaluation pilot was required to recognize when the minimum conditions were violated by activating a trigger button on the control stick. Once the aircraft returned above the predetermined conditions, the same button would be activated again. This process would record event markers on the time history tape, thereby producing reaction time intervals that could be used to suggest the best design for inflight aircraft performance awareness. Some of the cloverleaf quarter-section loops were accomplished within parameters, requiring no action by the evaluation pilot, thereby keeping him unsure of the next desired response. The tracking task was briefed as primary, whereas the monitoring and recognizing task was secondary.

In addition to the altitude and airspeed limitations, the target was programmed to occasionally disappear, leaving the evaluation pilot with an unusual (and unexpected) spatial orientation problem to resolve. When this occurred, the evaluation pilot was instructed to orient the aircraft to another pitch and bank condition as soon as the target disappeared. The evaluation pilot would promptly orient the own-ship to the desired position. When the recovery was completed and the new position established, the evaluation pilot acknowledged the recovery and the chase continued. The target was programmed to disappear five times during each sortie, these times being unknown to the evaluation pilot. These procedures produced a flight profile unpredictable to the evaluation pilot, yet somewhat realistic in an A/A scenario. Successful completion was defined as achievement of an attitude within 20 deg in bank and 5 deg in pitch of the predetermined attitude. Response time to the first stick input was measured as well as the overall reaction time to complete attitude change.

Subjects were occasionally distracted from these tasks by a third task designed to measure the evaluation pilot's attitude awareness. In this task, each evaluation pilot had a card located on his kneeboard that resembled a bingo game card. The card consisted of lettered columns and numbered rows, shown in table 5. Within the matrix were letter pairs. The evaluation pilot was asked to respond to a letter-number combination with a letter pair from the matrix. For example, in response to the experimenter's saying "A3," the evaluation pilot would respond with the letter pair in column A, third row (in this case, SL). While the evaluation pilot was completing the task, the HUD display was frozen. Upon completion of the distraction task, the experimenter would ask the evaluation pilot to look at the HUD and report the attitude. The response was recorded in the logbook by the experimenter. The rationale behind this task was that the greater the evaluation pilot's attitude awareness, the more accurate his response to the attitude recognition task would be.

These variables (minimum altitude, minimum airspeed, and attitude recognition), when incorporated into a realistic simulated inflight task like the A/A scenario, made for a perfect situation to test the evaluation pilot's ability to recognize, recover, and maintain attitude awareness. Since there were no other instrument displays that the evaluation pilot could use for recovery (the traditional panel instruments were covered), the speed of the trigger response and correctness of recoveries produced with the HUD were considered a good indication of display design improvements. The experimental design should have elucidated the HUD symbology features that provide the pilot with the best overall performance (a part of overall situation awareness).

The pilots practiced until they felt comfortable with the tracking task and confident that they could control the simulator throughout the entire flight profile. The study was originally designed as a completely crossed factorial arrangement. The intent was that all evaluation pilots would complete all the tasks with each HUD. Unfortunately, because of time constraints and programming problems, the original plan had to be modified. Each evaluation pilot performed some of the tasks with some of the HUD configurations. The frequency and presentation order of the secondary task stimuli were equivalent for all HUD configurations.

Subjective data analysis: Questionnaires were administered to the evaluation pilots at the end of the A/A portion of the experiment. The pilots were asked to indicate their preferences for each aspect of the HUD configuration. The summary of the preferences is shown in figure 11. Although a sufficient amount of survey data to perform an analysis of variance (ANOVA) did not exist,

the pilots' responses were averaged and several interesting trends were revealed. The results of the survey indicated that, on average, the evaluation pilots had at least slight preferences for the following HUD characteristics:

1. Bent climb-dive ladder lines
2. Vertical asymmetry
3. Variable compression
4. Quickening

Objective data analysis: Three of the recorded variables were airspeed, altitude, and an event marker triggered by the evaluation pilot's pressing the event button on the throttle in response to the secondary task. By measuring the elapsed time from when the airspeed and altitude limits were exceeded to when the event marker was triggered, a reaction time for recognition of an event was obtained. The mean reaction times are shown in figure 12.

An examination of the data points revealed that a number of excursions never received a response. The reason for these errors was not determined, but it was assumed that the pilot did not recognize that a limit had been exceeded. In addition, other trials had abnormally long reaction times (some as long as 60 sec), which suggested that the evaluation pilot might have been pressing the event button in anticipation of exceeding a limit or he might have been pressing the button to respond to some other unknown event. Therefore, only trials with a reaction time of less than 18 sec (a time limit determined by subject matter experts) were used in the analysis.

An ANOVA was performed on the data to determine if there was any difference caused by the 14 different HUD configurations. The ANOVA was marginally significant ($p = 0.06$). Duncan's range test revealed that the reaction times with HUD configurations 1 (TO: 1:1 QM) and 3 (BI: 1:1 QM) were significantly longer than reaction times with HUD configurations 4 (VA: 1:1 QM) and 6 (TO: V QM). Also reaction times with HUD configurations 1, 3, and 10 (SO: V QM) were significantly longer than with HUD configuration 4. These data suggest that vertical asymmetry may be a useful tool for enhancing a pilot's awareness of the state of the aircraft, i.e., may make him less likely to fall victim to spatial disorientation.

Results: Because of the experimental design modifications discussed above, there were missing data points resulting in an unbalanced design that made the statistical analysis difficult. Because of the missing data, the statistical tests used were less likely to detect differences between conditions if differences did exist.

Technical difficulties with the simulator and the data reduction process resulted in the loss of additional data points.

Discussion: The tasks were much more challenging than expected. The evaluation pilots had a difficult time keeping adequate spacing. Often the evaluation pilot overran the target, generating an unwanted unusual attitude (UA) recovery. This problem can be corrected in future simulations by fixing the distance between the target and the evaluation pilot's simulated aircraft. In addition, the task itself should be modified to include a low-level flight segment and fewer over-the-top maneuvers. This would simulate a profile more characteristic of a wide variety of fighter aircraft, and not detract from the realism already established in the profiles. The third task, attitude awareness with the letter pairs, seemed to cause the most confusion and produce the least amount of usable information. This task was therefore deleted from the study.

Low-level air-to-ground tracking--

Task description: The scenario used for this part of the study was a relatively simple pop-up maneuver culminating in the release of weapons on two fixed ground targets. The following paragraphs describe the scenario; they are taken from the evaluation pilot instructions.

Initial setup is 420 knots indicated airspeed (KIAS), 200-ft altitude, heading 355 deg. When the bay becomes visible off to the left, maneuver over to follow the bay and fly up the river. The river will end at a dam with a house shortly beyond.

Cross the end of the river at 420 KIAS, 200 ft, heading 350 deg. With the gun cross abeam the house, go to mil thrust and make a moderately aggressive 4-g pull up to a 40-deg climb angle. At 6000 ft, roll 180 deg and pull 2-3 g down to a wings-level 40-deg dive (thus a straight pop-up and roll-ahead).

As the aircraft reaches 360 KIAS, reduce the throttle to idle and track the first target (house along road) with the CDM. With the CDM on the first target, press the pickle button passing through 4,500 ft.

Then roll left and put the CDM on the center of the large tanks (second target) and pickle at 1,500 ft and 420 KIAS with the CDM on the tanks.

Points of interest in A/G HUD symbology work are the ability to capture and hold predetermined profiles, precisely execute maneuvers, and identify ground targets against a cluttered background through using HUD symbology. Figure 13 shows the route followed during the task.

Subjective data analysis: Partial data were obtained for eight evaluation pilots in the A/G tasks, only three pilots testing with all fourteen HUD configurations. The subjective data were obtained from the comments and ratings on the ratings display card completed by each pilot (with the experimenter) after each run.

The overall display rating, Question 1, is summarized in table 6. Also shown in the table is the average of the subjective ratings per display. No conclusions can be drawn for the ratings of HUDs 2, 3, 4, or 5 because of lack of data. Table 7 shows the same results for HUD configurations 1 and 6–14.

Note that for the purposes of data analysis, items marked “0” and “Didn’t notice” on the ratings display card were changed to a score of 3.5. This was done to better approximate subjective opinions about the display. Otherwise, the considerable number of ratings of 0 could not be used with the 1 to 7 “Helped to hurt” continuum scale used to rate features of the displays: they would be dropped out. Essentially a “Didn’t notice” rating has been equivocated to a “Medium” or a “Did not interfere or help” rating.

Answers to questions 4–6 from the ratings display card were reviewed and tabulated according to whether the pilots “liked” or “did not like” a feature of the display. In an attempt to better manage the data for review, some comments were consolidated. That is, comments that mentioned disliking a certain feature were also counted as a “liked” comment for the opposite feature. For example, there were many comments regarding the quickening of the CDM. Many of the pilots indicated a *dislike* of the nonquickened CDM. Since there were only two options in this study, the dislike of the nonquickened CDM was counted as a “liked” for the quickened CDM.

Figure 14 shows what the evaluation pilots did and did not prefer.

Objective data analysis: One of the primary purposes for this experiment was to test tools and procedures that can be repeated in future studies. Through the course of design and implementation for these simulations, many factors came into play that reduced the effectiveness of the results. Primarily, there are missing data cells, unbalanced combinations of variables, and a small sample size. As a result, it is difficult to determine exactly what features of the display were influencing pilot performance and ratings.

Results: The ratings on questions 1–3 show each of the HUD configurations overall around the center of the “Helped–Hurt” scale (between 3.0 and 4.0).

The responses to questions 4–6 showed that CDM quickening was good or helpful more often than any other fea-

ture. The variable-compression CDL had the second-highest number of favorable comments. To a lesser extent, vertical asymmetry in the CDL was rated good. There is ambiguity about the viability of most of the other HUD features.

The 1:1 compression CDL had the largest number of negative comments. The fixed-scale ladder had the second-highest number of negative comments. There is ambiguity about the degree that other HUD features were disliked.

Discussion: With such a small sample size and with missing data, the opinion of just one or two pilots can weight ratings significantly. Therefore, generalization from these data should be done cautiously. Within these original constraints on the data, a quickened CDM and a variable-compression CDL are highly desirable in this pop-up A/G task. A 1:1-scale CDL, nonquickened CDM, and fixed scales were not liked. Some ladder comments concentrated on degree increments: some wanted smaller increments, some larger.

The following paragraphs elaborate on the findings.

