Anthropometric Comparative Study of Oman Military Aircrew Recruits

Sasirajan Jeevarathinam Yousuf M. Al Wardi Saleh H. Al Sabei

#### Introduction

Military aircrew-aircraft compatibility is of prime importance for task accomplishment and flight safety

- Royal Air Force of Oman (RAFO)
  Anthropometric aircrew selection standards based on
  - Selection standards of western defense forces
  - As the aircrafts were imported from those developed countries

#### Introduction

- Efforts made to fit the local native aviators into the aircraft
  - not initially designed for them

This study to obtain the anthropometric data of Oman aircrew recruits

- Compare with published western and eastern aircrew data
  - To understand and to highlight the aircrew-aircraft mismatch issues, if any

#### RAFO Anthropometric Standard

| Parameter       | Range (cm) |
|-----------------|------------|
| Standing Height | 162 - 188  |
| Sitting Height  | 86.5 - 101 |
| Arm Reach       | 74 - 90    |
| Thigh Length    | 56 - 66    |
| Leg Length      | 100 - 120  |

## Methodology

The anthropometric data of Omani recruits from 2003 to 2012 collected

Their statistical distribution of data collated

The anthropometric comparison with the published data from the USA, UK, and Singapore done

#### Results

- 3,000 Omani candidates underwent initial screening for standing height parameter alone
  - 704 failed giving an initial screening rejection rate of 23.4%.

|                                     | Ν    | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|------|------------|
| Recruits                            | 2296 |            |
| Anthropometric<br>fit for aircrew   | 1968 | 86%        |
| Anthropometric<br>unfit for aircrew | 328  | 14%        |

#### Results

# 2296 Omani recruits for aircrew selection

| Parameter   | Mean       | SD   |
|-------------|------------|------|
| Age         | 20.1 years | 2.34 |
| Body Weight | 64.09 kg   | 9.52 |
| BMI         | 21.65      | 3.06 |

#### Results

5 Aviation significant anthropometric measurements

| Parameter          | Mean (cm) | SD   |  |
|--------------------|-----------|------|--|
| Standing<br>Height | 171.95    | 4.95 |  |
| Sitting<br>Height  | 90.31     | 2.74 |  |
| Arm Reach          | 77.07     | 3.33 |  |
| Thigh<br>Length    | 58.6      | 2.99 |  |
| Leg Length         | 104.93    | 4.05 |  |

8

#### Anthropometric comparison 1



## Anthropometric comparison 2



Anthropometric comparison studies between Western and Far Eastern country aviators available

Differences among Asians minimal

#### Differences substantial when compared to American and European aircrew

\*Singh, J., Peng, C. M., Lim, M. K., & Ong, C. N. (1995). Ananthropometric study of Singapore candidate aviators. *Ergonomics*, *38*, 651–658

\*Kennedy, K.W. 1982, International anthropometric variability and its effect on aircraft cockpit design, in A. Chaparis (ed.) Ethnic Variables in Human Factors Engineering (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press), pp. 42-66.

Aircraft cockpit design

To nominally accommodate the 5th to 95th percentile of the population

Across aviation significant anthropometric parameters

Military aircraft engineers design cockpit
 Only 12–15% population should be too small or too large to operate the aircraft

- Anthropometric comparison between Middle Eastern (Omani) data with Western and Far Eastern data
  - Similar differences noted with data midway between Western and Far Eastern data
- Higher anthropometric rejection rate among native recruits
- Serious Ergonomic implications while importing aircrafts to suit native population

|                | RAFO<br>Standard<br>(cm) | Recruit Data<br>(5 <sup>th</sup> -95 <sup>th</sup><br>percentiles) |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|
| Stature        | 162 - 188                | 164.19 – 181   |
| Sitting Height | 86.5 - 101               | 86.5 - 95  |
| Arm Reach      | 74 - 90                  | 72.6 - 83  |
| Leg Length     | 56 - 66                  | 55.5 - 63  |
| Thigh Length   | 100 - 120                | 100 - 112.5  |

#### In this study,

- 34% of the anthropometric unfit recruits in different parameters had standing height below 165 cm
- Recruits passing RAFO minimum standing height standard (162 cm) but failed in other anthropometric parameters had the minimum recruitment standard measurement around 50th percentile
- Scope to revise minimum standing height standard from 162 cm to 165cm

#### Conclusion

- Recognizes the dilemmas of Middle Eastern aircrew selection for western cockpits
  - Using the western anthropometric selection standards
- Scope for native aircrew recruitment standards and periodical updation to aid the ideal man-machine interface
  - National policy
  - Anthropometric trends of general population
  - Procured aircraft profile of the country

## Thank you