



Ain Shams University
Faculty of Engineering
Structural Department

MOMENT REDISTRIBUTION IN HIGH-STRENGTH CONCRETE BEAMS

By

Eng. Hossam Ali Abdalla Elagroudy

B.Sc. Civil Engineering, Ain Shams University, 1999

M.Sc. Civil Engineering, North Carolina State University, 2003

**A Thesis Submitted to the Structural Engineering Department,
Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University**

**For the Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Civil Engineering (Structural Engineering)**

SUPERVISED BY

Prof. Dr. Ali Sherief Abdel-Fayyad

Prof. of Structural Eng.-Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Osama Hamdy Abdel-Wahed

Prof. of Structural Eng.-Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

Dr. Ahmed Hassan Ghallab

Associate Prof. of Structural Eng.-Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

Dr. Tarek Kamal Hassan

Associate Prof. of Structural Eng.-Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

CAIRO - EGYPT

2010



APPROVAL SHEET

MOMENT REDISTRIBUTION IN HIGH-STRENGTH CONCRETE BEAMS

By

Hossam Ali Abdalla Elagroudy

B.Sc., Civil Engineering (Structural), Ain Shams University, 1999

M.Sc., Civil Engineering (Structural), North Carolina State University, 2003

ii. Examiners Committee:

Name	Signature
Prof. Dr. Nabil Ahmed Fouad	
Prof. Dr. Ahmed Sherief Essawy	
Prof. Dr. Osama Hamdy Abdel Wahed	
Associate Prof. Dr. Ahmed Hassan Ghallab	

ABSTRACT

The evaluation of ductility of reinforced concrete beams is very important, since it is essential to avoid a fragile collapse of the structure by ensuring adequate deformation at the ultimate limit state. One of the procedures used to quantify ductility is based on deformations, namely, the plastic rotation capacity. Knowledge of the plastic rotation capacity of certain regions of the structure is important for a plastic analysis or a linear analysis with moment redistribution. An experimental program is described in this article. It is composed of 10 tests designed to study the moment redistribution and ductility of continuous T-section high-strength concrete (HSC) beams. Particular care was given to analyzing how the tensile reinforcement ratio, concrete compressive strength, slenderness ratio and loading pattern influence the ductility and moment redistribution of the beams. A comparative study was carried out on several codes related to the moment redistribution permitted and the experimental findings. It was found that the code recommendations for normal strength concrete (NSC) can be safely applied to high strength concrete. A new equation is proposed to determine the degree of moment redistribution as a function in the value (x/d) for high strength concrete elements. This equation is only valid for concrete strength between 60 MPa and 90 MPa and for values of x/d between 0.1 and 0.2 only. A finite element model is being designed to verify the experimental results. A strong agreement was found between the experimental results and the analytical predictions regarding load deflection relationship. The Analytical model has been applied to various cases other than that studied in the experimental program.

STATEMENT

This Thesis is submitted to Ain Shams University for the degree of Doctorate of Philosophy in Civil Engineering, (Structural Engineering).

The work included in this thesis was carried out by the author at the Structural Engineering Department, Ain Shams University, from September 2006 to March 2010.

No part of this thesis has been submitted for a degree or qualification to any other University or Institution.

Date: / /2010

Name: Hossam Ali Abdalla Elagroudy

Signature

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and Foremost, all thanks and gratitude are due to ALLAH for His mercies and blessings all the way long.

The author is grateful for the very capable assistance of both Prof. Ali Sherief and Prof. Osama Hamdy, Professors of Concrete Structures, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, for their kind supervision of the work. Their valuable discussions have been fruitful and have greatly improved the thesis. Their unfailing help, keen insight, and guidance influenced the course of this work.

My special thanks and gratitude is dedicated to both Dr. Ahmed Ghallab and Dr. Tarek Hassan, Associate Professors of Structural Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University. Without their constant and unparalleled guidance and invaluable suggestions, this work would not have been possible.

Also I would like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Khaled Hilal for his unfailing help, keen insight, and guidance during my resaerch work have positively influenced the course of this work.

I owe special thanks and deep appreciation to Mr. Mahmoud Badr, Lab technician at faculty of engineering, Ain Shams University, for his assistance in carrying the experimental part of the thesis and all the Lab. Team..

I would like to acknowledge the great help of Beshay Steel for providing me the steel rebars required for the experiemntal program.