1. Climb–dive marker: It was virtually unanimous that the CDM should be quickened. Comments regarding the nonquickened marker were that it was sluggish, it was hard to follow, it required too much anticipation, and it was difficult to use. The opposite was said for the quickened CDM.
2. Fixed scales: Most comments on the desirability of fixed scales were negative, mentioning the undesirable pendulum effect and pitch control and scan difficulty. One evaluation pilot, however, said that the fixed scales did not affect the task much.
3. Vertical asymmetry: The only negative comment on vertical asymmetry was that the evaluation pilot did not really notice it. The other comments were positive, including that this scale “left no doubt whether [I was] in a climb or a dive.”
4. Straight lines: Straight lines seemed to be undesirable. Only HUDs 5 and 10 had straight-line CDLs. HUD 5 had a 1:1 ladder and HUD 10 had a variable-compression ladder. Unfortunately, only one pilot flew with HUD 5, so a meaningful comparison between 1:1 and variable compression with straight lines is impossible. From the pilots evaluating straight lines, there were more negative than positive comments, including observation of a laddering effect.
5. Variable-compression ladder: Some negative feelings about variable compression were evident in the fact that there were some positive comments about 1:1 scaling. Most comments were clearly positive about variable-compression scaling.

6. Tick marks: Very few comments were made regarding the tick mark location. Some pilots thought that the tick marks were inconsequential, while some liked them on the outside (saying they emphasized the taper on HUD 1), some suggested tick mark removal, and some thought the inside ticks were undesirable. One evaluator said that he used the ticks mainly to tell if he was "above or below."

To enhance the task, the following changes could be made:

1. Provide a featureless landscape for part of the run-in, e.g., barren desert or ocean;
2. Provide hills and mountains to navigate through during the run-in;
3. Require several heading changes to put the aircraft in position for attack on ground targets and a suitable escape route;
4. Include an "observable ceiling" over which the aircraft can be observed by enemy radar;
5. Provide a time above the observable ceiling to complete the mission before missile launch (serves as an artificial threat, for realism and stress increase);
6. Use an artificial time-to-pop-up cue, such as a tone to ensure that all pilots pop up at the same point in the attack (alternatively, use the point of penetration of the observable ceiling);
7. Modify the actual pop-up maneuver to fit the scenario, to add realism, or to increase the difficulty of the mission.

The following performance measures are recommended for future evaluations using the A/G task:

1. Heading, altitude, and airspeed (fidelity to prescribed values throughout the run);
2. Stick and throttle reversals;
3. Time to visually acquire the target (not necessarily using the piper, a verbal "see target one" and "see target two");
4. Time above observable ceiling;
5. Ability to capture prescribed climb-dive angles and rollover.

ILS approach task-

Task description: The approach and landing task involved a standard ILS approach to a landing or missed approach. The initial conditions (ICs) for the approach were as follows:

Range:	5 n. mi.
Lateral offset:	3,000 ft
Altitude:	1,200 ft
Glideslope:	3 deg
Heading:	Parallel with runway heading

Each pilot made two approaches for each HUD configuration. One approach was terminated with a waveoff at a 200-ft decision height. The second approach was terminated when the aircraft touched down on the runway. The evaluation pilots were instructed to maintain airspeed-AOA and glideslope-localizer deviations.

Both approaches were made during low-visibility conditions. The first approach (to a waveoff) had visibility conditions of 100 ft and 1/4 n. mi. and the second approach (to touchdown) had visibility conditions of 200 ft and 1/2 nm. Both approaches were flown with moderate turbulence levels to increase pilot workload.

Figure 15 shows the approach plate used by the evaluation pilots.

Subjective data analysis: Pilot comments indicated a strong preference for the quickened CDM display.

Objective data analysis: The primary measures of HUD performance during this task were glideslope localizer, airspeed, and AOA deviations; throttle position; and longitudinal and lateral stick positions (used as a measure of pilot physical workload). Both time histories and end-of-run statistics were used to measure pilot performance and physical workload. The following parameters were recorded on time histories: flightpath angle, AOA, airspeed, glideslope deviation, localizer deviation, pitch attitude, bank attitude, throttle position, longitudinal stick position, and lateral stick position. The following parameters were recorded for end-of-run statistics: AOA deviations from approach AOA; airspeed deviations from approach airspeed; glideslope deviation; localizer deviation; and washed-out throttle, longitudinal stick, and lateral stick positions. The calculations of the throttle and stick parameters are shown below. The AOA, airspeed, glideslope, and localizer deviations were used to measure approach performance. The washed-out throttle and stick positions were used as a measure of pilot physical workload:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Throttle and stick position} \longrightarrow \boxed{\begin{array}{c} 0.5s \\ (0.5s + 1) \end{array}} \longrightarrow \boxed{(abs)} \longrightarrow \begin{array}{l} \text{Calculate mean and standard deviation} \end{array} \end{array}$$

(9)

Results: Only eight precision approaches were completed during the evaluation. This only allowed for the validation of the task itself and the data collection algorithms. No statistically significant data could be obtained from the limited number of approaches made.

Discussion: Pilot comments did indicate strong preference for the quickened CDM display. It allowed more aggressive maneuvers with minimal overshoots and eliminated the disappearance of the display from the HUD field of view during aggressive maneuvers. The task, as described, appears to be suitable for further evaluations of landing symbolologies.

Unusual attitude recovery—One of the flying tasks that has been of particular interest to those developing the HUD as a flight reference display is UA recovery. The ability to quickly assess and react to the aircraft's attitude is a critical function of any flight display. In the task of attitude assessment, the HUD has its most significant departure from traditional flight displays. By its very nature, the HUD is unable to display flight attitude as unambiguously as a head-down attitude indicator. This is the major reason behind the reluctance of the USAF to qualify the HUD as a primary flight display.

The development of an evaluation technique that can evaluate the ability of a given display to convey flight attitude information to the pilot was a major objective of the FSWG. The bulk of past research has relied on a single technique to evaluate UA recoveries. In this technique, the evaluation pilot is presented with a blank display. Upon command of the pilot, a UA is presented on the display. The pilot then recovers to straight-and-level flight.

Task description: Each evaluation pilot was given a preliminary briefing of each of the HUD configurations to be evaluated, the test procedure, and the performance parameters that were to be collected. Once briefed and positioned in the simulator, the pilots were presented with one of the HUD configurations being evaluated. Each pilot was given an opportunity to fly the simulator with the HUD being flown for that trial block.

When the evaluation pilot indicated he had adequately familiarized himself with the HUD characteristics, the HUD was blanked. The experimenter instructed the pilot about the attitude to which he was to recover: wings level or another assigned attitude.

Upon activation by the evaluation pilot (via the trigger switch), the simulator was reset to the UA with the HUD on. The pilot then initiated the recovery to the preassigned attitude. Once the pilot felt he had achieved the assigned attitude, he terminated the trial by pressing the trigger switch, at which time the HUD would blank. The initial conditions and final conditions are shown in table 8.

This procedure was repeated until all trials for each block were completed.

The HUD symbolologies are shown in table 2.

Subjective data analysis: Pilot ratings were obtained from the postflight and final questionnaires. Free-form pilot comments were also obtained.

Objective data analysis: Data parameters analyzed for UA recovery include

reaction time (sec)—the time from initiation to the first correct control input;

recovery time (sec)—the time from initiation until the evaluation pilot presses the trigger indicating recovery;

altitude loss/gain (ft)—maximum altitude deviation from initiation until recovery.

Results: Although the evaluation did not result in a clear pilot preference for any one of the HUD configurations, it did provide valuable information. Based on pilot comments made during the course of the evaluation and responses on posttest questionnaires, a consensus was achieved on some key issues.

First, most of the evaluation pilots felt that asymmetry between nose-up and nose-down was a very desirable characteristic for an attitude display. However, the degree of asymmetry and how it is achieved is open to debate. Several of the evaluation pilots felt that the configuration that maximized asymmetry was most effective for the recovery task, but they expressed some concern with regard to roll assessment with the bent scale lines. This concern has been expressed by other researchers (refs. 9 and 10).

Several of the evaluation pilots commented on the effectiveness of the inboard ticks on the CDL as an effective horizon pointer. At the same time, some commented that these ticks created undesirable clutter in the central portion of the display, which might inhibit or detract from A/A or A/G weapon delivery.

Second, nearly all of the evaluation pilots expressed a preference for the quickened CDM and felt that it increased the stability of the display. Some of the evaluation pilots commented that the movement of the scales with the quickened CDM was a distraction and did not improve cross-check patterns.

Third, opinions of the evaluation pilots were split on the effectiveness and desirability of CDL compression. The purpose of compression is to reduce the rate of ladder movement during highly dynamic maneuvering. Two pilots commented that they used the rate of ladder

movement as a gauge of pitch rate and gravity pull. They found that, as the rate of apparent motion decreased or increased, they increased or decreased the stick input to attempt to maintain a constant motion of the CDL.

Discussion: One objective of the experiment was to develop and refine effective measurement techniques for each of the tasks. For UA recovery, there is a well established technique. One of the concerns is the need to determine if the pilot can assess his attitude, not merely recover to wings level. For this reason, the task of recovering to a different, non-wings-level attitude was added. This addition was based on the idea that, for a pilot to efficiently maneuver to a different attitude, he must first accurately assess his initial attitude rather than simply determine the direction to the horizon.

In practice, this task proved to be more complicated than anticipated. It was discovered that careful selection of initial and final conditions and analysis of the control inputs is required.

Conclusions

This study served as a focal point for the FSWG and provided an instrument for exchange of information and ideas on flight symbology and test methods. For this initial study, 14 variations of HUD symbology were studied with respect to the CDL presentation, CDM quickening, and altitude and airspeed positioning. Four specific maneuver scenarios were flown by six experienced pilots. Tested HUD symbologies represented commonly used symbologies found in the USAF, RAE, and USN cockpits. Likewise, the pilots were from the same organizations. The simulator used was the NASA Ames R-CAB fixed-base simulator. This initial study proved to be logistically difficult to manage since it involved both tri-service and international agreements, travel, and assignments without direct simulation funding by each organization. Nevertheless, the simulations were successful, and the findings are summarized as follows:

1. A/A tracking

a. In subjective analysis the pilots expressed preferences for

- 1) bent climb-dive ladder lines
- 2) vertical asymmetry
- 3) variable compression
- 4) quickening

b. Objective data collected during the A/A tracking task indicated that pilot reaction times were significantly faster with asymmetrical CDLs, which may indicate

enhanced pilot awareness when performing an attitude awareness task.

2. Low-level A/G tracking

a. The subjective data showed that the pilots preferred the quickened CDM, and disliked the nonquickened CDM.

b. The objective analysis shows pilot preference for CDM quickening, variable-compression CDL, and, to a lesser extent, vertical asymmetry in CDL when performing the low-level A/G tracking task. Other factors in HUD features produced statistically ambiguous results.

c. The objective data showed that a negative pilot rating was given to the 1:1-compression CDL and the fixed-scale ladder for this task.

