

Zeitschrift: IABSE publications = Mémoires AIPC = IVBH Abhandlungen
Band: 32 (1972)

Artikel: The flexural ductility of reinforced concrete sections
Autor: Cohn, M.Z. / Ghosh, S.K.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-24953>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 04.04.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

The Flexural Ductility of Reinforced Concrete Sections

La capacité de déformation de sections en béton armé due à l'effort de flexion

Die Verformungsfähigkeit armerter Betonquerschnitte infolge Biegung

M. Z. COHN

Professor of Civil Engineering

S. K. GHOSH

Research Assistant

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Introduction

While the inelastic flexural behaviour of reinforced concrete members and structures has been recognized for a long time [1], its adoption in design practice is still a controversial matter: some codes allow for plastic redistribution of up to 30% of the elastic stress distribution [2], some codes do not recognize plastic action at all [3]. Between these two extremes, some other codes allow an arbitrary degree of redistribution varying from 0 to 30% [4], [5].

In a debate initiated by the Joint ACI-ASCE Committee 428, Limit Design, a few years ago, some basic questions on the admissibility and features of non-linear analysis and design were investigated [6], [7]. From that debate and other similar discussions in the literature, it became obvious that the role, nature and extent of ductility in flexural concrete structures is not fully understood and that some tentative conclusions on the subject were based on insufficient factual data.

It was suggested that high grade steels were not suitable for inelastic design, that the use of compression reinforcement (to increase ductility) eliminates the economic advantages of inelastic design, and that elastic action should not be allowed in reinforced concrete members subject to combined bending and axial loads.

Some years ago one of the authors remarked [7]:

... "It would be ignoring reality to neglect the existence of strength reserve due to the inelasticity of reinforced concrete and not to take advantage of it only because imperfect rather than ideal plasticity is proper to this material. The problem raised by the

particular type of concrete ductility is not *whether* but *how* it should be considered. That concrete, unlike steel, displays only a limited adaptability does not preclude its exploitation, but rather requires a deeper study of its physical significance and limitations." . . .

This paper is an attempt in this direction, and has the following objectives:

1. A proper definition of flexural ductility for reinforced concrete sections.
2. An exhaustive study of the main variables affecting ductility.
3. Some conclusions on conditions and limitations of plastic adaptability in structural concrete.
4. Possible practical guidelines on the applicability of limit design to reinforced concrete structures.

The approach used in this analytical investigation is a computer simulation of the behaviour of over 1700 reinforced concrete section specimens under pure and combined bending. Starting from reliable stress-strain characteristics for steel and concrete [8], moment-curvature relationships and ductility factors are derived for an extensive range of variable combinations. Results obtained justify a more positive view of the potential use of inelastic design methods, when their limitations and the effects of major variables are well understood.

Definition of Ductility

Ductility is recognized as a factor governing the rotation capacity of hinging zones and the redistribution of moments in a structure [9]; the adaptability of structures to foundation settlements and volume changes [6]; and the energy absorption capacity of structures subject to dynamic (wind, earthquake, blast) loads [10], [11], [12]. Ductility safeguards a structure against sudden overloads, impact and load reversals. For this reason it is desirable that structures be capable of mobilizing a reasonable amount of ductility whenever actions such as those mentioned above are foreseen. Experience shows that the members of a structure are sufficiently ductile, for all practical purposes, when they resist only transverse loads, are moderately reinforced in tension, moderately to heavily reinforced in compression and shear, use mild or intermediate grade steels, and high grade concretes. It is also an established fact that careful joint detailing and a high standard of execution in the field contribute to the achievement of high degrees of ductility [13].

Beyond these general qualitative facts and except for some attempts to study the ductility of reinforced concrete sections [10], [11], [14], [15], [16], [17], there is only a limited knowledge of the problem.

In a broad sense, ductility is taken to be the ability to sustain deformations beyond the elastic range without a significant variation of the resistance capacity. Such a qualitative description of ductility is broad enough to accom-

moderate the response of plastic, strain-hardening or strain-softening materials, as long as precise limits of deformation and strength variations are not specified.

More precise definitions of ductility have to be dependent on at least the following: a) level of study – material, sectional and structural ductility should be defined in terms of strains, curvatures, and rotations or deflections, respectively; b) type of stress – ductility under axial loading, flexure, shear and torsion should be defined in terms of longitudinal strains, curvatures, shearing strains, and angles of twist, respectively; c) nature of study – depending upon which, it may be more or less suitable to define ductility in terms of limiting deformations (e. g. ϵ_u , ϕ_u), differences or ratios between limiting and idealized elastic limit deformations (e. g. $\epsilon_u - \epsilon_y$, $\phi_u - \phi_y$, ϵ_u/ϵ_y , ϕ_u/ϕ_y), or areas under load-deformation diagrams up to limiting deformations or between limiting and idealized elastic limit deformations. While the second alternative may be satisfactory in the limit analysis and design of concrete structures, the last may be more meaningful in earthquake engineering; d) nature of loading (static, dynamic).

Some possible and serious confusions may arise from an interchange of ductility definitions. Here are two typical examples:

a) The effect of high grade concrete is favorable on *sectional* ductility, [14], [15] but is unfavorable on *material* ductility [8].

b) Lateral reinforcement is more efficient than compression reinforcement in increasing the *material* ductility (of concrete), [18]; compression reinforcement is more efficient than lateral reinforcement in increasing *sectional* ductility [19].

This study is concerned with the ductility of reinforced concrete sections, on the assumption that the properties of steel and concrete are known. The investigation is limited to pure and combined bending, because these are the most common cases when a designer faces inelastic action in structural concrete. Further studies should provide similar data on r. c. ductility in shear and torsion. As an index of sectional ductility, the *ductility factor* is defined as the ratio of ultimate to yield curvatures, ϕ_u/ϕ_y . It is found that this definition is the most widely used for evaluating ductility under static loads and is equally significant for both steel [20] and reinforced concrete [21], [22]. In brief, this investigation is concerned with the ductility (a) of reinforced concrete sections, (b) under flexural action, (c) defined as a ratio of curvatures, (d) for static loading only.