I would like to extend my gratefulness to Dr. Yasser Afifi the principale strutral engineer at the Engineering Consultants Group for his remarkable efforts in running the Analytical program. I really appreciate the time he donated to adjust my ANSYS program.

Last but not least, I would like to dedicate this thesis, to the soul of my dear parents, to my beloved brother and sister.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	I
STATEMENT.....	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	V
LIST OF FIGURES.....	VIII
LIST OF TABLES.....	XIII
LIST OF SYMBOLS.....	1
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1 General.....	4
1.2 Objectives of the Present Investigation.....	5
1.3 Outline of the Thesis.....	5
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Benefits of Ductility.....	7
2.3 Behavior of Statically Indeterminate Structures.....	9
2.4 Influence of Beam Stiffness on Rotation Capacity.....	12
2.5 Influence of Post Peak Characteristics of the Reinforcing Steel.....	15
2.6 Benefits of Moment Redistribution.....	18
2.7 Available Rotation Capacity.....	19
2.8 Factors Affecting Plastic Rotational Capacity.....	22
2.8.1 Effect of Shear Stresses.....	22
2.8.2 Effect of Slenderness Ratio:.....	24
2.8.3 Effect of Section Geometry:.....	28
2.8.4 Effect of Tensile Reinforcement Ratio:.....	28
2.8.5 Effect of Bar Diameter:.....	32
2.8.6 Effect of Member Size:.....	33
2.8.7 Effect of Concrete Confinement:.....	36
2.8.9 Effect of Concrete Compressive Strength:.....	39
2.9 Design Codes' Provisions for Moment Redistribution.....	44
2.9.1 ECCS 203-2007:.....	45
2.9.2 ACI 318M-05:.....	45
2.9.3 Eurocode 2:.....	46
2.9.4 CSA A23.3-94:.....	46
2.9.5 BS 8110-1-1997:.....	46
2.10 Comparison between Codes.....	47
CHAPTER 3: EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM.....	52
3.1 Introduction.....	52
3.2 Test Program.....	52

3.2.1 General.....	52
3.2.2 Test Specimens	53
3.2.3 Material Properties.....	57
3.2.4 Concrete Mixing	59
3.2.5 Casting and Curing	59
3.2.6 Control Specimen Preparation	61
3.2.7 Test Setup.....	61
3.2.8 Instrumentations.....	62
CHAPTER 4: EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS	65
4.1 Introduction.....	65
4.2 Failure load and Crack pattern:.....	66
4.3 Load deflection relationship.....	85
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF TEST RESULTS.....	95
5.1 Introduction.....	95
5.2 Comparison between B1, B2, and B3	95
5.3 Ductility and Moment Redistribution of Tested Beams	99
5.3.1 Ductility	99
5.3.2 Displacement Ductility	100
5.3.3 Energy ductility:.....	100
5.4 Comparison between B1 and B4.....	102
5.5 Comparison between B6, B7, and B8	106
5.6 Comparison between B6 and B9.....	109
5.7 Comparison between B6 and B10.....	113
5.8 Effect of Longitudinal Reinforcement Ratio for 60 MPa Concrete Strength	116
5.9 Effect of Concrete Compressive Strength.....	118
5.10 Effect of Longitudinal Reinforcement Ratio for 90 MPa Concrete Strength	120
5.11 Effect of Type of Loading.....	122
5.12 Effect of Span to Depth Ratio	125
5.13 Comparison Between Experimental Results of the Current Research and Previous Researches.....	126
5.14 Comparing the Experimental Results with the Codes of Practice	131
CHAPTER 6: NONLINEAR FINITE ELEMENT MODEL	132
6.1 Introduction.....	132
6.2 Finite Element Program Description	132
6.3 Scope of Work	133
6.4 Material Models	133
6.4.1 Material Model for Concrete	133
6.4.2 Solid 65 - 3-D Reinforced Concrete Solids	136