3. ILS approach

a. Subjective data analysis indicated strong pilot preference for a quickened CDM display.

b. Only eight precision approaches were completed and no statistically valid data were presented for this maneuver.

4. UA recovery

Subjective data show the following:

a. Pilots preferred asymmetry between nose-up and nose-down HUD presentations. (The amount of asymmetry needed was not evaluated in this study.)

b. Pilots expressed concern with interpreting roll attitude when using bent scale lines.

c. Pilots preferred inboard ticks on CDL, but they commented that the ticks cause clutter in the center of the display.

d. Pilots again preferred quickened CDM.

e. Movement of the pitch line scales with the quickened CDM was a distraction.

f. The effective measurement techniques of UA for the pilot to assess initial position proved to be too difficult to evaluate in this simulation. More carefully controlled initial and final conditions will be needed for future studies.

Insights and lessons learned during this first FSWG simulation effort will be considered in future deliberations and symbology trials. The experience gained during this collaboration with the three U.S. military services and the RAE has led to changes in test methods, an exchange of ideas, and an understanding and appreciation for the difficulty in obtaining objective performance measures. Also, an appreciation was gained for the requirements for

specific symbology presentations for specific aircraft and tasks in order to optimize pilot/vehicle performance.

References

1. Barnette, J. F.: Role of Head-Up Display in Instrument Flight. AFIFC-LR-76-2, 1976.
2. Newman, R. L.: Operational Problems Associated With Head-Up Displays During Instrument Flight. AFAMRL-TR-80-116, Oct. 1980.
3. Danek, George L.: Vertical Motion Simulator Familiarization Guide. NASA TM-103923, 1991.
4. Anderson, L. C.; and Bunnell, J. W.: AV-8B Simulation Model Engineering Specification. Systems Control Technology Final Report on Contract N00421-81-C-0289, Jan. 1985.
5. Hall, J. R.; and Penwill, J. C.: RAE Fast-Jet HUD Format – Specification Issue 2. RAE FM-WP(89)064, Sept. 1989.
6. Task Load Index, Human Performance Research Group, Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, Calif., version 1.0, 1987.
7. Bjorkman, W. S.; and Bondi, M. J.: TRENDS, The Aeronautical Post-Test Database Management System. NASA TM-101025, 1990.
8. TRENDS Users Reference, Analytical Mechanics Associates, May 1988.
9. Penwill, J. C.; and Hall, J. R.: A Comparative Evaluation of Two HUD Formats by All Four Nations to Determine the Preferred Pitch Ladder Design for EFA. RAE FM-WP(90)022, 1990.
10. Weinstein, L. F.; and Ercoline, W. R.: HUD Climb–dive Ladder Configuration and Unusual Attitude Recovery. Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting of the Human Factors Society, San Francisco, Calif., Sept. 2–6, 1991, pp. 12–16.
11. Cooper, G. E.; and Harper, R. P.: The Use of Pilot Rating in the Evaluation of Aircraft Handling Qualities. NASA TN D-5153, Apr. 1969.

Table 1. Effects and object models in the visual database

Effect	Description and comments
Illumination	Three levels: day, dusk, or night conditions
Horizon glow	Available for dusk or night conditions
Hazy horizon	Similar to horizon glow
Ground haze and fog	Visibility controllable from 0 to 20 n. mi.
Patchy fog	Pseudo-random variations in visibility
Clouds	Overcast, scud, and cloud tops available
Smoke	Visibility and color both controllable
Low-level route	A low-level database simulating the Napa Valley. The route followed a river with features such as buildings, roads, and bridges used for navigation, initial points (IPs), and targets
Seymour Johnson AFB	A conventional airport database modeled after Seymour Johnson AFB. Features include runway, taxiways, buildings, and vehicles. The surrounding region contains housing tracts, roadways, and vehicles representing suburban America

Table 2. HUD symbologies tested

No.	Label	Type of lines	Ticks	Compression	Quickening?	Fixed scales
1	TO: 1:1 QM	Tapered	Outside	1:1	Yes	Moving
2	TI: 1:1 QM	Tapered	Inside	1:1	Yes	Moving
3	BI: 1:1 QM	Bent	Inside	1:1	Yes	Moving
4	VA: 1:1 QM ^a	Tapered	Outside	1:1	Yes	Moving
		Bent	Inside			
5	SO: 1:1 QM	Straight	Outside	1:1	Yes	Moving
6	TO: V QM	Tapered	Outside	Variable	Yes	Moving
7	TI: 1:1 QM	Tapered	Inside	Variable	Yes	Moving
8	BI: 1:1 QM	Bent	Inside	Variable	Yes	Moving
9	VA: 1:1 QM ^a	Tapered	Outside	Variable	Yes	Moving
		Bent	Inside			
10	SO: 1:1 QM	Straight	Outside	Variable	Yes	Moving
11	TO: 1:1 QF	Tapered	Outside	1:1	Yes	Fixed
12	TO: 1:1 QF	Tapered	Outside	1:1	Yes	Fixed
13	TO: 1:1 NQF	Tapered	Outside	1:1	No	Fixed
14	TO: 1:1 NQF	Tapered	Outside	1:1	No	Fixed

^aTapered/outside above horizon; bent/inside below.

Table 3. Recorded variables

	Variable	Name	Units
0	Time	Time	sec
1	XNRUN	Run number	
2	XITASK	Task number	= 1: Low level = 2: Air to ground = 3: Air to air = 4: Unusual attitude = 5: Dynamic maneuvers = 6: ILS approach
3	XHUDMOD	HUD number	
4	XQUICK	Quickening	Quickening = 1; nonquickening = 0
5	XQ2	(Not used)	
6	XMOVE	Symbols	Scales fixed = 0; move with CDM = 1
7	DTHECB	Stick (pitch)	in.
8	DPHICB	Stick (roll)	in.
9	DPSICB	Rudder input	in.
10	PRLVCB	Power input	Fraction of full stroke
11	TRLVCB	Transition lever	Fraction of full stroke
12	THETJ	Nozzle angle	deg
13	RPMHAR	Engine speed	rpm
14	VEQ	Airspeed	knots
15	VEQERR	Reference airspeed	knots
16	DELTVEQ	Own-target speed	knots
17	VD	Velocity	ft/sec (inertial coordinates)
18	ALT	Barometric altitude	ft
19	HAGLCT5	Radar altitude	ft
20	RALTERR	Radar altitude error	ft
21	PLNERR	Distance error from flightpath	ft
22	PHI	Roll	deg
23	THET	Pitch	deg
24	PSI	Yaw	deg
25	PHID	Roll Euler rate	rad/sec
26	THED	Pitch Euler rate	rad/sec
27	PSID	Yaw Euler rate	rad/sec
28	ALFA	Angle of attack	deg
29	BETA	Angle of sideslip	deg
30	GAMV	Flightpath angle	deg
31	DIVEERR	Dive angle error	deg
32	PIPERR	Pipper error	mrاد
33	XRANGE	Range to target	ft
34	GAMH	Flightpath angle	deg (clockwise from north)
35	XCG	X position	ft
36	YCG	Y position	ft
37	HCG	Z position	ft
38	UB	X velocity	ft/sec (body frame)
39	VB	Y velocity	ft/sec (body frame)
40	WB	Z velocity	ft/sec (body frame)
41	UBD	X acceleration	ft/sec
42	VBD	Y acceleration	ft/sec

Table 3. Concluded

43	WBD	Z acceleration	ft/sec
44	PB	Roll rate	rad/sec
45	QB	Pitch rate	rad/sec
46	RB	Yaw rate	rad/sec
47	PBD	Roll acceleration	rad/sec
48	QBD	Pitch acceleration	rad/sec
49	RBD	Yaw acceleration	rad/sec
50	AX	X acceleration	ft/sec (body frame)
51	AY	Y acceleration	ft/sec (body frame)
52	AZ	Z acceleration	ft/sec (body frame)
53	ERSLOC	Localizer error	deg
54	ERSGS	Glideslope error	deg
55	XNUMSEG	Segment number	
56	DELTAS	Own-target speed	knots
57	EVSW1	Event switch 1	
58	EVSW2	Event switch 2	
59	EVSW3	Event switch 3	
60	EVSW4	Event switch 4	
61	EVSW5	Event switch 5	
62	EVSW6	Event switch 6	
63	EVSW7	Event switch 7	
64	EVSW8	Event switch 8	
65	EVSW9	Event switch 9	
66	XTRIG	Trigger	Trigger depressed = 1; not depressed = 0
67	XNOSHOOT	No shoot button	Button depressed = 1; not depressed = 0
68	XWINDO	In shoot envelope	In window = 1; not in window = 0
69	GSERR	Glideslope error	ft
70	AZMTHER	Azimuth error	ft
71	QUICKEN	Quickening term, q ₁	See equation (6)
72	QUICKACS	Quickening term, q ₂	See equation (7)
73	YHVV	Y velocity vector	mrاد (HUD coordinates)
74	XHVV	X velocity vector	mrاد (HUD coordinates)
75	YHACS	Y climb-dive	mrاد (HUD coordinates)
76	THTHUD	Y pitch	mrاد (HUD coordinates)
77	VEQHUD	Aircraft airspeed	knots (HUD signal)
78	ALTHUD	Aircraft altitude	ft (HUD signal)
79	PSIHUD	Aircraft heading	deg (HUD signal)
80	PHIHUD	Aircraft roll	deg (HUD signal)
81	VVEL	Velocity vector, elevation component	deg
82	VVAZ	Velocity vector, azimuth component	deg
83	RVR	Visual range	ft

Table 4. Evaluation pilot experience

ID	Organization	Total	Current aircraft	Using HUD ^a	Test pilot	Current aircraft	Other HUD-equipped aircraft flown
1	RAF	2,000	150	150	Yes	Harrier	Tornado, Jaguar
2	USN	2,500	150	250	No	F-18	Harrier ^b
3	USAF	4,000	800	260	Yes	A-7D, T-38 ^c	A-10
4	USN	3,300	1,400	15	Yes	F-14, A-4M	Harrier, ^b F-15, F-18, Mirage
5	USAF	2,600	N/R	N/R	No	T-38 ^c	A-10
6	RAF	N/R	1,000	N/R	Yes	Harrier	
7 ^d	USAF	2,200	130	N/R	Yes	A-10, T-38 ^c	
8 ^d	N/R ^e	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	
Average		1,967	205	169	5-Y, 2-N, 1-N/R	9 different HUD-equipped airplanes flown	

^aHours using HUD in IMC.^bAV-8B.^cNot HUD-equipped.^dDid not participate in A/A experiment.^eInitial questionnaire not available.

