

Zeitschrift: IABSE reports = Rapports AIPC = IVBH Berichte

Band: 46 (1983)

Artikel: Evaluation of brick masonry by non-destructive methods

Autor: Noland, James L. / Atkinson, Richard H.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-35837>

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: 01.04.2026

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


Evaluation of Brick Masonry by Non-Destructive Methods

Evaluation de maçonnerie en briques à l'aide de méthodes non destructives

Bewertung von Backsteinmauerwerk mit Hilfe zerstörungsfreier Prüfverfahren

James L. NOLAND

Structural Engineer
Atkinson-Noland & Associates
Boulder, CO, USA



James L. Noland, born 1934, received his Ph.D. in structural engineering from the University of Colorado. He has been involved in research, development and design in many areas related to structures and structural materials with a special interest in masonry.

Richard H. ATKINSON

Geotechnical Engineer
Atkinson-Noland & Associates
Boulder, CO, USA



Richard Atkinson, born 1938, received his Ph.D. in geotechnical engineering from the University of Colorado. Application of rock mechanics techniques to mining problems and to structural masonry have been a major area of his work.

SUMMARY

The project reviews existing non-destructive evaluation methods, which have been applied to other materials, for their effectiveness as methods of strength and condition assessment of masonry. Results are briefly presented with the conclusion that certain methods appear to have potential as practical means of evaluating masonry.

RESUME

Le projet analyse l'application des méthodes non destructives, utilisées pour d'autres matériaux, à l'évaluation de la résistance et de l'état réel d'une structure en maçonnerie. Les résultats sont présentés brièvement. Il semblerait que certaines méthodes puissent être utilisées comme moyens pratiques d'évaluation des structures en maçonnerie.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Der Beitrag untersucht verschiedene zerstörungsfreie Prüfmethode (NDE-Verfahren) auf ihre Eignung zur Bestimmung der Festigkeit und Güte von Mauerwerk. Die Ergebnisse zeigen, dass sich lediglich gewisse Verfahren für die praktische Bewertung von Mauerwerk eignen.



1. INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of masonry structures in the USA to ascertain strength properties and general condition, i.e., presence of flaws and/or general deterioration, is primarily based on visual observations and destructive tests of specimens removed from the structures [9,31]¹. Visual examination can detect only gross defects while destructive tests of specimens removed from a structure may be time consuming, expensive, and may cause aesthetic or structural damage particularly if the number of destructive test specimens is sufficient to yield a satisfactory degree of statistical confidence.

The research reviewed herein was done to determine whether methods and equipment used for NDE of other materials, primarily rock and concrete [1,2,4,7,11,13,18,21,26], could be, or have the potential to be, satisfactory NDE methods for structural masonry. The NDE methods evaluated in the research were chosen based on:

- availability and cost of equipment,
- potential for safe and ease of use in field conditions, and
- prior success of use for NDE of other materials.

2. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS NDE OF MASONRY IN THE USA

With the exception of two limited studies on full scale buildings [20,28], no systematic investigation had been conducted in the USA into the application of NDE methods to masonry prior to the study discussed in this paper [30].

3. NON-DESTRUCTIVE EVALUATION METHODS CONSIDERED

3.1 Schmidt Rebound Hammer

The Schmidt Rebound Hammer is primarily a surface hardness test apparatus developed for concrete testing [13], but has also been used to evaluate rock [1,7] and to provide data used to predict performance of rock tunnel boring mechanics [27].

3.2 Mechanical Pulse Velocity

The mechanical pulse velocity method is based on the correlation of the velocity of an impact-generated stress wave in a material to the properties of that material. Wave velocity is primarily a function of elastic modulus, poisson's ratio, and density, however correlations have been found between strength properties of concrete and wave velocity [13,26]. Wave velocity is affected by flaws in a material [4,13] and was therefore considered potentially amenable to flaw detection in masonry.

3.3 Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity

The ultrasonic pulse velocity method operates on the same principle as the mechanical pulse velocity method. The stress waves are generated, however, by an electroacoustic transducer and are at a high frequency [13,26]. This method has been used to detect flaws in the collar joint of two-wythe masonry walls [29].

¹It should be noted that a form of destructive test, the "shove-test", is being used in parts of the USA for examination of older masonry buildings made using lime-sand mortar or mortars of very low cement content. Post-test repairs completely restore original appearance [30,31]. The "flat-jack" test used in Italy is also a test which temporarily damages the structure, but it can easily be restored to original condition [5,12,17].