Having defined the meaning of the ductility factor in the context of this paper it is necessary to further define the curvatures, ϕ_u and ϕ_y . The current practice is to assume that the ultimate curvature is associated with a conventional limiting value of the concrete strain at the extreme fibre i.e. $\epsilon_u = 0.3\%$, $\epsilon_u = 0.35\%$ and $\epsilon_u = 0.38\%$ according to the ACI Code [23], CEB Recommendations [4] and some earlier investigations at the University of Illinois [14], [24], respectively. These ϵ_u values are considered to be independent

of such factors as the longitudinal and lateral reinforcement, strain-hardening, strain gradient, etc. A more satisfactory definition of the ultimate strain, proposed by RÜSCH [25] is adopted in this study: since the primary function of a structure is to carry loads, ϵ_u is defined as the strain corresponding to the ultimate stage, i. e. at which the section reaches its maximum load or moment carrying capacity. Similarly, the ultimate curvature, ϕ_u , is the one associated with the strain, (ϵ_u), load, (P_u), or moment, (M_u), at the ultimate stage.

The yield curvature, ϕ_y , is defined as the curvature at which the tension steel reaches its yield point stress. The stress-strain relationships used for steel in the present investigation are characterized by well defined yield points. Thus, when the tension steel in a section does not yield before the section reaches its ultimate stage, it is either because the section is highly over-reinforced or because it carries a heavy axial load. Instead of attempting to arbitrarily define an idealized yield stage, the ductility factors of such sections, possessing very little ductility, are assumed to be equal to unity in the present study.

Factors Affecting Ductility

The major factors affecting the ductility of a reinforced concrete section can be classified as follows:

1. Material Variables:

- a) Concrete quality.
- b) Grades of tension and compression reinforcement.
- c) Grade of lateral reinforcement.
- d) Strain-hardening of steel.
- e) Bond.
- f) Tensile strength of concrete.

2. Geometric Variables:

- a) Shape and size of sections.
- b) Amount of tension reinforcement.
- c) Amount of compression reinforcement.
- d) Amount and spacing of lateral reinforcement.
- e) Cover thickness.

3. Loading Variables:


- a) Duration of loading.
- b) Axial loading.
- c) Prestressing.
- d) Repetition of loading.
- e) Loading reversal.

The effects of the above factors on sectional ductility were investigated by using a nonlinear sectional theory, realistic stress-strain relationships for concrete and steel and a numerical method of computation developed in [8]. These have been described in a recent paper by the authors [26] and are briefly reviewed in the next section.


Sectional Analysis

a) Stress-Strain Relationship for Concrete in Compression

The main factors affecting concrete behaviour are: concrete strength, lateral reinforcement, creep, strain gradient, size of specimen and type of loading. A stress-strain relationship for concrete in compression, proposed by SARGIN [8], takes all these factors into account by a proper choice of five governing parameters: the concrete cylinder strength, f'_c ; the initial Young modulus, E_c ; the ratio of maximum stress to cylinder strength, k_3 ; the strain corresponding to maximum stress, ϵ_0 ; and a parameter, D , which mainly affects the descending branch of the stress-strain curve. By denoting $A = E_c \epsilon_0 / k_3 f'_c$ and $x = \epsilon / \epsilon_0$, Sargin's relationship can be expressed as:



(a) PLAIN CONCRETE



(b) REINFORCING STEEL

Fig. 1. Typical stress-strain curves for (a) concrete in compression and (b) reinforcing steel.

$$\sigma = k_3 f'_c \frac{A x + (D-1) x^2}{1 + (A-2) x + D x^2}. \quad (1)$$

Equations expressing E_c , k_3 , ϵ_0 and D in terms of the factors affecting them are given in [8] and are used in numerical calculations. For the sake of brevity, these are not reproduced here. Typical stress-strain curves for concrete in compression, Eq. (1), are illustrated in Fig. 1 (a).

b) Stress-Strain Relationship for Concrete in Tension

The behaviour of concrete in tension is assumed to be elastic-brittle and can be expressed by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_t &= E_c \epsilon_t \quad (\text{for } \epsilon_t \leq \epsilon_{tr}), \\ \sigma_t &= 0 \quad (\text{for } \epsilon_t > \epsilon_{tr}), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon_{tr} = \sigma_{tr}/E_c$ is the cracking strain and σ_{tr} is the modulus of rupture of concrete. An equation expressing σ_{tr} in terms of the factors governing it is also given in [8].

c) Stress-Strain Relationships for Reinforcing Steels

The following idealized relationships, consisting of three parts corresponding to the elastic, yield and strain-hardening ranges, and considered applicable to most American steel grades with yield limits not in excess of 75 ksi, are adopted in this study:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_s &= E_s \epsilon_s \quad (\text{for } 0 \leq \epsilon_s \leq \epsilon_y), \\ \sigma_s &= f_y \quad (\text{for } \epsilon_y < \epsilon_s \leq \epsilon_{sh}), \\ \sigma_s &= f_y + E_{sh} (\epsilon_s - \epsilon_{sh}) \left[1 - \frac{E_{sh} (\epsilon_s - \epsilon_{sh})}{4 (\sigma_{su} - f_y)} \right] \quad (\text{for } \epsilon_s > \epsilon_{sh}), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where E_s is the Young modulus for steel, f_y is the yield limit, ϵ_{sh} is the strain at the onset of hardening, E_{sh} is the strain-hardening modulus and σ_{su} is the ultimate stress.