Table 5. Workload distraction task: A/A task

	A	B	C	D	E
1	NS	RH	BJ	TG	YK
2	FO	GW	IR	LP	DA
3	SL	QI	ED	PF	OT
4	XV	CE	HB	VD	WM
5	KN	MQ	UX	AC	JY

Table 6. Averages of subjective display ratings: A/G task

Pilot	HUD number												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	13	14
1	2.7	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.4	1.6	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.9		1.6	2.8
2	3.8					3.1		3.5		3.2	3.3	3.2	3.8
3	3.7					3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.9
4	2.5					2.6	3.4	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.6	2.5
5	3.6	3.4		3.5		3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.6
6	3.9					3.2	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.6	4.3
7	4.4					3.3	3.9	3.4	3.2	3.3	4.6	3.3	3.9
8	3.1					3.1	3.3	3.4	3.3				
Ave	3.5	2.9	2.4	3.0	2.4	3.0	3.2	3.11	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.5

Table 7. Averages of subjective display ratings: A/G task (reduced data table)

	HUD number										
	1	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Ave
Ladder	TO	TO	TI	BI	VA	SO	TO	TO	TO	TO	
Gearing	1:1	Var	Var	Var	Var	Var	1:1	1:1	Var	Var	
Quickening	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
Fixed	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
1	2.7	1.6	1.8	1.9	1.7	1.9		3.1	1.6	2.8	2.1
2	3.8	3.1		3.5		3.2	3.3	4.4	3.2	3.8	3.5
3	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.5	4.3	3.5	3.9	3.6
4	2.5	2.6	3.4	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.8	2.6	2.5	2.7
5	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.4
6	3.9	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.9	4.3	3.6	4.3	3.6
7	4.4	3.3	3.9	3.4	3.2	3.3	4.6	5.3	3.3	3.9	3.9
8	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.3						3.2
Ave	3.5	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.3

Table 8. Unusual attitudes

Unusual attitude	Initial conditions		Final condition ^a	
	Pitch, deg	Roll, deg	Pitch, deg	Roll, deg
1	+50	155 R	+45	60 L
2	-55	60 L	-55	100 R
3	-15	0	+45	45 R
4	+50	45 L	-50	135 L
5	+50	45 L	0	0
6	-55	135 R	0	0

^aThe evaluation pilot was to recover to this attitude.




Figure 1. R-CAB cockpit used in simulation (ref. 3). (IPS: image presentation system)




Figure 2. R-CAB field of view (ref. 3).




Figure 3. Experimental cockpit (AC90-0115-2).




Figure 4. View of HUD and instrument panel (AC90-0178-67).





Figure 5. Flight dynamics HUD installation (AC90-0178-65). (CRT: cathode-ray tube)






Figure 7. Basic HUD symbology.




Figure 8. Climb-dive ladder with tapered lines (TO).




Figure 9. Climb-dive ladder with bent lines (BI).




Figure 10. ILS guidance symbology.

	Very Helpful		Neutral				Not Helpful	
Straight	1	2	3	4		6	7	
Tapered	1	2	3		4	5	6	7
Bent	1	2		3	4	5	6	7
Vert Asymm	1	2		3	4	5	6	7
Ticks/In	1	2	3	4		5	6	7
Ticks/Out	1	2		3	4	5	6	7
1:1 Gearing	1	2	3	4		5	6	7
Variable Compression	1	2		3	4	5	6	7
Quickening	1		2	3	4	5	6	7

Figure 11. Subjective questionnaire responses averaged across subjects: A/A task.




Figure 12. Reaction time as a function of HUD types: A/A task.




Figure 13. Map of low-level route.

Subjective responses: Questions 4-6






Figure 14. Subjective responses: A/G task.



Airport Diagram

ILS RWY 8



ILS RWY 8

35°20'N-77°58'W

Figure 15. Approach procedure flown during ILS task.

Appendix A

Subjective Questionnaires

Background

One of the objectives of the TRISTAR simulations was to develop a methodology for display evaluation. It is clear that subjective pilot ratings play a key role in any such evaluation. Historically, pilot ratings have been patterned after one of two forms: The Cooper-Harper Pilot Rating (ref. 11) or a traditional "rate the difficulty on a scale of (e.g.) one to seven."

The Cooper-Harper ratings scale uses a decision tree to allow the pilot to "walk through" a series of dichotomous alternatives answering questions, such as "Is [the airplane] controllable?"; "Is adequate performance attainable with a tolerable workload?"; and "Is it satisfactory without improvement?" Following these dichotomies, the pilot makes a choice of at most three subalternatives.

Traditional rating scales either ask the pilot to rate the difficulty on a continuum of easy to hard or force him to make choices such as "Very Easy," "Easy," "Medium," "Hard," or "Very Hard." Examples of this type of scale are the NASA TLX workload rating scales (ref. 6). Similar ratings have been used in previous HUD simulations. The chief advantage for traditional scales is the ease with which a subject can learn them.

One disadvantage of such scales is the reluctance of subjects to use extreme values, and another is the reluctance of most pilots to use "difficult" ratings unless the display is quite bad. As a result, a seven point scale tends to become a three point scale.

The main advantage of the Cooper-Harper approach is that the logic tree involved produces consistent results, particularly with trained evaluators. This is evident in the area of aircraft handling qualities ratings. The difficulty is the time that an evaluator must spend learning the logic tree. When Cooper-Harper ratings are used with untrained evaluators, often a copy of the logic diagram is provided.

Display Evaluation

Two aspects of flight displays must be considered: Can the pilot determine the value of a specific parameter (such as airspeed)?; and Can the display be used to control that variable? As we have said, these two questions must be answered in the context of a specific mission scenario.

Because of the widespread acceptance of the Cooper-Harper rating scale in the flight-test community, two logic trees were constructed to rate the "readability" and the "flyability" of the display. These two decision trees are shown in figures A-1 and A-2. The readability rating

indicates whether or not the pilot can determine the value of a specific parameter using the information display. The controllability rating follows the original Cooper-Harper decision tree closely. The difference between the display controllability rating and a Cooper-Harper handling qualities rating is the requirement that the evaluation pilot consider aircraft control **using the display for information**. This is essentially a Cooper-Harper rating of the airplane handling qualities in series with the display control laws.

Note that it is possible to have a readable display that is uncontrollable as well as an unreadable display that is controllable.

It is necessary for the pilot to consider every significant variable in turn to develop his display rating. This means that he must, for example, rate the readability and controllability of airspeed information, altitude information, etc. Of course he should rate the display on an overall basis.

It is imperative that any rating be taken in the context of a specific mission segment flown by a typical operational pilot. Cooper and Harper emphasized this requirement in their report, but it applies to all aircraft control-display evaluations as well. For this reason, the evaluation pilot must have a clear understanding of the performance criteria for the task to be performed. These criteria were provided to each evaluation pilot with his task briefing materials.

The rating card is shown in appendix A-1. Copies of the logic trees and performance criteria were also provided to the evaluation pilots.

Need for Pilot Comments

No display rating (or any aircraft rating for that matter) can tell the whole story with a single number (or pair of numbers). It is essential for the pilot to tell why he made the rating. In handling qualities, a pilot might rate two airplanes as "6" in roll. One airplane might be much too responsive and easily overcontrolled while the other might be extremely sluggish in its response. Clearly, a single "6" does not tell the whole story.

Space on the rating card for pilot comments was provided.

It is essential that the evaluating pilots be acquainted with the vocabulary of display ratings. They should be aware of pilot compensation in the form of leads or lags (or both). It would be well for them to be given some opportunity to practice their ratings on standard displays.

Need for Validation

The NASA TLX workload rating scale was used as a validating "traditional scale" for all mission segments except the UA recovery. For this task, the questionnaire used in the previous UA study was used, and it is shown in appendix A-2.

The NASA TLX workload rating scale form is shown in appendix A-3.

This questionnaire, patterned after those used in previous studies, is shown in appendix A-4.

Postexperiment Questionnaire

Each evaluation pilot completed a postexperiment questionnaire. This questionnaire is shown in appendix A-5.

Subject Qualification Questionnaire

Each evaluation pilot completed a brief questionnaire describing his experience, including HUD experience.




Figure A-1. Readability rating.




Figure A-2. Flyability rating.

Appendix A-1
Pilot Rating Card

Name: _____

Display: _____

Mission: _____

Sortie: _____ Date: _____

DISPLAY PARAMETER	READA- BILITY RATING	CONTROL- LABILITY RATING	REMARKS (include estimate of precision, need for parameter, reason for rating, etc.
Pitch			
Attitude			
Bank			
Angle			
Airspeed			
Altitude			
Flight Trajectory			
Ground Track			
OVERALL		////////	
ORIENTAT'N		////////	
OVERALL	////////		
CONTROL	////////		

Additional Comments:

Appendix A–2
Rating Card Used in UA Task

POST-FLIGHT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____ Date: _____

Display: _____ Sortie: _____

1. How easy was it to fly using this display?

	Very Easy			Med- ium			Very Hard
Unusual Attitude	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recovery							

2. How easy was it to maintain orientation using this display?

	Very Easy			Med- ium			Very Hard
Unusual Attitude	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recovery							

3. What is your over all rating of this display?

	Very Easy			Med- ium			Very Hard
Unusual Attitude	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recovery							
What do you think it would be in your operations?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. What do you like about this display?

5. What problems do you see in using this display?

Name: _____ Display: _____

6. Are there any changes you might recommend to this display to make it more acceptable?

7. Any other comments or suggestions?

Appendix A-3
NASA TLX Rating Card


Subject ID: _____ Task ID: _____

RATING SHEET

MENTAL DEMAND




PHYSICAL DEMAND



TEMPORAL DEMAND



PERFORMANCE



EFFORT



FRUSTRATION



RATING SCALE DEFINITIONS

Title	Endpoints	Descriptions
MENTAL DEMAND	Low/High	How much mental and perceptual activity was required (e.g., thinking, deciding, calculating, remembering, looking, searching, etc.)? Was the task easy or demanding, simple or complex, exacting or forgiving?
PHYSICAL DEMAND	Low/High	How much physical activity was required (e.g., pushing, pulling, turning, controlling, activating, etc.)? Was the task easy or demanding, slow or brisk, slack or strenuous, restful or laborious?
TEMPORAL DEMAND	Low/High	How much time pressure did you feel due to the rate or pace at which the tasks or task elements occurred? Was the pace slow and leisurely or rapid and frantic?
PERFORMANCE	good/poor	How successful do you think you were in accomplishing the goals of the task set by the experimenter (or yourself)? How satisfied were you with your performance in accomplishing these goals?
EFFORT	Low/High	How hard did you have to work (mentally and physically) to accomplish your level of performance?
FRUSTRATION LEVEL	Low/High	How insecure, discouraged, irritated, stressed and annoyed versus secure, gratified, content, relaxed and complacent did you feel during the task?