FIGURE 1 - BRICK MASONRY WALL SPECIMEN




FIGURE 2 - SMALL-SCALE SPECIMENS



3.4 Vibration

Free vibration may be analyzed to obtain natural frequency, modulus, and damping values which sometimes can be related to strength properties. Vibration methods have been used to characterize overall properties of tall masonry and steel buildings [14,15,22].

3.5 Acoustic-Mechanical Pulse

The acoustic-mechanical pulse method is an adaptation of the acoustic-ultrasonic technique [23,24,25] which is in turn an adaptation of the acoustic-emission technique [11]. This method relies upon introducing energy into the material (specimen) by a single mechanical impact rather than by ultrasonic excitation or by material deformation. Sophisticated, but durable and easy-to-operate, equipment records various characteristics of the mechanically induced stress wave (other than velocity) which have been related to material properties [23,24,25].

3.6 Penetration

The strength and stiffness of the material are among the factors which determine the depth of penetration of a probe of a given mass, shape, and impact velocity [13]. Penetration methods have been used in an experimental evaluation of masonry in field conditions [28].

4. RESEARCH CONDUCTED

4.1 Experimental Phase

NDE measurements were made on large brick masonry wall specimens constructed in a laboratory in a cantilever condition as shown in Figure 1. A total of thirty walls were constructed of three types of brick each of a different compressive strength; walls of each kind of brick were built using each of five different mortars. This was done to provide a range of strength properties over which to evaluate the NDE methods considered. The wall specimens built and the NDE tests performed on each are summarized in Table A. Companion small-scale specimens, as shown in Figure 2, were built for destructive tests to provide strength properties of each brick-mortar combination [3,16].

Subsequent to NDE tests, flaws, in the form of delaminated bed joints, were created in the wall specimens so that the capability of each NDE method to detect such flaws could be assessed.

4.2 Analytical Phase

Linear bivariate regression analyses were performed to assess the correlation between each type of NDE measurement and the strength properties as established by destructive tests of the small-scale specimens. Equations for the best fit lines and corresponding coefficients of determination and correlation coefficients were obtained.

5. RESULTS

Because the intent of the research was to assess the applicability of the NDE methods considered to masonry, the data of primary interest were the coefficients of determination and associated correlation coefficients associated with each linear regression expression. The coefficients are presented in Table B.

The ultrasonic pulse velocity, mechanical pulse velocity, acoustic-mechanical pulse, and vibration methods yielded significantly different results when applied to walls with one or two delaminated bed joints. The pulse velocity

methods appeared capable of locating the flawed joint, but the acoustic-mechanical pulse and vibration methods could not. The rebound hammer method did not show sensitivity to bed joint flaws.

6. CONCLUSIONS

NDE, at least for the type of masonry tested, appears to have potential for assessment of the strength and condition of masonry. Of the methods considered, the Schmidt Rebound Hammer results were the most closely correlated to compressive strength while the ultrasonic pulse velocity method yielded results most closely related to the modulus of rupture. None of the methods were able to provide results well correlated to joint shear strength.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Additional experiments are suggested to evaluate NDE on other forms of masonry. Combining NDE methods applied to masonry may provide better NDE measurement to strength property correlations [6,19].

REFERENCES

1. ATKINSON, R.H., Suggested Methods for Determination of Hardness. Document No. 9, International Society for Rock Mechanics, Commission on Standardization of Laboratory and Field Test, 1975.
2. BARTON, N. and CHOVBAY, V., The Shear Strength of Rock Joints in Theory and Practice. v. 10, no. 1-2, Rock Mechanics, December 1977.
3. BAUR, J., NOLAND, J., and CHINN, J., Compression and Tension Bond Strength of Small-Scale Masonry Specimens. Proceedings of the North American Masonry Conference, Boulder, Colorado, August 1978.
4. BRUENING, S.M. and BONE, A.J., Soniscope Applied to Maintenance of Concrete Structures. Proceedings, 33rd Annual Meeting, Highway Research Board, 1954, pp. 210-216.
5. BINDA, L., BALDI, G., CARABELLI, E., ROSSI, G., LANDRIANI, S., Evaluation of the Statical Decay of Masonry Structures: Methodology and Practice. ISMES Report No. 166, Bergamo, Italy.
6. CLIFFON, J. and ANDERSON, E., Nondestructive Evaluation Methods for Quality Acceptance of Hardened Concrete in Structures. NBSIR 80-2163, Center for Building Technology, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C., January 1981.
7. DEERE, D.U. and MILLER, R.P., Engineering Classification and Index Projects for Intact Rocks. Air Force Weapons Laboratory Technical Report No. AFWL-TR-65-116, December 1966.
8. ELLINGWOOD, BRUCE, Analysis of Reliability for Masonry Structures. Proc. Am. Soc. of Civil Eng., Vol. 107, No. ST5, May 1981, pp. 757-773.
9. FATTEL, S.G. and CATTANEO, L., Evaluation of Structural Properties of Masonry in Existing Buildings, NBSIR 74-520, Center for Building Technology, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.
10. HART, G.C., SABOL, T.A. and HUANG, S.C., Rehabilitation of Masonry Buildings Using Reliability and Decision Theory. Proc. 2nd North Am. Masonry Conf., August 1982.
11. HUCKA, U., A Rapid Method of Determining the Strength of Rocks In-Situ. Int. J. Rock Mech. Mining Science, Vol. 2, 1965, pp. 127-134.