Typical stress-strain curves for steel, Eq. (3), are illustrated in Fig. 1 (b), along with stress-strain curves for high strength steels (proof stress > 75 ksi) and prestressing wires, which are not used in the present investigation.

d) Nonlinear Sectional Theory

With the notations and assumptions of Fig. 2, the force and moment equilibrium equations for a reinforced concrete section, symmetrical about




Fig. 2. Basic notations in the flexural analysis of reinforced concrete sections.

one axis and loaded in the plane of symmetry, can be expressed as follows:

$$\int_0^{kd} \sigma(\epsilon) b(y) dy + A'_s \sigma'_s - \int_0^{y_t} \sigma_t(\epsilon_t) b(y) dy - A_s \sigma_s = P, \quad (4)$$

$$\int_0^{kd} \sigma(\epsilon) b(y) (d - kd + y) dy + A'_s \sigma'_s (d - d') - \int_0^{y_t} \sigma_t(\epsilon_t) b(y) (d - kd - y) dy = P e' + M. \quad (5)$$

The assumption of linear strain distribution implies:

$$\frac{\epsilon_c}{kd} = \frac{\epsilon'_s}{kd - d'} = \frac{\epsilon_s}{d - kd} = \frac{\epsilon}{y} = \frac{\epsilon_{tr}}{y_t}. \quad (6)$$

Eqs. (1), (2) and (3) are used to eliminate σ , σ_t and σ_s , σ'_s , respectively, and Eq. (6) to eliminate y and y_t from Eqs. (4) and (5).

e) Numerical Method of Solution

A numerical method is developed to solve Eqs. (4) and (5) simultaneously in the following steps (Fig. 3):

- Starting from zero, increase ϵ_c at some chosen interval.
- For any given value of ϵ_c , find a value of k by successive approximation such that Eq. (4) is satisfied with a specified tolerance.
- Solve Eq. (5) for M with the known values of ϵ_c , k and the given P .
- Calculate all other behaviour parameters: ϕ , EI (flexural rigidity), etc.
- Continue to increase ϵ_c up to and beyond the value ϵ_u at which the moment reaches a maximum. ϵ_u corresponds to the ultimate state of the section.




Fig. 3. Flow diagram for numerical analysis.

Using the above method of sectional analysis, 1734 sections were analyzed under various combinations of the factors enumerated in the preceding section (Tables 1 and 2). Some of the results of this investigation are presented herein. The effects of the various factors on the ductility of the sections analyzed are discussed in the next three sections.

Material Variables

The effects of *concrete and tension reinforcement qualities* on the $M-\phi$ relationships of reinforced concrete sections are shown in Fig. 4. This figure shows that, irrespective of the reinforcement percentage p , sectional ductility increases with increasing concrete and decreasing tension reinforcement strengths. This can be seen more clearly in Fig. 5, in which the ductility ratio ϕ_u/ϕ_y is plotted against the reinforcement percentage p for various grades of concrete and tension reinforcement. Each curve has a little arrowhead attached to it, which corresponds to the maximum percentage of tension reinforcement, p_{max} , that can be used in sections designed according to the ACI ultimate strength theory [23]. Fig. 5 shows that although for low reinforcement percentages fairly high ductility ratios are available for most grades of concrete and steel, this ratio may be as low as 2.5 for some steel and concrete grades,

Table 1. Variable combinations for various sections investigated

SECTION #										f' _c ksi	f _y ksi	ρ	ρ'/ρ	E _{sh} x10 ³ ksi	d'' in.	s in.	t min.	c in.	F	σ _t	
P/P _u =0.0	P/P _u =0.1	P/P _u =0.2	P/P _u =0.3	P/P _u =0.4	P/P _u =0.45	P/P _u =0.5	P/P _u =0.6	P/P _u =0.8	T												
1	57																				
2	58																				
3																					
4																					
5																					
6																					
7																					
8																					
9	59																				
10	60																				
11																					
12	61																				
13																					
14																					
15																					
16																					
17																					
18																					
19																					
20	62																				
21																					
22																					
23																					
24	63																				
25																					
26																					
27																					
28	64																				
29	65																				
30	66																				
31																					
32	67	73	83	93	103	113	123	133	143												
33																					
34	68	74	84	94	104	114	124	134	144												
35																					
36		75	85	95	105	115	125	135	145												
37																					
38	69																				
39	70	76	86	96	106	116	126	136	146												
40	71	77	87	97	107	117	127	137	147												
41																					
42																					
43																					
44																					
45																					
46																					
47																					
48																					
49		78	88	98	108	118	128	138	148												
50	72	79	89	99	109	119	129	139	149												
51		80	90	100	110	120	130	140	150												
52		81	91	101	111	121	131	141	151												
53																					
54		82	92	102	112	122	132	142	152												
55																					
56																					

Sections 153-204, 205-456, 457-608, 1127-1278, 1279-1430, 1431-1582, and 1583-1734 correspond to sections 1-152 for f'_c, f_y = 3,60; 3,75; 4,45; 4,75; 5,45; 5,60; and 5,75 ksi, respectively.

CONSIDERED

as p approaches p_{max} . It must be remembered, however, that Fig. 5 is for singly reinforced sections containing nominal amounts of lateral reinforcement (No. 2 ties at 9" spacing). Ductility can be increased somewhat by reducing the spacing and increasing the diameter of the ties. It can be improved considerably by the addition of suitable amounts of compression reinforcement.

Sectional behaviour is affected much more by the spacing and cross-sectional area of lateral reinforcement than by its grade. The latter was, therefore, not studied in the present investigation.

SECTION #										SECTION #											
P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	
=0.0	=0.1	=0.2	=0.3	=0.4	=0.5	=0.6	=0.7	=0.8	=0.8												
T																					
723																					
724																					
725																					
726																					
727																					
728																					
729																					
730																					
731																					
732																					
733																					
734																					
735																					
736																					
737																					
738																					
739																					
740																					
741																					
742																					
743																					
744																					
745																					
746																					
747																					
748																					
749																					
750																					
751																					
752																					
753																					
754																					
755																					
756																					
757																					
758																					
759																					
760																					
761																					
762																					
763																					
764																					
765																					
766																					
767																					
768																					
769																					
770																					
771																					
772																					
773																					
774																					
775																					
776																					
777																					
778																					
779																					

SECTION #										SECTION #											
P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	P/P_u	
=0.0	=0.1	=0.2	=0.3	=0.4	=0.5	=0.6	=0.7	=0.8	=0.8												
T																					
780																					
781																					
782																					
783																					
784																					
785																					
786																					
787																					
788																					
789																					
790																					
791																					
792																					
793																					
794																					
795																					
796																					
797																					
798																					
799																					
800																					
801																					
802																					
803																					
804																					
805																					
806																					
807																					
808																					
809																					
810																					
811																					
812																					
813																					
814																					
815																					
816																					
817																					
818																					
819																					
820																					
821																					
822																					
823																					
824																					
825																					
826																					
827																					
828																					
829																					
830																					

C O N S I D E R E D

C O N S I D E R E D

C O N S I D E R E D

C O N S I D E R E D

C O N S I D E R E D

C O N S I D E R E D

C O N S I D E R E D

C O N S I D E R E D




Fig. 4. Effect of concrete and steel grades and of steel percentages on ductility: $M-\phi$ diagrams.