Appendix A–4

Initial Questionnaire

INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____

Date: _____

1. What type aircraft and HUD are you presently flying?

Aircraft: _____

HUD: _____

2. What are your present flight qualifications?

- ☐ Instructor Pilot
- ☐ Flight Lead
- ☐ Aircraft Commander
- ☐ Other (please specify)

3. Indicate your flight experience.

	<u>All</u> <u>Aircraft</u>	<u>Current</u> <u>Aircraft</u>
Total flying time:	-----	-----
As Instructor Pilot	-----	-----
Actual Instrument	-----	-----
Actual instrument (using HUD)	-----	-----

4. Have you flown other HUD-equipped airplanes?
If so, what airplanes and how much time?

5. Have you noticed any tendency towards disorientation when flying by
reference to the HUD?
If so, please describe.

Appendix A–5
Final Questionnaire

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____

Date: _____

- Which of the following features would you feel would be beneficial in future HUDs?

	Very Help- ful			Neu- tral			Not Help- ful	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Tapered Pitch Ladder:								
Slanted Pitch Ladder (F-18):								
Slanted and Tapered P. L.:								
Slanted below horizon, Straight above								
Full-time 2:1 Compression								
Variable Pitch Compression								
Automatic 2:1 Compression:								
Elimination of preces- sion "over the top"								

- Pitch compression, if installed, could be different for different HUD modes -- i. e. 1:1 for ILS approaches or air-to-ground weapon delivery and compressed for other modes (such as cruise). Would this influence your answers to question 1?

Name: _____

Display: _____

3. Do you feel any tasks require 1:1 pitch scaling?
If so, which ones?
4. Do you foresee any problems with using different pitch scalings for different HUD modes?
5. Automatic "upset modes" have been suggested for unusual attitude recovery. Do you feel that the following automatic mode switching could be of benefit?

	Very Help- ful		Neu- tral		Not Help- ful		
Automatic declutter:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Automatic pitch: compression	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Automatic declutter and compression	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. What should trigger such pitch scale compression?
- Excessive bank angle () what value?
- Excessive pitch attitude () what value?
- Combination of pitch and bank () what values?
- Stick-mounted paddle switch, i. e. pilot selected. ()
- Automatic, but with stick mounted paddle switch to cancel ()

Name: _____

Display: _____

7. Do you have any comments regarding "upset modes"?

8. Were your instructions and questionnaires clear?

9. Were there any problems with the simulator?

10. Any other comments, suggestions, criticisms, etc. will be welcome.

Appendix B

Tristar Trends Database Output

Appendix B-1

Wordscan Output Example

WORDSCAN OUTPUT FOR

TRISTAR DATABASE

SCAN.TRXTS1

5-SEP-90 14:15:13

		Pilot Comments	Duration	Tzero
FLT	3 CTR	21 HUD01/UA01:+50,155R:+45, 60L	12.00	0:00:00.024
FLT	3 CTR	22 HUD01/UA02:-55, 60L:-55,100R	5.50	0:00:00.024
FLT	3 CTR	23 HUD01/UA03:-15, 0R:+45, 45R	10.87	0:00:00.024
FLT	3 CTR	26 HUD01/UA06:+50, 30L:-50,135L	13.85	0:00:00.024
FLT	3 CTR	27 HUD01/UA07:+50, 45L: 0, 0	10.99	0:00:00.024
FLT	3 CTR	28 HUD01/UA08:-55,135R: 0, 0	9.50	0:00:00.024

		Pilot Comments	Duration	Tzero
FLT	4 CTR	29 HUD02/UA00:PRACTICE	56.16	0:00:00.024
FLT	4 CTR	30 HUD02/UA02:-55, 60L:-55,100R	4.73	0:00:00.024
FLT	4 CTR	32 HUD02/UA06:+50, 30L:-50,135L	13.85	0:00:00.024
FLT	4 CTR	33 HUD02/UA08:-55,135R: 0, 0	9.14	0:00:00.024
FLT	4 CTR	34 HUD02/UA01:+50,155R:+45, 60L	7.06	0:00:00.024
FLT	4 CTR	35 HUD02/UA03:-15, 0R:+45, 45R	9.65	0:00:00.024
FLT	4 CTR	37 HUD02/UA07:+50, 45L: 0, 0	16.49	0:00:00.024

		Pilot Comments	Duration	Tzero
FLT	5 CTR	38 HUD04/UA00:PRACTICE	46.90	0:00:00.024
FLT	5 CTR	39 HUD04/UA03:-15, 0R:+45, 45R	10.66	0:00:00.024
FLT	5 CTR	40 HUD04/UA06:+50, 30L:-50,135L	13.82	0:00:00.024
FLT	5 CTR	41 HUD04/UA01:+50,155R:+45, 60L	8.76	0:00:00.024
FLT	5 CTR	43 HUD04/UA07:+50, 45L: 0, 0	12.26	0:00:00.024
FLT	5 CTR	44 HUD04/UA02:-55, 60L:-55,100R	6.62	0:00:00.024
FLT	5 CTR	46 HUD04/UA08:-55,135R: 0, 0	8.16	0:00:00.024

		Pilot Comments	Duration	Tzero
FLT	7 CTR	57 HUD06/AA00:PRACTICE	29.86	0:00:00.024
FLT	7 CTR	58 HUD06/AA00:PRACTICE	58.92	0:00:00.024
FLT	7 CTR	59 HUD06/AA1A:+20, 20R:+20, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	7 CTR	60 HUD06/AA1B:+50, 45L:+20, 45R	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	7 CTR	62 HUD06/AA1D:+70,160L:+30, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	7 CTR	63 HUD06/AA1E:-20, 20L:-20, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	7 CTR	65 HUD06/AA1D:+70,160L:+30, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	7 CTR	66 HUD06/AA2A:+70,160L:+30, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000

		Pilot Comments	Duration	Tzero
FLT	8 CTR	69 HUD02/AA4E:+20, 20R:+20, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	70 HUD02/AA3B:+50, 45L:+20, 45R	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	72 HUD02/AA2A:+70,160L:+30, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	73 HUD02/AA4C:+70,160L:+30, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	74 HUD02/AA2E:+50, 45L:+20, 45R	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	75 HUD02/AA1A:+20, 20R:+20, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	76 HUD02/AA3C:+70,160R:+30, 45R	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	77 HUD02/AA4B:+50, 45R:+50, 20L	21.91	0:00:00.024
FLT	8 CTR	79 HUD02/AA3D:-20, 20R:-40, 20R	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	80 HUD02/AA1D:+70,160L:+30, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	82 HUD02/AA1E:-20, 20L:-20, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	83 HUD02/AA2C:+20, 20R:+20, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	84 HUD02/AA2A:+70,160L:+30, 45L	0.00	0:00:00.000
FLT	8 CTR	85 HUD02/AA2D:-20, 20R:-40, 20R	0.00	0:00:00.000

Appendix B–2

Item Definitions

TRISTAR PARAMETER DEFINITIONS

ITEMS.TRXTS1

5-SEP-90 14:20:08

ML Mnemonic-ordered list

Seq	Item	Description	Units	Item- Code Grp	Filtr Freq	Input Rate/Dec
1	ALFA	ANGLE OF ATTACK	DEG		TC	
2	ALT	BAROMETER ALTITUDE	FEET		TC	
3	ALTHUD				TC	
4	AX	X-ACCEL AIRCRAFT CG	RAD/S2		TC	
5	AY	Y-ACCEL AIRCRAFT CG	RAD/S2			
6	AZ	Z-ACCEL AIRCRAFT CG	RAD/S2		TC	
7	AZMTHERR	AZIMUTH ERROR	FEET		TC	
8	BETA	SIDESLIP ANGLE	DEG		TC	
9	DELTAS	OWN TARGET SPEED	KNOTS		TC	
10	DELTVEQ	OWN-TARGET SPEED	KNOTS		TC	
11	DIVEERR	OWN DIVE ANGLE	DEG		TC	
12	DPHICB	ROLL INPUT	INCHES		TC	
13	DPSICB	YAW INPUT	INCHES		TC	
14	DTHECB	PITCH INPUT	INCHES		TC	
15	DURTIME	LENGTH OF RUN IN SECONDS	SEC		TC	
16	EPSGS	GLIDE SLOPE ERROR	DEG		TC	
17	EPSLOC	LOCALIZED ERROR	DEG		TC	
18	ETRRV	ELAPSED TIME FROM RVR=0	SEC		ΔΔ	
19	EVSU1					
20	EVSU2					
21	EVSU3					
22	EVSU4					
23	EVSU5					
24	EVSU6					
25	EVSU7					
26	EVSU8					
27	EVSU9					
28	E_TLX	EFFORT - RATING SHEET	Z		PR	
29	F_TLX	FRUSTRATION - RATING SHEET	Z		PR	
30	GAMH	FLT ANGLE CLOCKWISE FROM NORTH	RAD		TC	
31	GAMV	FLIGHT PATH ANGLE	RADS		TC	
32	GSERR	GLIDE SLOPE ERROR	FEET		TC	
33	HAGLCT5	RADAR ALTITUDE	FEET			
34	HCG	Z-POSITION OF AIRCRAFT	FEET		TC	
35	HHGS	GLIDE SLOPE ERROR	FEET		TC	
36	HUD10DEF	SO:STRA,OUT VAR QM:QUICK,MOVE			HD	
37	HUD11DEF	TO:TAPER,OUT 1:1 QF:QUICK, FIX			HD	
38	HUD12DEF	TO:TAPER,OUT 1:1 NQF:NOQUI, FIX			HD	
39	HUD13DEF	TO:TAPER,OUT VAR QF:QUICK, FIX			HD	
40	HUD14DEF	TO:TAPER,OUT VAR NQF:NOQUI, FIX			HD	
41	HUD1DEF	TO:TAPER,OUT 1:1 QM:QUICK,MOVE			HD	
42	HUD2DEF	TI:TAPER,IN 1:1 QM:QUICK,MOVE			HD	
43	HUD3DEF	BI:BENDY,IN 1:1 QM:QUICK,MOVE			HD	
44	HUD4DEF	VA:VERT ASYM 1:1 QM:QUICK,MOVE			HD	
45	HUD5DEF	SO:STRA,OUT 1:1 QM:QUICK,MOVE			HD	
46	HUD6DEF	TO:TAPER,OUT VAR QM:QUICK,MOVE			HD	
47	HUD7DEF	TI:TAPER,IN VAR QM:QUICK,MOVE			HD	