6.4.2.1 Assumptions and Restrictions.....	136
6.4.2.2 Element Description.....	137
6.4.2.3 Solid 65 Input Data.....	137
6.4.2.4 Nonlinear Behavior - Concrete.....	137
6.4.2.5 Modeling of a Crack.....	138
6.4.2.6 Modeling of Crushing.....	142
6.4.3 Material Model for Steel Bars.....	143
6.4.3.1 Assumptions and Restrictions.....	143
6.4.3.2 Element Matrices and Load Vector.....	143
6.4.4 Material Model for Steel Plates.....	145
6.5 Description of The Finite Element Model.....	147
6.5.1 Element type.....	147
6.5.2. Material Models.....	148
6.5.2.1 Concrete.....	148
6.5.2.2 Steel rebars.....	148
6.5.2.3 Steel plates.....	149
6.5.3 Modeling and Meshing.....	149
6.5.4 Solution Controls:.....	151
 CHAPTER 7: FINITE ELEMENT MODEL VERIFECATION AND PREDICTIONS	
.....	153
7.1 Introduction.....	153
7.2 Verification of the Model.....	153
7.3 Deformation Pattern.....	160
7.4 Crack pattern as obtained from ANSYS program.	164
7.4 Parametric study.....	168
 CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	178
8.1 Summary.....	178
8.2 Conclusions.....	179
8.3 Recommendations.....	180
REFERENCES.....	181

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Moment redistribution in statically indeterminate member, after CEB Bulletin d'Information No.242	10
Figure 2.2 Development of the moment in the span and over the support as a function of the applied load, after CEB Bulletin d'Information No.242	11
Figure 2.3 Ratio of stiffness in the cracked state over the support to that in the span, after Macchi 1976	12
Figure 2.4 Experimental set-up and selected results of a test performed on a continuous slab over three supports under four-point bending, after Eligehausen/Fabritius 1993	14
Figure 2.5 Test results of a fixed-end slab loaded by a concentrated load, after Eligehausen/Zhao/Fabritius 1995	17
Figure 2.6 Results of about 350 tests on beams performed in the 60's and 70's were compared by Siviero (1976).....	21
Figure 2.7 Flexural crack hinge (left) and shear crack hinge (right), after Bachmann 1970.....	23
Figure 2.8 Influence of shear cracks on rotation capacity, after Langer 1987.....	24
Figure 2.9 Influence of slenderness ratio on rotation capacity, after Langer 1987.....	25
Figure 2.10 Influence of reinforcement ratio on rotation capacity for different values of slenderness ratio, after Eifler 1983	26
Figure 2.11 Relation between total, elastic and plastic rotation (Θ , Θ_{el} , and Θ_{pl} , respectively) and the member slenderness ratio, after Langer 1987.....	27
Figure 2.12 Influence of section geometry on plastic rotation, after Sigrist 1995.....	28
Figure 2.13 Results of the experimental investigation carried out by Eifler/Plauk (1974) are compared with the simulations performed by Langer (1987)	30
Figure 2.14 Relation between reinforcement ratio and deflection ductility, after Bernardo and Lopes 2004.	31
Figure 2.15 Relation between reinforcement ratio and displacement ductility for different value of concrete compressive strength, after Ashour 2000.	31
Figure 2.16 influence of bar diameter on plastic rotation, after Eifler/Plauk 1974.	33
Figure 2.17 Results of three point bending tests of one span beams without shear reinforcement, after Bigaj and Walraven [1993]	35
Figure 2.18 Influence of the member effective height on the rotation capacity, after Bigaj 1998.....	36
Figure 2.19 Influence of the beam depth on the plastic rotation, after Bosco and Debernardi 1993.....	36
Figure 2.20 Load deflection curves for beams having identical geometry and reinforcement ratio but different confining reinforcement arrangement, after Burns/Siess 1966.....	38
Figure 2.21 Influence of lateral confinement on the relation between neutral axis depth (x/d) and plastic rotation for concrete strength in the range of 25-30 MPa, after Carmo and Lopes 2005.	38
Figure 2.22 Influence of lateral confinement on the relation between neutral axis depth (x/d) and plastic rotation for concrete strength in the range of 90-105 MPa, after Carmo and Lopes 2005.	39
Figure 2.23 Theoretical prediction of the effect of a change in the concrete compressive strength from 30 to 75 MPa on the total and plastic rotation capacity as a	