Fig. 6 shows the effects of *strain-hardening* of steel on the $M-\phi$ relationships of singly reinforced sections. All reinforcing steels had the same modulus of elasticity, yield strength and strain at the onset of hardening; only the strain-hardening modulus E_{sh} was varied. The ductility ratio ϕ_u/ϕ_y is plotted against p for three different E_{sh} in Fig. 7. It can be seen that strain-hardening of steel improves the ductility of lightly reinforced sections, but has a negligible effect on heavily reinforced sections. Fig. 7 also shows that ductility increases as E_{sh} is increased from 0 to 1.25×10^3 ksi, but then it decreases as E_{sh} is further increased to 2.5×10^3 ksi. This would suggest that there is an optimal values of E_{sh} that maximizes the sectional ductility.




Fig. 5. Effect of concrete and steel grades and of steel percentages on ductility: ϕ_u/ϕ_y - p diagrams.




Fig. 6. Effect of strain-hardening of steel on ductility: M - ϕ diagrams.




Fig. 7. Effect of strain-hardening of steel on ductility: ϕ_u/ϕ_y - p diagrams.

The effect of *bond* was investigated through BAKER's [26] bond factor F , which is defined as the ratio of steel and virtual concrete strains at the same level, i. e.

$$F = \frac{\epsilon_s k}{\epsilon_c (1 - k)} \quad (7)$$




Fig. 8. Effect of bond on ductility: $M-\phi$ diagrams.

Fig. 8 shows the $M-\phi$ relationships of four singly reinforced sections with $F=0.25, 0.50, 0.75$ and 1.00 , respectively, and identical in all other respects. The ductility ratios of these sections are plotted in Fig. 9, which shows that ductility is the highest for the section with full bond ($F=1.00$) and that it decreases steadily as F is reduced from 1.00 to 0.25 .

$M-\phi$ relationships for sections in which the *tensile strength of concrete* was totally neglected and in which it was accounted for were found to be nearly identical. It was, therefore, concluded that the tensile strength of concrete has no significant effect on the sectional behaviour.




Fig. 9. Effect of bond on ductility: ϕ_u/ϕ_y-p diagrams.

Geometric Variables

NEWMARK and HALL [10] studied the effect of variations in depth on the ductility of rectangular sections and concluded that ductility was unaffected by such variations. The effects of sectional width and effective depth variations on the rotation capacity (hence ductility) of rectangular sections were investigated by CORLEY [28]. He concluded that ductility was not significantly affected either by depth or by width. These conclusions, based on reliable experimental evidence, are accepted in this study; the effects of *sectional size* on ductility are not investigated.




Fig. 10. Effect of sectional shape on ductility: $\phi_u/\phi_y - p$ diagrams for T -sections.

Fig. 10 shows $\phi_u/\phi_y - p$ (with $p = A_s/b_w d$, and $b_w =$ web width) diagrams for T -sections, the overall depth, effective depth and web width of which were equal to the corresponding depths and width (20", 18" and 10", respectively) of the rectangular sections studied so far. The flange width and thickness were 30" and 2.5", respectively. It can be seen by comparison with Fig. 5 that the overhanging flanges provide a substantial improvement in ductility. This is not surprising in view of the fact that the overhanging flange area can be considered as an equivalent compression steel area and compression reinforce-

ment is known to have a favourable effect on ductility. *Sectional shapes* other than rectangle and *T* were not investigated.

The effect of the *amount of tension reinforcement* on ductility can be observed in Figs. 4 and 5. Fig. 11 illustrates sectional *M* - ϕ relationships for various amounts of tension steel, corresponding to a particular quality of concrete




Fig. 11. Effect of tension steel percentage on ductility: *M*- ϕ diagrams.




Fig. 12. Effect of compression reinforcement on ductility: *M*- ϕ diagrams.

and of tension reinforcement. Figs. 4, 5 and 11 confirm that ductility decreases with increasing amounts of tension reinforcement, and that very little or no ductility is available for sections with very high steel percentages (e.g. 4%). This is why most codes of practice [23] impose an upper limit on the amount of tension reinforcement that should be used in design.

Fig. 12 shows the effect of *compression reinforcement* on sectional $M - \phi$ relationships. For a particular quality of concrete and of reinforcing steel, $M - \phi$ diagrams are drawn for various percentages of tension reinforcement and for various ratios of compression and tension steel areas. $\phi_u/\phi_y - p$ diagrams for various p'/p ratios and for various qualities of concrete and steel are plotted in Fig. 13. These figures show clearly that sectional ductility can be improved considerably by the addition of suitable amounts of compression reinforcement. This is also evident from Table 3, in which ϕ_u/ϕ_y values are tabulated for different concrete and steel qualities, various amounts of tension




Fig. 13. Effect of compression reinforcement on ductility: $\phi_u/\phi_y - p$ diagrams.

reinforcement and various p'/p ratios. For flexural members, the ductility of support sections is usually more critical than that of span sections [22], because span sections very often act as T -sections, so that their ductility is improved considerably by the overhanging flange areas (Fig. 10). However, support sections usually contain an amount of compression reinforcement. In flexural members, the amount of positive moment steel is usually about 75 to 80% of the tension steel provided for negative moments. If half of the steel for positive moments is bent up, the other half automatically provides compression steel in the amount $A'_s = 0.5 \times 0.8 A_s = 0.4 A_s$, where A'_s is the tension steel for negative moments. This amount of compression steel can considerably improve the ductility of a section. Table 3 shows that the ductility ratio of a section with $p = 1.5\%$, $f'_c = 4$ ksi and $f_y = 60$ ksi nearly doubles from 5.35 to 9.48 when compression steel in the amount $A'_s = 0.5 A_s$ is added. Incidentally, Table 3 also indicates that sections reinforced with usual, economic percentages of high grade steel, when made of commensurately high grades of concrete, are capable of mobilizing reasonable levels of ductility. For instance, a section with $f'_c = 5$ ksi, $f_y = 75$ ksi, $p = 1.5\%$, and $p' = 0.25 p$, has a ductility factor of 5.48. This would appear to suggest that inelastic design is not necessarily unsuitable for structures made of high grade steels, as has sometimes been claimed in the past. Table 3 also indicates that the unfavourable effect of an increase in steel strength on sectional ductility is usually more pronounced than the favourable effect of an increase in concrete strength.