48	HUD8DEF	BI:BENDY,IN	VAR QM:QUICK,MOVE		HD
49	HUD9DEF	VA:VERT ASYM	VAR QM:QUICK,MOVE		HD
50	IQ2	QUICKENING=1	NON-QUICKENING=0		TC
51	MD_TLX	MENTAL DEMAND - RATING SHEET	Z		PR
52	PB	ROLL RATE (BODY FRAME)	RAD/S		TC
53	PBD	ROLL ACCEL (BODY FRAME)	RAD/S2		TC
54	PD_TLX	PHYSICAL DEMAND - RATING SHEET	Z		PR
55	PHI	OWNSHIP ROLL	DEG		TC
56	PHID	ROLL EULER RATE	RAD/S		
57	PHIHUD				TC
58	PIPRER	PIPPER ERROR	MRADS		TC
59	PLNERR	DIST ERROR FROM FLIGHT PATH	FEET		TC
60	PRERV	TIME BERFORE RVR=0	SEC		ΔΔ
61	PRLVCB	POWER INPUT			TC
62	PSI	OWNSHIP YAW	DEG		TC
63	PSID	YAW EULER RATE	RAD/S		
64	PSIHUD				TC
65	P_TLX	PERFORMANCE - RATING SHEET	Z		PR
66	QB	PITCH RATE (BODY FRAME)	RAD/S		TC
67	QBD	PITCH ACCEL (BODY FRAME)2	RAD/S2		TC
68	QUICKEN				TC
69	QUIKACS				TC
70	RALTERR	OWN-REF RADAR ALT	FEET		
71	RB	YAW RATE (BODY FRAME)	RAD/S		TC
72	RBD	PITCH ACCEL (BODY FRAME)	RAD/S2		
73	RC_1OT	OVERALL - RATING CARD	1-7		PR
74	RC_1PT	PRESENT TASK - RATING CARD	1-7		PR
75	RC_2A	MOTION HUD TO READ WORLD	0-7		FR
76	RC_2B	MOTION OF PITCH LADDER/HORIZ	0-7		PR
77	RC_2C	MOTION OF SCALES	0-7		PR
78	RC_2D	MOTION OF AIRPLANE SYMBOL	0-7		PR
79	RC_2E1	MOTION V/V DIAMOND STRAIGHT	0-7		PR
80	RC_2E2	MOTION V/V DIAMOND EASY TURNS	0-7		PR
81	RC_2E3	MOTION V/V DIAMOND HARD TURNS	0-7		PR
82	RC_3P	EASE OF MAINTAINING PITCH	0-7		PR
83	RC_3R	EASE OF MAINTAINING ROLL	0-7		PR
84	RPMHAR	RPM			
85	RVR	VISUAL RANGE	FEET		TC
86	THED	PITCH EULER RATE	RAD/S		
87	THET	OWNSHIP PITCH	DEG		TC
88	THETAJ				
89	THTHUD				TC
90	TRLVCB				
91	T_TLX	TEMPORAL - RATING SHEET	Z		PR
92	UB	X-VEL FORWARD (BODY FRAME0	FPS		
93	UBD	X-ACCEL FORWARD (BODY FRAME0	FPS2		TC
94	VB	Y-VEL FORWARD (BODY FRAME0	FPS		
95	VBD	Y-ACCEL FORWARD (BODY FRAME0	FPS2		
96	VD	OWN VELOCITY TO EARTH CENTER	FPS		
97	VEQ	OWNSHIP AIRSPEED	KNOTS		TC
98	VEQERR	OWN REFERENCE SPEED	KNOTS		TC
99	VEQHUD	HUD AIRSPEED	KNOTS		TC
100	VVEL				TC
101	VVEL2			VVEL	

102	WB	Z-VEL FORWARD (BODY FRAME0	FPS	TC
103	WBD	Z-ACCEL FORWARD (BODY FRAME0	FPS2	TC
104	XCG	X-POSITION OF AIRCRAFT	FEET	TC
105	XHUDMOD	HUD MODEL NUMBER	1-14	TC
106	XHVV	X-VELOCITY VECTOR		TC
107	XITASK	TASK NUMBER	1-6	TC
108	XMOVE	SIDESCLS FIXED=0		TC
109	XNRUN	RUN NUMBER		TC
110	XNUMSEG	SEGMENT NUMBER		TC
111	XOSHOOT	NO SHOOT DEPRESSED=1		TC
112	XQ2	QUICKENING=1, NON-QUICKENING=0		TC
113	XQUICK	QUICKENING=1, NON-QUICKENING=0		TC
114	XRANGE			TC
115	XTRIG	TRIGGER DEPRESSED=1		TC
116	XWINDO	IN WINDOW=1, NOT IN WINDOW=0		TC
117	YCG	Y-POSITION OF AIRCRAFT	FEET	TC
118	YHACS			TC
119	YHVV	Y-VELOCITY VECTOR		TC

Appendix B–3

Flight Descriptions

EXAMPLE OF FLIGHT DESCRIPTIONS

FLIGHTS.TRXTS1

5-SEP-90 14:21:52

FLIGHTS: Show Flight Descriptions

\$ Enter BRIEF, NOTES or FULL :
+F

\$ LOOK FOR:
+*

\$ Enter flight(s) of interest :
+200-225

AIRCRAFT: TS1 UNUSUAL ATTITUDE - HUD 2
FLIGHT: 200 LOCATION: VMS
FLT DATE: 16 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1013- 1016
DIRECTOR: PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
During present task 3.5
Overall 3.5

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't Notice Helped Medium Hurt
(HELP OR HINDER) 0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
A HUD-motion wrt real world
B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
C Motion of scales
D Motion of airplane symbol
E Motion of V/V diamond in:
E1 straight flight
E2 easy turns
E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION Very Good Medium Very Poor
-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
Pitch orientation 3
Roll orientation 2

Rating Sheet

-----> Mental demand 50% Physical Demand 60% Temporal 40%
Performance 40% Effort 50% Frustration 40%

4. Liked:----- 1:1 apparent tapering effect is less.
5. Problems:-- Cues for extreme pitch attitude are reduced.
6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 UNUSUAL ATTITUDE - HUD 7
 FLIGHT: 201 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 16 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1016- 1023
 DIRECTOR: PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 2.5
 Overall 2.5

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
 C Motion of scales
 D Motion of airplane symbol 4
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 Pitch orientation 2
 Roll orientation 2

Rating Sheet

-----> Mental demand 45% Physical Demand 40% Temporal 40%
 Performance 30% Effort 40% Frustration 40%

4. Liked:-----
 5. Problems:-- Scan pattern could add to workload so should fix scales to CDA.
 6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 UNUSUAL ATTITUDE - HUD 14
 FLIGHT: 202 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 16 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1024- 1027
 DIRECTOR: PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--

During present task 6
 Overall 6

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
 C Motion of scales 6
 D Motion of airplane symbol
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 Pitch orientation
 Roll orientation 2

Rating Sheet
 -----> Mental demand 50% Physical Demand 60% Temporal 50%
 Performance 60% Effort 70% Frustration 75%

4. Liked:-----
 5. Problems:-- Scan pattern became enormous, so unsat. -setting att. more diff.
 6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 AIR TO GROUND - HUD 6
 FLIGHT: 203 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 16 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1029- 1030
 DIRECTOR: PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 2
 Overall 2

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
 C Motion of scales
 D Motion of airplane symbol
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns 4

E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good	Medium	Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--		
Pitch orientation	2		
Roll orientation	2		

Rating Sheet

----->	Mental demand	50%	Physical Demand	50%	Temporal	50
	Performance	40%	Effort	50%	Frustration	30%

4. Liked:-----

5. Problems:-- Straight pitch bar good since accurate attitude.

6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 AIR TO GROUND - HUD 1
FLIGHT: 204 LOCATION: VMS
FLT DATE: 16 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1031- 1033
DIRECTOR: PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING	Very Good	Medium	Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--		
During present task	3		
Overall	3		

2. APPARENT MOTION	Didn't						
(HELP OR HINDER)	Notice	Helped	Medium		Hurt		
	-----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--						
A HUD-motion wrt real world							
B Pitch motion ladder/horizon							
C Motion of scales							
D Motion of airplane symbol							
E Motion of V/V diamond in:							
E1 straight flight							
E2 easy turns							4
E3 hard turns							

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good	Medium	Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--		
Pitch orientation	4		
Roll orientation	2		

Rating Sheet

----->	Mental demand	60%	Physical Demand	60%	Temporal	60
	Performance	40%	Effort	50%	Frustration	40%

4. Liked:-----

- *****

1. OVERALL RATING .	Very Good	Medium	Very Poor
-----	1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--		
During present task	5		
Overall	5		

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good		Medium		Very Poor
	-----1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----6-----7--
Pitch orientation					
Roll orientation					

4. Liked:-----
5. Problems:-- ILS display should stay fixed relative to pitch bar. Smaller gearing of heading scale.
6. Changes?:--

77

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 5
 Overall 5

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
 C Motion of scales
 D Motion of airplane symbol
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 Pitch orientation
 Roll orientation

Rating Sheet

-----> Mental demand 70% Physical Demand 50% Temporal 50%
 Performance 40% Effort 60% Frustration 45%

4. Liked:-----
 5. Problems:-- Tabs on inside add a little clutter when CDA gets to -5 dive.
 6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 PRECISION APPROACH HUD 13
 FLIGHT: 207 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 16 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1038- 1039
 DIRECTOR: PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 6
 Overall 6

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
 C Motion of scales
 D Motion of airplane symbol

E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good		Medium		Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--				
Pitch orientation					
Roll orientation					

Rating Sheet

----->	Mental demand	80%	Physical Demand	50%	Temporal	60%
	Performance	40%	Effort	70%	Frustration	60%

4. Liked:-----
 5. Problems:-- Scan pattern is enormous and with heading being important makes task difficult.
 6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1	PRECISION APPROACH HUD 14
FLIGHT: 208	LOCATION: VMS
FLT DATE: 16 MAR 90	COUNTERS: 1040- 1041
DIRECTOR:	PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING	Very Good		Medium		Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--				
During present task					6.5
Overall					6.5