12. JARINA, L., PEANO, A., Characterization of Brick Masonry Stiffness by Numerical Modeling. ISMES Report No. 165, ISMES, Bergamo, Italy.
13. MALHOTRA, V.M., Testing Hardened Concrete: Non-Destructive Methods. Iowa State University Press and American Concrete Institute, 1976.
14. Medearis, K., An Investigation of the Dynamic Response of the Park Lane Towers to Earthquake Loadings. Report to the Colorado Masonry Institute, Denver, Colorado, 1974.
15. MEDEARIS, K., An Investigation of the Strength of Masonry Walls Using Vibration Techniques. Report to the Colorado Masonry Institute, Denver, Colorado, 1976.
16. NUSS, L., NOLAND, J., and CHINN, J., The Parameters Influencing Shear Strength Between Clay Masonry Units and Mortar. Proceedings of the North American Masonry Conference, Boulder, Colorado, August 1978.
17. ROSSI, P., Analysis of Mechanical Characteristics of Brick Masonry Tested by Means of Non-Destructive In-Situ Tests. ISMES Report No. 167, ISMES, Bergamo, Italy.
18. SABNIS, G.M., MILLSTEIN, L., Use of Non-Destructive Methods to Evaluate and Investigate Condition of Buildings and Bridges. Proc. Int'l Conf. on Rehabilitation of Buildings and Bridges Including Investigations, Howard University, Washington, D.C., October 1982.
19. SAMARIN, A., and MEYNINK, P., Use of Combined Ultrasonic and Rebound Hammer Method for Determining Strength of Concrete Structural Members. Concrete International, March 1981, pp. 25-29.
20. SNELL, L.M., Non-Destructive Testing Technique to Evaluate Existing Masonry Construction. Proceedings of the North American Masonry Conference, Boulder, Colorado, August 1978.
21. TARKOY, P.J., Predicting Tunnel Boring Machine Penetration Rates in Selected Rock Types. Ninth Canadian Symposium on Rock Mechanics, Montreal, December 1973.
22. TRIFUNAC, J., Wind and Microtremor Induces Vibrations of a Twenty-Two Story Steel Frame Building. California Institute of Technology EERL Report, Pasadena, California, 1970.
23. VARY, ALEX, A Review of Issues and Strategies in Nondestructive Evaluation of Fiber Reinforced Structural Composites. NASA Technical Memorandum 79246, 1979.
24. VARY, A., BOWLES, K., Ultrasonic Evaluation of the Strength of Unidirectional Graphite-Polyimide Composites. Proceedings, 11th Symposium on Nondestructive Testing, American Society for Nondestructive Testing and Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas, 1977, pp. 242-258.
25. VARY, A. and LARK, R., Correlation of Fiber Composite Tensile Strength with the Ultrasonic Stress Wave Factor. J. Testing and Evaluation, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1979, pp. 185-191.
26. WHITEHURST, E.A., Evaluation of Concrete Properties from Sonic Test. American Concrete Institute Monograph No. 2, 1966.
27. WHITMAN, R., HEGER, F., LUFT, R., KRIMGOLD, F., Seismic Resistance of Existing Buildings. Jn. Struc. Div., ASCE, July 1980, pp. 1573-1592.
28. Non-Destructive Test Procedures for Brick, Block, and Mortar. Victor Wilburn Associates, Report to the Dept of Housing and Urban Development, Contract #H-2540, July 1979.

29. Investigation of Sonic Testing of Masonry Walls. Aerojet-General Corp. Report to the Dept. of General Services, Office of Architecture and Construction, State of California, 1967.
30. An Investigation into Methods of Nondestructive Evaluation of Masonry Structures. Report by Atkinson-Noland & Associates, Inc. to National Science Foundation, Grant No. PFR-7916572, February 1982.
31. Earthquake Hazard Reduction in Existing Buildings. Los Angeles City Building Code, Division 68, 1982.