The effect of *tie spacing* on sectional $M - \phi$ relationships is illustrated in Fig. 14. Fig. 15 shows ϕ_u/ϕ_y variation with p for different tie spacings. It can be seen that ductility increases somewhat as tie spacing is reduced, but that




Fig. 14. Effect of tie spacing on ductility: $M - \phi$ diagrams.

Table 3. Ductility factor, ϕ_u/ϕ_y , for sections with various steel and concrete strengths and tension and compression reinforcement areas

f'_c ksi	f_y ksi	P %	ϕ_u/ϕ_y					$\rho'/\rho=1.0$
			$\rho'/\rho=0$	$\rho'/\rho=0.25$	$\rho'/\rho=0.5$	$\rho'/\rho=0.75$	$\rho'/\rho=1.0$	
3	45	0.5	33.80	38.20	43.70	45.20	50.30	50.30
		1.0	15.20	21.80	25.80	31.00	37.60	37.60
		1.5	8.75	12.60	18.60	22.80	28.50	28.50
		2.0	2.78	8.63	13.20	18.25	25.00	25.00
		2.5	2.00	2.89	10.20	15.25	21.00	21.00
		3.0	1.39	2.32	8.18	13.90	19.70	19.70
	60	0.5	1.00	1.76	3.00	12.10	17.45	17.45
		1.0	1.00	1.33	2.47	10.65	16.60	16.60
		1.5	16.75	19.95	22.90	28.60	31.40	31.40
		2.0	7.10	9.61	12.95	16.20	19.40	19.40
		2.5	3.77	5.52	8.30	11.70	14.30	14.30
		3.0	1.42	3.74	6.43	9.65	12.70	12.70
4	45	0.5	1.00	1.10	4.40	8.30	11.05	11.05
		1.0	1.00	1.00	3.54	7.32	9.85	9.85
		1.5	1.00	1.00	1.64	6.52	9.38	9.38
		2.0	1.00	1.00	1.33	5.92	8.59	8.59
		2.5	10.60	13.70	15.85	18.60	23.90	23.90
		3.0	4.25	5.83	8.39	11.30	13.88	13.88
	75	0.5	1.90	3.41	5.60	8.41	11.10	11.10
		1.0	1.00	2.00	3.89	6.77	9.12	9.12
		1.5	1.00	1.00	2.90	5.85	8.12	8.12
		2.0	1.00	1.00	2.28	5.21	7.61	7.61
		2.5	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.72	7.00	7.00
		3.0	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.30	6.47	6.47
5	60	0.5	42.40	48.10	50.10	51.20	51.80	51.80
		1.0	19.40	24.10	29.30	34.60	43.80	43.80
		1.5	12.13	15.65	19.80	27.30	33.40	33.40
		2.0	3.94	11.12	15.05	21.60	27.00	27.00
		2.5	2.89	8.37	12.60	17.95	24.40	24.40
		3.0	2.21	3.06	10.10	15.55	21.05	21.05
	75	0.5	1.72	2.61	8.35	13.20	19.80	19.80
		1.0	1.5	2.10	3.17	12.10	17.64	17.64
		1.5	20.30	23.70	27.20	33.40	34.70	34.70
		2.0	9.22	11.80	14.35	17.35	23.00	23.00
		2.5	5.35	7.42	9.48	13.70	16.40	16.40
		3.0	3.26	5.05	7.15	11.16	13.65	13.65
5	60	0.5	1.50	3.56	5.67	9.50	12.48	12.48
		1.0	1.10	1.64	4.59	8.34	11.05	11.05
		1.5	1.00	1.33	3.66	7.41	9.95	9.95
		2.0	1.00	1.03	3.08	6.65	9.53	9.53
		2.5	13.05	15.50	18.30	22.60	25.45	25.45
		3.0	5.82	7.50	9.68	13.20	15.95	15.95
	75	0.5	2.96	4.48	6.46	9.70	12.60	12.60
		1.0	1.77	3.00	4.65	7.44	10.20	10.20
		1.5	1.00	2.03	3.61	6.27	9.00	9.00
		2.0	1.00	1.00	2.97	5.52	8.44	8.44
		2.5	1.00	1.00	2.39	4.97	7.69	7.69
		3.0	1.00	1.00	2.00	4.48	7.07	7.07
5	45	0.5	46.40	51.00	52.00	52.50	53.00	53.00
		1.0	21.80	27.70	32.60	40.40	44.30	44.30
		1.5	14.00	17.10	23.00	28.20	35.20	35.20
		2.0	9.60	13.30	17.20	21.90	26.10	26.10
		2.5	3.82	9.56	13.50	19.20	25.40	25.40
		3.0	2.84	4.06	10.90	16.20	21.90	21.90
	60	0.5	2.32	3.30	9.70	14.80	20.50	20.50
		1.0	1.86	2.72	8.18	12.70	19.50	19.50
		1.5	22.60	25.90	27.90	30.90	31.80	31.80
		2.0	10.95	12.90	15.25	19.60	23.40	23.40
		2.5	6.53	8.73	10.80	13.33	17.50	17.50
		3.0	4.43	6.05	8.21	10.50	14.30	14.30
5	60	0.5	3.13	4.57	6.60	9.15	13.00	13.00
		1.0	1.60	3.48	5.38	7.80	12.10	12.10
		1.5	1.14	1.83	4.50	6.71	10.85	10.85
		2.0	1.00	1.46	3.74	6.24	9.85	9.85
		2.5	14.73	16.70	20.20	25.00	27.60	27.60
		3.0	6.64	8.56	10.70	13.30	16.95	16.95
	75	0.5	3.96	5.48	7.30	10.00	13.20	13.20
		1.0	2.48	3.76	5.50	7.67	11.10	11.10
		1.5	1.19	2.61	4.23	6.52	9.75	9.75
		2.0	1.00	1.87	3.39	5.73	8.72	8.72
		2.5	1.00	1.09	2.79	4.96	8.28	8.28
		3.0	1.00	1.00	2.37	4.54	7.57	7.57




Fig. 15. Effect of tie spacing on ductility: ϕ_u/ϕ_y-p diagrams.