2. APPARENT MOTION	Didn't				
(HELP OR HINDER)	Notice	Helped		Medium	Hurt
	-----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--				
A HUD-motion wrt real world					
B Pitch motion ladder/horizon					
C Motion of scales					
D Motion of airplane symbol					
E Motion of V/V diamond in:					
E1 straight flight					
E2 easy turns					
E3 hard turns					

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good		Medium		Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--				
Pitch orientation					
Roll orientation					

Rating Sheet

----->	Mental demand	80%	Physical Demand	60%	Temporal	70%
	Performance	60%	Effort	75%	Frustration	65%

4. Liked:-----
 5. Problems:-- Scan still enormous. FPM much harder to control: overcontrol-
 ling made task harder.
 6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1	PRECISION APPROACH HUD 13
FLIGHT: 209	LOCATION: VMS
FLT DATE: 16 MAR 90	COUNTERS: 1042- 1043
DIRECTOR:	PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 4
 Overall 4

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world 2
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
 C Motion of scales 4
 D Motion of airplane symbol 2
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 Pitch orientation
 Roll orientation

Rating Sheet						
----->	Mental demand	60%	Physical Demand	40%	Temporal	60%
	Performance	20%	Effort	50%	Frustration	20%

4. Liked:-----
 5. Problems:-- Would like A/S closer.
 6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 PRECISION APPROACH HUD 14
 FLIGHT: 210 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 16 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1044- 1045
 DIRECTOR: PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 4
 Overall 4

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 (HELP OR HINDER) -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world 2
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
 C Motion of scales 2
 D Motion of airplane symbol 2
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 Pitch orientation
 Roll orientation

Rating Sheet
 -----> Mental demand 50% Physical Demand 50% Temporal 60%
 Performance 30% Effort 40% Frustration 20%

4. Liked:-----
 5. Problems:--
 6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 PRECISION APPROACH HUD 7
 FLIGHT: 211 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 16 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1046- 1047
 DIRECTOR: PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 2.5
 Overall 2.5

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 (HELP OR HINDER) -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--

A HUD-motion wrt real world 2
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
 C Motion of scales 1
 D Motion of airplane symbol 2
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good		Medium		Very Poor
	-----1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----6-----7--
Pitch orientation					
Roll orientation					

Rating Sheet

----->	Mental demand	50%	Physical Demand	40%	Temporal	60%
	Performance	20%	Effort	40%	Frustration	10%

4. Liked:-----
 5. Problems:-- Task does not require pilot to monitor scales. Task which required pilot to monitor Alt. would be better.
 6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 PRECISION APPROACH HUD 6
 FLIGHT: 212 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 16 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1048- 1049
 DIRECTOR: PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 2
 Overall 2

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 (HELP OR HINDER) -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world 2
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
 C Motion of scales 2
 D Motion of airplane symbol 2
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good		Medium		Very Poor
	-----1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----6-----7--

Pitch orientation
Roll orientation

Rating Sheet

-----> Mental demand 40% Physical Demand 40% Temporal
 Performance 10% Effort 35% Frustration 10%

50%

4. Liked:-----
5. Problems:--
6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 AIR TO AIR - HUD 1
FLIGHT: 213 LOCATION: VMS
FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1051- 1055
DIRECTOR: KESSLER/LH PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 4
 Overall 4

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
(HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
-----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
A HUD-motion wrt real world
B Pitch motion ladder/horizon 6
C Motion of scales
D Motion of airplane symbol
E Motion of V/V diamond in:
E1 straight flight
E2 easy turns
E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
Pitch orientation 5
Roll orientation 2.5

Rating Sheet

-----> Mental demand 80% Physical Demand 65% Temporal
 Performance 30% Effort 60% Frustration 30%

60%

4. Liked:-----
5. Problems:-- Ladder effects with pitch rates. (would get worse with higher pitch rates)
6. Changes?:-- Gear it. Eliminate multiple righting of the pitch bars.

AIRCRAFT: TS1 AIR TO AIR - HUD 6
 FLIGHT: 214 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1056- 1063
 DIRECTOR: KESSLER/LH PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 2.5
 Overall 2.5

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon 4
 C Motion of scales
 D Motion of airplane symbol
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 Pitch orientation 2
 Roll orientation 2.5

Rating Sheet
 -----> Mental demand 70% Physical Demand 60% Temporal 60%
 Performance 15% Effort 50% Frustration 20%

4. Liked:-----
 5. Problems:-- Doesn't display ladder effects. Compressed gearing. Slightly
 abnormal motions of pitch ladder occasionally.
 6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 AIR TO AIR - HUD 5
 FLIGHT: 215 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1064- 1068
 DIRECTOR: GK/LH PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 5

Overall 5

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
A HUD-motion wrt real world
B Pitch motion ladder/horizon 6
C Motion of scales
D Motion of airplane symbol
E Motion of V/V diamond in:
E1 straight flight
E2 easy turns
E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
Pitch orientation 5.5
Roll orientation 3

Rating Sheet

-----> Mental demand 80% Physical Demand 60% Temporal 50%
 Performance 60% Effort 75% Frustration 30%

4. Liked:----- Nothing
5. Problems:-- Multiple writing in pitch bars. Coarse indication of (?). No analog feedback of pitch attitude. Must read numbers. Used to 10 degree markings.
6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 AIR TO AIR - HUD 10
FLIGHT: 216 LOCATION: VMS
FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1069- 1074
DIRECTOR: GK/LH PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 3.5
 Overall 3.5

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
A HUD-motion wrt real world
B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
C Motion of scales
D Motion of airplane symbol
E Motion of V/V diamond in:
E1 straight flight

E2 easy turns
E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good	Medium	Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--		
Pitch orientation	3.5		
Roll orientation	3		

Rating Sheet

----->	Mental demand	40%	Physical Demand	60%	Temporal	50%
	Performance	30%	Effort	60%	Frustration	20%

4. Liked:----- Don't suffer from laddering. Like crispness of pitch ladder.
5. Problems:-- Awful lot of writing of bars. Very evident in this display.
6. Changes?:-- Better analog information from this display. Needs tapers.

AIRCRAFT: TS1	UNUSUAL ATTITUDE - HUD 4
FLIGHT: 217	LOCATION: VMS
FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90	COUNTERS: 1075- 1078
DIRECTOR: GK/LH	PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING	Very Good	Medium	Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--		
During present task	3		
Overall	3		

2. APPARENT MOTION (HELP OR HINDER)	Didn't Notice	Helped	Medium	Hurt
	-----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--			
A HUD-motion wrt real world				
B Pitch motion ladder/horizon		4.5		
C Motion of scales				
D Motion of airplane symbol				
E Motion of V/V diamond in:				
E1 straight flight				
E2 easy turns				
E3 hard turns				

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good	Medium	Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--		
Pitch orientation	2.5		
Roll orientation	3.5		

Rating Sheet

----->	Mental demand	60/65%	Physical Demand	50%	Temporal	50%
	Performance	50%	Effort	50%	Frustration	20%

4. Liked:----- Very obvious whether you're above or below horizon.
5. Problems:-- Laddering. Looks like 2 different displays above or below hor.
Window problems - left bank & pulling. Numbers on pitch bars
are late coming into display.
6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 UNUSUAL ATTITUDE - HUD 9
FLIGHT: 218 LOCATION: VMS
FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1079- 1082
DIRECTOR: GK/LH PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
During present task 3
Overall 3

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
(HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
-----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
A HUD-motion wrt real world
B Pitch motion ladder/horizon
C Motion of scales
D Motion of airplane symbol
E Motion of V/V diamond in:
E1 straight flight
E2 easy turns
E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
Pitch orientation 2
Roll orientation 3

Rating Sheet

-----> Mental demand 60% Physical Demand 50% Temporal 50%
Performance 30% Effort 50% Frustration 20%

4. Liked:----- Good analog info. about below and above horizon.
5. Problems:-- Less happy about 0 below horizon. Error of +/-20 degs. of roll.
Using different techniques for attitudes below & above horizon.
6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1

AIR TO AIR - HUD 5

FLIGHT: 219 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1083- 1091
 DIRECTOR: GK/LH PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 4
 Overall 4

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon 4
 C Motion of scales 4
 D Motion of airplane symbol 4
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 Pitch orientation 3
 Roll orientation 3

Rating Sheet
 -----> Mental demand 40% Physical Demand 40% Temporal 40%
 Performance 60% Effort 40% Frustration 40%

4. Liked:----- Similar to what he's used to.
 5. Problems:-- Not used to A/S & attitude, but better than what he's used to.
 6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 AIR TO AIR - HUD 10
 FLIGHT: 220 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1093- 1096
 DIRECTOR: GK/LH PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 6
 Overall 6

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world

B Pitch motion ladder/horizon 6
 C Motion of scales 6
 D Motion of airplane symbol 6
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good	Medium	Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--		
Pitch orientation	6		
Roll orientation	6		

Rating Sheet

----->	Mental demand	60%	Physical Demand	40%	Temporal	70
	Performance	80%	Effort	70%	Frustration	50%

4. Liked:-----
 5. Problems:-- Didn't like this HUD. Logarithmic representation was not liked.
 Don't like since linear nose track not shown with variable.
 Felt like nose track was slowing down.
 6. Changes?:--
 7. Comments:-- First impression when he saw the top or bottom - not used to it.
 On 1:1 cannot see number well, but number on bars not important.