function of reinforcement ratio (left) as function of neutral axis depth (x/d) (right), after Langer 1989.....	40
Figure 2.24 Influence of concrete strength on plastic rotation for different values of neutral axis depth (x/d) after Carmo et al. [2003].....	43
Figure 2.25 Influence of concrete compressive strength on the displacement ductility for different reinforcement ratios by Ashour [2000]	44
Figure 2.26 Specimens tested by Shin et al. [1989] and Scott and Whittle [2005]	44
Figure 2.27 Numerical comparisons between the allowable limits for moment redistribution of the above mentioned codes	49
Figure 2.28 Comparison between the CSA A23.3-94 limits for moment redistribution and the upper and lower bound curves of the proposed model.....	50
Figure 2.29 Comparative study on several codes by Carmo and Lopes [2005]	50
Figure 3.2 Specimens after casting	60
Figure 3.3 Test setup.....	62
Figure 3.4 Instrumentation.....	64
Figure 4.1 Location of both right and left loads and right and left spans.	66
Figure 4.2 Failure of B1	68
Figure 4.3 Crack pattern of B1 under the right load	68
Figure 4.4 Crack pattern of B1 at intermediate support.....	69
Figure 4.5 Crack pattern of B1 under the left load	69
Figure 4.6 Failure of B2.....	70
Figure 4.7 Crack pattern of B2 under the right load	70
Figure 4.8 Crack pattern of B2 at intermediate support.....	70
Figure 4.9 Crack pattern of B2 under the left load	71
Figure 4.10 Failure of B3	71
Figure 4.11 Crack pattern of B3 under the right load	72
Figure 4.12 Crack pattern of B3 at intermediate support.....	72
Figure 4.13 Crack pattern of B3 under the left load	72
Figure 4.14 Failure of B4.....	73
Figure 4.15 Crack pattern of B4 under the right load	73
Figure 4.16 Crack pattern of B4 at intermediate support.....	74
Figure 4.17 Crack pattern of B4 under the left load	74
Figure 4.18 Failure of B5	75
Figure 4.19 Crack pattern of B5 under the right load	75
Figure 4.20 Crack pattern of B5 at intermediate support.....	76
Figure 4.21 Crack pattern of B5 under the left load	76
Figure 4.22 Failure of B6.....	77
Figure 4.23 Crack pattern of B6 under the right load	77
Figure 4.24 Crack pattern of B6 at intermediate support.....	78
Figure 4.25 Crack pattern of B6 under the left load	78
Figure 4.26 Failure of B7.....	78
Figure 4.27 Crack pattern of B7 under the right load	79
Figure 4.28 Crack pattern of B7 at intermediate support.....	79
Figure 4.29 Crack pattern of B7 under the left load	79
Figure 4.30 Failure of B8.....	80
Figure 4.31 Crack pattern of B8 under the right load	80
Figure 4.32 Crack pattern of B8 at intermediate support.....	81
Figure 4.33 Crack pattern of B8 under the left load	81

Figure 4.34 Failure of B9.....	82
Figure 4.35 Crack pattern of B9 under the right load.....	82
Figure 4.36 Crack pattern of B9 at intermediate support.....	82
Figure 4.37 Crack pattern of B9 under the left load.....	83
Figure 4.38 Failure of B10.....	83
Figure 4.39 Crack pattern of B10 under the right load.....	84
Figure 4.40 Crack pattern of B10 at intermediate support.....	84
Figure 4.41 Crack pattern of B10 under the left load.....	84
Figure 4.42 Applied load vs. deflection for beam B1.....	85
Figure 4.43 Applied load vs. deflection for beam B2.....	85
Figure 4.44 Applied load vs. deflection for beam B3.....	86
Figure 4.45 Applied load vs. deflection for beam B4.....	86
Figure 4.46 Applied load vs. deflection for beam B5.....	87
Figure 4.47 Applied load vs. deflection for beam B6.....	87
Figure 4.48 Applied load vs. deflection for beam B7.....	88
Figure 4.49 Applied load vs. deflection for beam B8.....	88
Figure 4.50 Applied load vs. deflection for beam B9.....	89
Figure 4.51 Applied load vs. deflection for beam B10.....	89
Figure 4.52 Moment distribution along the beam length for beam B1.....	90
Figure 4.53 Moment distribution along the beam length for beam B2.....	90
Figure 4.54 Moment distribution along the beam length for beam B3.....	91
Figure 4.55 Moment distribution along the beam length for beam B4.....	91
Figure 4.56 Moment distribution along the beam length for beam B5.....	92
Figure 4.57 Moment distribution along the beam length for beam B6.....	92
Figure 4.58 Moment distribution along the beam length for beam B7.....	93
Figure 4.59 Moment distribution along the beam length for beam B8.....	93
Figure 4.60 Moment distribution along the beam length for beam B9.....	94
Figure 4.61 Moment distribution along the beam length for beam B10.....	94
Figure 5.1 Load vs. steel strain at applied load right for B1, B2 and B3.....	96
Figure 5.2 Load vs. steel strain at intermediated support for B1, B2 and B3.....	96
Figure 5.3 Load vs. steel strain at applied load left for B1, B2 and B3.....	97
Figure 5.4 Load vs. degree of moment redistribution at intermediate support for B1, B2 and B3.....	98
Figure 5.5 Load vs. deflection at applied load left for B1, B2 and B3.....	99
Figure 5.6 Load vs. deflection at applied load right for B1, B2 and B3.....	99
Group 1.....	100
Figure 5.7 Load vs. steel strain at applied load right for B1 and B4.....	103
Figure 5.8 Load vs. steel strain at intermediate support for B1 and B4.....	103
Figure 5.9 Load vs. steel strain at applied load left for B1 and B4.....	104
Figure 5.10 Load vs. degree of moment redistribution at intermediate support for B1 and B4.....	104
Figure 5.11 Load vs. deflection at applied load left for B1 and B4.....	105
Figure 5.12 Load vs. deflection at applied load right for B1 and B4.....	105
Figure 5.13 Load vs. steel strain at applied load right for B6, B7 and B8.....	106
Figure 5.14 Load vs. steel strain at intermediate support for B6, B7 and B8.....	107
Figure 5.15 Load vs. steel strain at applied load left for B6, B7 and B8.....	107
Figure 5.16 Load vs. degree of moment redistribution for B6, B7 and B8.....	108
Figure 5.17 Load vs. deflection at the right applied load for B6, B7 and B8.....	108
Figure 5.18 Load vs. deflection at left applied load for B6, B7 and B8.....	109