Fig. 16. Effect of tie size on ductility: ϕ_u/ϕ_y-p diagrams.




Fig. 17. Relative effect of compression and lateral reinforcements on ductility.

this is not a very effective way to improve ductility. Fig. 16 shows that ductility increases slightly with an increase in the cross-sectional area of lateral reinforcement, at all tie spacings.

Fig. 17 illustrates the relative efficiency of compression and lateral reinforcements in improving the ductility of reinforced concrete sections. It can be seen clearly that compression reinforcement is considerably more efficient than ties at all percentages of tension reinforcement. In a recent investigation, [18] SHAH and VIJAY RANGAN studied the relative efficiency of compression

reinforcement, rectangular ties and randomly oriented short steel fibres in improving the ductility of compression concrete in flexural members. Rectangular ties were found to be by far the most efficient among the three. This conclusion may seem to be contradictory to that suggested by Fig. 17. It has been pointed out, however, that this is not the case [19]. As has been mentioned while discussing various ductility definitions, the ductility of steel and concrete as materials is very different from the ductility of a reinforced concrete section.

Fig. 18 shows the effect of cover thickness on sectional $M - \phi$ relationships. $\phi_u/\phi_y - p$ diagrams for different thicknesses of cover are plotted in Fig. 19. It can be seen that the influence of cover thickness on sectional ductility is negligible.




Fig. 18. Effect of concrete cover on ductility: $M - \phi$ diagrams.




Fig. 19. Effect of concrete cover on ductility: $\phi_u/\phi_y - p$ diagrams.

Loading Variables

In creep analysis, the major factors are the rate of loading, loading duration and the age of concrete at the time of loading. Since control of the rate of loading is difficult in actual structures, a conventional loading rate should be adopted. A practical proposal, due to RÜSCH [25] and adopted in this study, is to assume that the load is applied in about 20 minutes at constant rates and sustained subsequently up to failure. The age of concrete at the time of loading was assumed to be 28 days for all the sections studied. Fig. 20 illustrates $M - \phi$ relationships for different durations of loading, corresponding to various percentages of tension reinforcement. $\phi_u/\phi_y - p$ diagrams are plotted for different loading durations in Fig. 21. It can be seen that the effect of creep




Fig. 20. Effect of loading duration on ductility: $M - \phi$ diagrams.




Fig. 21. Effect of loading duration on ductility: $\phi_u/\phi_y - p$ diagrams.

on ductility is, in general, favourable, although for low reinforcement percentages, ductility drops a little when loading duration exceeds 10^4 min. (≈ 1 week). On the whole, the effect of loading duration on ductility is found not to be very significant.

Fig. 22 shows the effect of *axial loading* on sectional $M - \phi$ relationships for a particular quality of concrete and of reinforcing steel and for various amounts of reinforcement. $\phi_u/\phi_y - p (= p')$ diagrams for various levels of axial load and various qualities of steel and concrete are plotted in Fig. 23 for symmetrically reinforced rectangular sections. Load-moment interaction diagrams for sections with $f'_c = 4$ ksi, $f_y = 60$ ksi and different $p = p'$ are illustrated




Fig. 22. Effect of axial loads on ductility: $M - \phi$ diagrams.




Fig. 23. Effect of axial loads on ductility: ϕ_u/ϕ_y - p diagrams.

(in full lines) in Fig. 24. The shape of these diagrams in the region which corresponds to tension failure is to be noted. This shape is a consequence of the ultimate stage definition adopted in this study. The interaction diagrams drawn in full lines change to those indicated by dotted lines when the ultimate stage is defined by the extreme compression fibre strain reaching a value of 0.3%. Fig. 24 indicates that sectional behaviour is governed by tension only as long as axial load levels do not exceed 20 to 35% (depending upon the amount of reinforcement) of the axial load carrying capacity of the section. Fig. 23 indicates that as long as failure is governed by tension, a section is




Fig. 24. Interaction diagrams for symmetrically reinforced sections.

capable of mobilizing a certain amount of ductility, although this decreases drastically as the axial load on the section approaches the level corresponding to balanced failure. Fig. 23 also indicates that for the low levels of axial load usually carried by flexural members in reinforced concrete frames (not exceeding 10–15% of the axial load carrying capacity), fairly high amounts of sectional ductility are always available.

The effects of *repeated loading and load reversals* were not investigated by the authors. They would like, however, to refer here to an experimental investigation into these effects carried out by NEWMARK and HALL [10]. Several singly and doubly reinforced beams were tested such that the load on each beam was removed completely and then reapplied at several stages during a test. The results indicated that the removal and reapplication of load had little or no effect on either the load carrying capacity or the ductility. A few symmetrically reinforced beams were tested under repeated reversals of load. There were some indications that while load carrying capacity remained unchanged, ductility was impaired, albeit only slightly, by such repeated load reversals.

Summary and Conclusions

The findings of the present investigation can be summarized as follows:

1. The various factors affecting the ductility of a reinforced concrete section can be divided into three groups: material, geometric and loading variables.
2. a) Among the material factors, the quality of concrete and the grade of reinforcement appear to be the most important. Sectional ductility increases with higher concrete grades and lower tension reinforcement strengths.
- b) Sectional ductility increases as the strain-hardening modulus of tension

reinforcement, E_{sh} , is increased from zero to a certain value, but then decreases as E_{sh} is further increased.

c) Ductility is the highest for sections with full bond.

d) The tensile strength of concrete does not appreciably affect sectional ductility.

3. a) Among the geometric variables, sectional width and depth do not appear to affect sectional ductility.

b) The overhanging flange areas of T -sections improve sectional ductility considerably.

c) The ductility of a section decreases as the amount of tension reinforcement increases, very little ductility being available as p approaches the balanced steel percentage.

d) Sectional ductility can be improved by decreasing the spacing and increasing the amount of lateral reinforcement, and also by the addition of suitable amounts of compression reinforcement. The latter is found to be much more efficient than the former in providing sectional ductility. When an improved ductility is desired, the addition of suitable amounts of compression reinforcement seems to be the best way to provide it.

e) The influence of cover thickness on sectional ductility appears to be negligible.