Table A
Wall Specimens*

| Wall Series No. | Clay Unit Type | Mortar Type | Nondestructive Tests Performed |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------------------|
| IA | A.R. | 0:1:3 | SH, V, UP, MP |
| IB | A.R. | 0:1:3 | SH, V, UP, MP |
| IC | A.R. | 0:1:3 | SH, V, UP, MP |
| ID | A.R. | 0:1:3 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP |
| IIA | A.R. | 1:½:3 | SH, V, UP, MP |
| IIB | A.R. | 1:½:3 | SH, V, UP, MP |
| IIC | A.R. | 1:½:3 | SH, V, UP, MP |
| IID | A.R. | 1:½:3 | SH, V, UP, DP |
| IIIA | A.R. | 1:1:6 | SH, V, UP, MP |
| IIIB | A.R. | 1:1:6 | SH, V, UP, MP |
| IIID | A.R. | 1:1:6 | SH, V, UP, MP |
| IVA | A.R. | 1:2:9 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP, AMP |
| IVB | A.R. | 1:2:9 | SH, V, UP, MP, AMP |
| IVC | A.R. | 1:2:9 | SH, V, UP, MP, AMP |
| IVD | A.R. | 1:2:9 | SH, V, UP, DP |
| X | A.R. | 1:3:12 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP |
| VA | I.S. | 1:½:3 | V, UP, MP, DP |
| VB | I.S. | 1:½:3 | V, UP, MP |
| VC | I.S. | 1:½:3 | V, UP, MP |
| VIA | I.S. | 1:1:6 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP |
| VIB | I.S. | 1:1:6 | SH, V, UP, MP |
| VIC | I.S. | 1:1:6 | SH, V, UP, MP |
| VII | I.S. | 1:2:9 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP |
| VIII | I.S. | 1:3:12 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP |
| IX | I.S. | 0:1:3 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP |
| XI | H.P. | 1:½:3 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP |
| XII | H.P. | 1:1:6 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP |
| XIII | H.P. | 1:2:9 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP |
| XIV | H.P. | 1:3:12 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP |
| XV | H.P. | 0:1:3 | SH, V, UP, MP, DP |

*Code:

SH = Schmidt Hammer
 V = Mechanical Vibration
 UP = Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity
 A.R. = Antique Rustic Brick ($f_b = 86.1$ MPa)
 I.S. = Iron Spot Brick ($f_b = 91.2$ MPa)
 H.P. = Hard Pressed Brick ($f_b = 46.7$ MPa)

MP = Mechanical Pulse Velocity
 DP = Densicon Penetrometer
 AMP = Acoustic Mechanical Pulse



Table B
Results of Destructive Tests on Small Specimens
vs. NDE Measurements on Unflawed Wall Specimens

| Dependent Variable y' | Independent* Variable x | Correlation Coefficient R | Coefficient of Determination R^2 |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Compressive Strength f'_{mt} | NR | .890 | .792 |
| | WD | .768 | .590 |
| | HUV | .772 | .596 |
| | VUV | .849 | .721 |
| | UV | .776 | .603 |
| | VMV | .703 | .495 |
| | HMV | .734 | .539 |
| | BP | .620 | .390 |
| | MP | .530 | .280 |
| Modulus of Rupture R | HUV | .690 | .476 |
| | VUV | .675 | .455 |
| | UV | .672 | .452 |
| | WD | .644 | .415 |
| | NR | .738 | .545 |
| | VMV | .447 | .200 |
| | HMV | .910 | .828 |
| Shear Strength τ_o | NR | .518 | .268 |
| | WD | .177 | .031 |
| | HUV | .257 | .066 |
| | VUV | .392 | .154 |
| | UV | .220 | .049 |
| | VMV | .340 | .115 |
| | HMV | .326 | .106 |

Code:

- NR = Rebound number
- WD = Natural frequency of vibration
- HUV = Ultrasonic velocity - horizontal direction
- VUV = Ultrasonic velocity - vertical direction
- UV = Ultrasonic velocity - thru wall
- HMV = Mechanical pulse velocity - horizontal direction
- VMV = Mechanical pulse velocity - vertical direction
- BP = Penetration test - brick
- MP = Penetration test - mortar
- f'_{mt} = Compressive strength of prism
- R = Modulus of rupture
- τ_o = Shear strength as measured using the inclined bed joint specimen [16]