AIRCRAFT: TS1 AIR TO AIR - HUD 4
 FLIGHT: 221 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1097- 1102
 DIRECTOR: GK/LH PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING	Very Good	Medium	Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--		
During present task	3		
Overall	3		

2. APPARENT MOTION (HELP OR HINDER)	Didn't Notice	Helped	Medium	Hurt
	-----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--			
A HUD-motion wrt real world				
B Pitch motion ladder/horizon	3			
C Motion of scales	3			
D Motion of airplane symbol	3			
E Motion of V/V diamond in:				
E1 straight flight				
E2 easy turns				
E3 hard turns				

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good		Medium		Very Poor
	1	2	3	4	5
Pitch orientation	3				
Roll orientation	4				

Rating Sheet

Mental demand	30%	Physical Demand	30%	Temporal	30%
Performance	40%	Effort	30%	Frustration	20%

4. Liked:----- Liked the best since better sense of above or below.
5. Problems:-- Bridged information better for pitch attitude. Lack of compression requires symbology below horizon to give sense of urgency.
6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1	AIR TO AIR - HUD 9
FLIGHT: 222	LOCATION: VMS
FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90	COUNTERS: 1103- 1108
DIRECTOR: GK/LH	PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING	Very Good		Medium		Very Poor
	1	2	3	4	5
During present task	3				
Overall	3				

2. APPARENT MOTION (HELP OR HINDER)	Didn't Notice	Helped		Medium		Hurt
	0	1	2	3	4	5
A HUD-motion wrt real world						
B Pitch motion ladder/horizon		3				
C Motion of scales		3				
D Motion of airplane symbol		3				
E Motion of V/V diamond in:						
E1 straight flight						
E2 easy turns						
E3 hard turns						

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION	Very Good		Medium		Very Poor
	1	2	3	4	5
Pitch orientation	5				
Roll orientation	4				

Rating Sheet

Mental demand	40%	Physical Demand	35%	Temporal	40%
Performance	60%	Effort	45%	Frustration	40%

4. Liked:----- Increased sense of urgency in steep dive angles - bending bars.
5. Problems:-- Tougher for roll orientation at high pitch attitudes, but roll orientation not that important

6. Changes? :--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 UNUSUAL ATTITUDE - HUD 2
FLIGHT: 223 LOCATION: VMS
FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1109- 1113
DIRECTOR: GK/LH PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
During present task 5
Overall 4

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't Notice Helped Medium Hurt
(HELP OR HINDER) 0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
A HUD-motion wrt real world
B Pitch motion ladder/horizon 4
C Motion of scales 4
D Motion of airplane symbol 4
E Motion of V/V diamond in:
E1 straight flight
E2 easy turns
E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
Pitch orientation 5
Roll orientation 5

Rating Sheet

-----> Mental demand 40% Physical Demand 35% Temporal 40
Performance 65% Effort 50% Frustration 45%

4. Liked:-----

5. Problems:-- Rapid pitch changes at several nose down attitudes. Taper too subtle in FOV of HUD needs more. Since it wasn't compressed, he had a hard time with rapid pitch attitude change.

6. Changes? :-- Compression would help for this task.

AIRCRAFT: TS1 UNUSUAL ATTITUDE - HUD 7
FLIGHT: 224 LOCATION: VMS
FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1114- 1117
DIRECTOR: GK/LH PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 3
 Overall 3

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon 4
 C Motion of scales 4
 D Motion of airplane symbol 4
 E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION
 Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 Pitch orientation 3
 Roll orientation 4

Rating Sheet
 -----> Mental demand 25% Physical Demand 20% Temporal 25%
 Performance 40% Effort 25% Frustration 20%

4. Liked:----- Good display.
 5. Problems:--
 6. Changes?:--

AIRCRAFT: TS1 UNUSUAL ATTITUDE - HUD 11
 FLIGHT: 225 LOCATION: VMS
 FLT DATE: 19 MAR 90 COUNTERS: 1118- 1121
 DIRECTOR: GK/LH PILOTS:

1. OVERALL RATING Very Good Medium Very Poor
 -----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 During present task 4
 Overall 4

2. APPARENT MOTION Didn't
 (HELP OR HINDER) Notice Helped Medium Hurt
 -----0-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--
 A HUD-motion wrt real world
 B Pitch motion ladder/horizon 4
 C Motion of scales 4
 D Motion of airplane symbol 4

E Motion of V/V diamond in:
 E1 straight flight
 E2 easy turns
 E3 hard turns

3. EASE OF MAINTAINING ORIENTATION

	Very Good		Medium		Very Poor
	-----1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7--				
Pitch orientation					5
Roll orientation					4

Rating Sheet

----->	Mental demand	35%	Physical Demand	30%	Temporal	35%
	Performance	45%	Effort	40%	Frustration	40%

4. Liked:-----
5. Problems:-- Needs compression in this display.
6. Changes?:--

\$ Enter flight(s) of interest :

\$ Enter BRIEF, NOTES or FULL :

Appendix C

Evaluation Pilots' Briefing Materials

C-1 A/A Dynamic Maneuvering Task

Each evaluation pilot "flew" 14 different HUD symbol sets. The primary task was to track a target aircraft through a set of acrobatic maneuvers similar to those required in A/A combat. The target, a CGI silhouette of a MIG-27, moved in a cloverleaf type of pattern within the visual field. Movement was varied enough to be unpredictable to the evaluation pilot, who was instructed to fly the simulator (own-ship) and keep the gun cross on the CGI target at all times. The HUD-referenced aiming symbol (gun cross) was a set of cross hairs resembling the aiming reference of an F-16 aircraft.

The evaluation pilot did not know when the target would begin to climb, which direction the target would roll, nor how tight the target was pulling. Therefore, the target could very easily be changing flight parameters (i.e., loosening the pull either during the pull up or during the pull through), and transitioning below a predetermined minimum altitude (11,000 ft) or a predetermined minimum airspeed (200 knots).

C-2 Low-Level and A/G Task

Initial setup is 420 KIAS, 200-ft altitude, heading 355 deg. When the bay becomes visible off to the left, maneuver over to follow the bay and fly up the river. The river will end at a dam with a house shortly beyond.

Cross the end of the river at 420 KIAS, 200 ft, heading 350 deg. With the gun cross abeam the house, go to mil thrust and make a moderately aggressive 4-g pull up to a 40-deg climb angle. At 6,000 ft, roll 180 deg and pull 2-3 g down to a wings-level 40-deg dive (thus a straight pop-up and roll ahead).

As the aircraft reaches 360 KIAS, reduce the throttle to idle and track the first target (house along road) with the CDM. With the CDM on the first target, press the pickle button passing through 4,500 ft.

Then roll left and put the CDM on the center of the large tanks (second target) and pickle at 1,500 ft and 420 KIAS with the CDM on the tanks.

C-3 ILS Approach Task

The approach and landing task involved a standard ILS approach to a landing or missed approach. The ICs for the approach were as follows:

Range	5 nm
Lateral offset	3,000 ft
Altitude	1,200 ft
Glideslope	3 deg
Heading	Parallel with runway heading

Each pilot made two approaches for each HUD configuration. One approach was terminated with a waveoff at a 200-ft decision height (DH). The second approach was terminated to maintain airspeed/angle of attack and glideslope/localizer deviations.

Both approaches were made during low visibility conditions. The first approach (to a waveoff) had visibility conditions of 100 ft and 1/4 nm and the second approach (to touchdown) had visibility conditions of 200 ft and 1/2 nm. Both approaches were flown with moderate turbulence levels to increase pilot workload.

C-4 UA Recovery Task

Each evaluation pilot was given a preliminary briefing of each of the HUD configurations to be evaluated, the test procedure, and the performance parameters that were to be collected. Once briefed and positioned in the simulator, the pilots were presented with one of the HUD configurations being evaluated. Each pilot was given an opportunity to fly the simulator with the HUD being flown for that trial block.

When the evaluation pilot indicated he had adequately familiarized himself with the HUD characteristics, the HUD was blanked. The experimenter instructed the pilot to the attitude to which he was to recover: wing-level or another assigned attitude.

Upon activation by the evaluation pilot (via the trigger switch), the simulator was reset to UA with the HUD on. The pilot then initiated the recovery to the pre-assigned attitude. Once the pilot felt he had achieved the assigned attitude, he terminated the trial by pressing the trigger switch, at which time the HUD would blank.

This procedure was repeated until all trials for each block were completed.

C-5 Performance Standards

Task	Parameter	Acceptable performance	Desirable performance
Low level	Maintain airspeed	±20 knots	±10 knots
	Maintain radar altitude ^a	±100 ft	±50 ft
	Maintain track	±1/4 nm	±1/2 nm
A/G	Maintain sight picture ^a	±10 mr	±5 mr
	Maintain airspeed	±10 knots	±5 knots
	Release altitude	±100 ft	±50 ft
	Sighting error at release	±5 mr	±2 1/2 mr
A/A	Maintain sight picture ^a	±10 mr	±5 mr
	Fire within roll constraint	±60 deg	±60 deg
	Minimum altitude	10,000 ft	10,000 ft
	Recovery heading	±10 deg	±5 deg
	Recovery altitude	±100 ft	±50 ft
	Recovery airspeed	±10 knots	±5 knots
UA recovery	First control input	<2 1/2 sec	<1 1/2 sec
	Control reversals	One	None
	Altitude loss	2,500 ft	1,000 ft
	Recovery heading	±10 deg	±5 deg
	Recovery altitude	±100 ft	±50 ft
	Recovery airspeed	±10 knots	±5 knots
Dynamic maneuver	Pitch at key points	±10 deg	±5 deg
	Recovery altitude	±200 ft	±100 ft
	Recovery airspeed	±10 knots	±5 knots
	Recovery heading	±10 deg	±5 deg
ILS	Maintain airspeed	±5 knots	±2 knots
	Maintain localizer	±2 dot	±1/2 dot
	Maintain glide slope	±1 dot	±1/2 – 0 dot
	Call decision height	±20 ft	±10 ft

^aFifty percent of the time.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE February 1995	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Technical Memorandum	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE TRISTAR I: Evaluation Methods for Testing Head-Up Display (HUD) Flight Symbology			5. FUNDING NUMBERS 505-64-36	
6. AUTHOR(S) R. L. Newman, L. A. Haworth,* G. K. Kessler, D. J. Eksuzian, W. R. Ercoline, R. H. Evans, T. C. Hughes, and L. F. Weinstein				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000 *U.S. Army Aviation and Troop Command, Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER A-94141	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546-0001			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER NASA TM-4665 TR-94-A-019	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Point of Contact: Loran Haworth, Ames Research Center, MS 243-3, Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000 (415) 604-6944				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified — Unlimited Subject Category 06			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The first in a series of piloted head-up display (HUD) flight symbology studies (TRISTAR) measuring pilot task performance was conducted at the NASA Ames Research Center by the Tri-Service Flight Symbology Working Group (FSWG). Sponsored by the U.S. Army Aeroflightdynamics Directorate, this study served as a focal point for the FSWG to examine HUD test methodology and flight symbology presentations. HUD climb-dive marker dynamics and climb-dive ladder presentations were examined as pilots performed air-to-air (A/A), air-to-ground (A/G), instrument landing system (ILS), and unusual attitude (UA) recovery tasks. Symbolic presentations resembled pitch ladder variations used by the U.S. Air Force (USAF), U.S. Navy (USN), and Royal Air Force (RAF). The study was initiated by the FSWG to address HUD flight symbology deficiencies, standardization, issue identification, and test methodologies. It provided the mechanism by which the USAF, USN, RAF, and USA could integrate organizational ideas and reduce differences for comparisons. Specifically it examined flight symbology issues collectively identified by each organization and the use of objective and subjective text methodology and flight tasking proposed by the FSWG.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Head-up display, Flight symbology			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 88	
			16. PRICE CODE A05	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	