4. Among the loading factors, only the effects of duration of loading and of axial loading are studied in detail.

a) The effect of loading duration on sectional ductility is found not to be very significant.

b) A section is found capable of mobilizing some ductility as long as failure is governed by tension, although the amount of this available ductility decreases drastically as the level of axial load approaches that corresponding to balanced failure. However, fairly high amounts of sectional ductility are found to be available for sections subject to axial loads in the order of 10–15% of their carrying capacities.

The following conclusions can be drawn from this study:

1. The ductility of reinforced concrete sections in bending is primarily influenced by p , p' , f'_c and f_y . Other variables have a secondary effect. (However, the amount and distribution of lateral reinforcement have an essential role in improving shear behaviour and preventing premature shear failure.)

2. The ductility factor is significantly reduced for high grade steels. However, when such steels are combined with relatively high grade concretes, the ductility factor is sufficiently large to accommodate plastic redistribution for usual, economical steel percentages. (For $\phi_u/\phi_y \geq 5$ with $f_y = 75$ ksi, $f'_c = 5$ ksi and $p' = 0$, $p \doteq 1.4\%$ follows.)

3. Since most reinforced concrete sections contain some compression rein-

forcement (because of construction or code requirements), the available ductility is usually adequate and larger than it would appear.

4. If a minimum value of $\phi_u/\phi_y = 5$ is accepted as a prerequisite for practical inelastic design, plastic action can be permitted in reinforced concrete columns, provided that the sections fail in tension under combined bending and compression.

Notations

A	$E_c \epsilon_0 / k_3 f'_c$.
A_s	area of tension steel.
A'_s	area of compression steel.
b	width of section.
c	thickness of cover.
C_c	resultant force in compression concrete.
C_s	resultant force in compression steel.
d	effective depth or depth of tension steel from extreme compression fibre.
d'	depth of compression steel from extreme compression fibre.
d''	tie diameter.
D	parameter of compression concrete stress-strain relationship.
e'	eccentricity of external load from centroid of tension steel.
e_p	proof strain of high strength steel.
E_c	initial tangent modulus of elasticity of concrete.
E_s	modulus of elasticity of steel.
E_{sh}	strain-hardening modulus of steel.
$E I$	$dM/d\phi = \Delta M/\Delta \phi$, flexural rigidity of section.
f'_c	standard cylinder strength of concrete.
f_y	yield strength of steel.
F	$\epsilon_s k/\epsilon_c (1 - k)$, bond factor.
h	total depth of section.
k	relative depth of neutral axis.
k_2	parameter indicating position of resultant compression concrete force.
k_3	ratio of maximum stress to cylinder strength.
M	sectional moment.
M_u	ultimate moment.
p	A_s/bd , tension reinforcement ratio.
p'	A'_s/bd , compression reinforcement ratio.
p_{max}	maximum permissible tension reinforcement ratio.
P	axial load on section.
P_u	ultimate load.
s	spacing of lateral reinforcement.
t	loading duration in minutes.
T_c	resultant force in tension concrete.
T_s	resultant force in tension steel.

x	ϵ/ϵ_0 .
y	distance of a sectional fibre away from neutral axis.
y_t	depth of uncracked area in tension from neutral axis.
ϵ	longitudinal strain, specifically compressive strain in concrete.
ϵ_0	compression concrete strain corresponding to maximum stress.
ϵ_p	$e_p + \sigma_p/E_s$.
ϵ_s	strain in tension steel.
ϵ'_s	strain in compression steel.
ϵ_{sh}	steel strain at the onset of strain-hardening.
ϵ_t	tensile strain in concrete.
ϵ_{tr}	cracking strain of concrete.
ϵ_u	ultimate strain, specifically in compression concrete.
ϵ_y	yield strain, specifically in compression concrete.
σ	compressive stress in concrete.
σ_p	proof stress of high strength steel.
σ_s	stress in tension steel.
σ'_s	stress in compression steel.
σ_t	tensile stress in concrete.
σ_{tr}	modulus of rupture of concrete.
ϕ	sectional curvature.
ϕ_u	curvature corresponding to ultimate moment.
ϕ_y	curvature corresponding to yield moment.

Acknowledgments

This paper is part of an investigation on the "Inelastic Behaviour of Reinforced Concrete Structures" in progress in the Solid Mechanics Division and the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.

The financial support of the National Research Council of Canada, under Grants A-4789 and D-10, is gratefully acknowledged.

References

1. BACH, C., and GRAF, O.: Investigations on Reinforced Concrete Beams Concerning the Moment-Curvature Relation. Parts I and II, Deutscher Ausschuss für Eisenbeton, Hefte 38 und 45, Verlag W. Ernst & Sohn, Berlin, 1917 und 1920 (in German).
2. Provisions for the Analysis of Redundant Reinforced Concrete Structures Allowing for the Redistribution of Stresses. 2nd Edition, Gosstrojizdat, Moscow, 1961 (in Russian); translation of the 1st Edition, Bulletin d'Information du CEB, No. 28, Paris, 1960.

