

CALIFORNIA STATE SCIENCE FAIR 2011 PROJECT SUMMARY

| Nama(s) | Project Number |
|---|----------------------------|
| | |
| Mattnew wong | |
| | |
| | |
| | 31333 |
| Project Title | |
| Perfect Pitch | |
| | \sim . O |
| 6 | \sim |
| Abstract | |
| Objectives/Goals | |
| The objective of my project was to investigate what type of rear horizontal stab | lizer would increase the |
| pitch sensitivity of a small, general aviation airplane. I hypothesized that a stra | ght rectangular stabilator |
| Would increase the pitch sensitivity of an airplane the most. | |
| Four unique horizontal stabilizers were designed and constructed and each my | usted to four identical |
| airplane models that I also built. Each stabilizer was a different share and type | a straight stabilator a |
| swept-back stabilator a straight stabilizer with elevators and swept-back stabilizer | ilizer with elevators My |
| designs allowed the elevators and stabilators to tilt for each esting procedure. | Materials used were balsa |
| wood and paper clips. To test and measure for pitch sensitivity, Neveloped a t | esting method to simulate |
| the airplane's ability to pitch-up and pitch-down. For a controlled testing enviro | onment, I designed and |
| constructed a wind tunnel using plexiglass. I updated and reproved the of my | previous wind tunnel |
| designs to suit this project's testing procedures. These unique designs and original | nal testing methods |
| enabled me to gather measurable data. All data was recorded, graphed, and ana | lyzed; conclusions were |
| drawn. | |
| Kesuits The similar with the straight stabiles had the associate visition for both ri | tab up and nitab dayun |
| tests. The airplane with the stabilizer with elevators and be airplane with the swept-back stabilizer both | |
| had less pitch variation than the plane with a spaight stabilition. The airplane with the least amount of | |
| pitch variation was the plane with a swept back stabilizer with elevators. For this project, a greater | |
| amount of pitch variation indicated increased pitch sensitivity. | no project, a greater |
| Conclusions/Discussion | |
| I concluded that the straight rectangular stabilator was the most pitch sensitive, thus supporting my | |
| hypothesis. A factor that could have affected the outcome of my experiments was the difference in | |
| surface areas between the straight reganged ar designs and the swept-back designs. The straight stabilizers | |
| had more surface area, and could bave increased pitch variation. The knowledge and experience I gained | |
| from this project have allowed me to add to research from previous aeronautic projects and, more | |
| importantly, add to my understanding of arplane design and construction for fu | iture projects. |
| | |
| | |
| Summary Statement | |
| My project we to determine whit type of rear herizental stabilizer increases the nitch consitivity of a | |
| small general aviation airplane | |
| sinan, generativiation anpiane. | |
| | |
| Help Received | |
| My parents assisted in driving me to purchase the materials. They also helped me with cutting some | |
| materials. | |
| | |