3. Deutscher Normenausschuss für Stahlbeton: Specifications for the Construction of Reinforced Concrete Structures. DIN 1045, 4th Ed., Verlag W. Ernst & Sohn, Berlin, November 1959 (in German).
4. CEB-FIP Joint Committee: International Recommendations for the Design and Construction of Concrete Structures. Cement and Concrete Association, London, June 1970.
5. British Standards Institution: Draft British Standard Code of Practice for the Structural Use of Concrete. BSI, London, 1969.
6. WINTER, G.: Whither Inelastic Concrete Design? Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Flexural Mechanics of Reinforced Concrete, Miami, Fla., November 1964, pp. 581-585.
7. COHN, M. Z.: Why Nonlinear Analysis and Design. Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Flexural Mechanics of Reinforced Concrete, Miami, Fla., November 1964, pp. 591-594.
8. SARGIN, M.: Stress-Strain Relationship for Concrete and the Analysis of Structural Concrete Sections. Study No. 4, Solid Mechanics Division, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 1971, 167 p.
9. ROY, H. E. H., and SOZEN, M. A.: Ductility of Concrete. Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Flexural Mechanics of Reinforced Concrete, Miami, Fla., November 1964, pp. 213-224.
10. NEWMARK, N. M., and HALL, W. J.: Dynamic Behavior of Reinforced and Prestressed Concrete Buildings under Horizontal Forces and the Design of Joints (Incl. Wind, Earthquake, Blast Effects). Preliminary Publication, 8th Congress, International Association for Bridge and Structural Engineering, New York, September 1968, pp. 585-613.
11. BLUME, J. A., NEWMARK, N. M., and CORNING, L. H.: Design of Multistory Reinforced Concrete Buildings for Earthquake Motions. Portland Cement Association, Skokie, Illinois, 1961, 318 p.
12. BLUME, J. A.: Design of Earthquake-Resistant Poured-in-Place Concrete Structures. Ch. 18 of "Earthquake Engineering", Wiegel, R. L., ed., Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970, pp. 449-474.
13. ENTRICAN, G. C.: Detailing for Ductility in Reinforced Concrete Frames Subject to Earthquake Forces. The Structural Engineer, Vol. 43, No. 8, August 1965, pp. 249-254.
14. PFRANG, E. O., SIESS, C. P., and SOZEN, M. A.: Load-Moment-Curvature Characteristics of Reinforced Concrete Cross Sections. ACI Journal, Proceedings Vol. 61, No. 7, July 1964, pp. 763-778.
15. PARK, R.: Ductility of Reinforced Concrete Frames under Seismic Loading. New Zealand Engineering, Vol. 23, No. 11, Wellington, November 15, 1968, pp. 427-435.
16. SAMPSON, R. A.: Ductility of Reinforced Concrete Columns. M. Eng. thesis, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, N.Z., 1971.
17. ABBASI, A. F., and SIESS, C. P.: Effect of Stress-Strain Characteristics of High-Strength Reinforcement on the Behavior of Reinforced Concrete Beam-Columns. Structural Research Series No. 354, Civil Engineering Studies, University of Illinois, Urbana, September 1969, 374 p.
18. SHAH, S. P., and VIJAY RANGAN, B.: Effects of Reinforcements on Ductility of Concrete. Journal of the Structural Division, ASCE, Vol. 96, No. ST 6, Proc. Paper 7366, June 1970, pp. 1167-1183.
19. GHOSH, S. K.: Discussion of Ref. 18, Journal of the Structural Division, ASCE, Vol. 97, No. ST 3, Proc. Paper 7944, March 1971, pp. 988-989.

20. American Society of Civil Engineers: Plastic Design in Steel. A Guide and Commentary. ASCE Manual No. 41, New York, 1971.
21. COHN, M. Z., and PETCU, V. A.: Moment Redistribution and Rotation Capacity of Plastic Hinges in Redundant Reinforced Concrete Beams. Indian Concrete Journal, Vol. 37, No. 8, Bombay, August 1963, pp. 282-290.
22. COHN, M. Z.: Rotation Compatibility in the Limit Design of Reinforced Concrete Continuous Beams. Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Flexural Mechanics of Reinforced Concrete, Miami, Fla., November 1964, pp. 359-382.
23. American Concrete Institute: Building Code Requirements for Reinforced Concrete. ACI 318-71, Detroit, Mich., November 1971.
24. HOGNESTAD, E.: A Study of Combined Bending and Axial Load in Reinforced Concrete Members. Bulletin No. 399, Engineering Experiment Station, University of Illinois, Urbana, November 1951, 128 p.
25. RÜSCH, H.: Researches Toward a General Flexural Theory for Structural Concrete. ACI Journal, Proceedings Vol. 57, No. 1, July 1960, pp. 1-28.
28. GHOSH, S. K., and COHN, M. Z.: Effect of Creep on the Flexural Strength and Deformation of Structural Concrete. Preliminary Publication, IABSE Symposium on the Design of Concrete Structures for Creep, Shrinkage and Temperature Changes, Madrid, September 1970, pp. 207-216.
27. BAKER, A. L. L.: Limit-State Design of Reinforced Concrete. Cement and Concrete Association, London, 1970.
28. CORLEY, W. G.: Rotational Capacity of Reinforced Concrete Beams. Journal of the Structural Division, ASCE, Vol. 92, No. ST 5, Proc. Paper 4939, October 1966, pp. 121-146.

Summary

An analytical investigation simulating tests on some 1700 specimens is performed, in order to evaluate the effect of a large number of factors on the ductility of reinforced concrete sections in pure and combined bending.

The analysis is based on reliable stress-strain characteristics for steel and concrete and enables moment-curvature and ductility factor-steel percentage diagrams to be prepared for a broad range of combinations of the variables.

The study demonstrates that reinforced concrete sections possess a significant amount of ductility which can be used advantageously within a wide spectrum of design variables.

Résumé

Une étude analytique simulant environ 1700 essais est effectuée afin de trouver l'influence d'un grand nombre de facteurs sur la capacité de déformation des sections en béton armé sous flexion pure et composée.

L'analyse est basée sur des diagrammes contraintes-déformations éprouvés pour l'acier et le béton. Elle offre la possibilité de trouver pour beaucoup de combinaisons de variables les diagrammes moments-courbures et les diagrammes capacité de déformation-pourcentage d'acier.

L'étude montre que les sections en béton armé possèdent une capacité de déformation accentuée dont on peut profiter dans un large spectre des variables.

Zusammenfassung

Es wird eine analytische Untersuchung, die Versuche an ungefähr 1700 Proben simuliert, durchgeführt, um den Einfluss einer Grosszahl von Faktoren auf die Verformungsfähigkeit armierter Betonquerschnitte unter reiner sowie zusammengesetzter Biegung zu ermitteln.

Die Berechnung beruht auf zuverlässigen Spannungs-Dehnungs-Diagrammen für Stahl und Beton und ermöglicht das Erstellen der Momenten-Krümmungs- sowie der Verformungsfaktor-Stahlgehalt-Diagramme für viele Kombinationsmöglichkeiten der Variablen.

Die Studie zeigt, dass armierte Betonquerschnitte eine ausgeprägte Verformungsfähigkeit besitzen, welche innerhalb eines breiten Spektrums von konstruktiven Annahmen vorteilhaft ausgenützt werden kann.

Leere Seite
Blank page
Page vide