Figure 5.19 Load vs. steel strain at right applied load for B6 and B9.	110
Figure 5.20 Load vs. steel strain at intermediate support for B6 and B9.	110
Figure 5.21 Load vs. steel strain at left applied load for B6 and B9.	111
Figure 5.22 Load vs. degree of moment redistribution at intermediate support for B6 and B9.	111
Figure 5.23 Load vs. deflection at right load for B6 and B9.	112
Figure 5.24 Load vs. deflection at left load for B6 and B9.	112
Figure 5.25 Load vs. steel strain at right load for B6 and B10.	113
Figure 5.26 Load vs. steel strain at intermediate support for B6 and B10.	114
Figure 5.27 Load vs. steel strain at left load for B6 and B10.	114
Figure 5.28 Load vs. degree of moment redistribution for B6 and B10.	115
Figure 5.29 Load vs. deflection at right load for B6 and B10.	115
Figure 5.30 Load vs. deflection at left load for B6 and B10.	116
Figure 5.31 Reinforcement ratio vs. curvature ductility for B1, B2 and B3.	117
Figure 5.32 Reinforcement ratio vs. deflection ductility for B1, B2 and B3.	117
Figure 5.33 reinforcement ratio vs. energy ductility for B1, B2 and B3.	118
Figure 5.34 Concrete compressive strength vs. curvature ductility for B1 and B4.	119
Figure 5.35 Concrete compressive strength vs. deflection ductility for B1 and B4.	119
Figure 5.36 Concrete compressive strength vs. energy ductility for B1 and B4.	120
Figure 5.37 Reinforcement ratios vs. degree of moment redistribution for B6, B7 and B8.	121
Figure 5.38 Reinforcement ratio vs. deflection ductility for B6, B7 and B8.	121
Figure 5.39 Reinforcement ratio vs. energy ductility for B6, B7 and B8.	122
Figure 5.40 Number of concentrated loads vs. ultimate deflection.	123
Figure 5.41 Number of concentrated loads vs. degree of moment redistribution.	123
Figure 5.42 Number of concentrated loads vs. deflection ductility.	124
Figure 5.43 Number of concentrated loads on each span vs. energy ductility.	124
Figure 5.44 Span to depth ratio vs. degree of moment redistribution.	125
Figure 5.45 Span to depth ratio vs. deflection ductility.	126
Figure 5.46 Span to depth ratio vs. energy ductility.	126
Figure 5.47 Relation between reinforcement ratio and degree of moment redistribution after Hossam et al. 2010, Scott and Whittle 2005 and Carmo and Lopes 2005.	127
Figure 5.48 Relation between concrete compressive strength and degree of moment redistribution after Hossam et al. 2010, Scott and Whittle 2005 and Carmo and Lopes 2005.	130
Figure 5.49 Relation between slenderness ratio and degree of moment redistribution after Hossam et al. 2010, Scott and Whittle 2005 and Carmo and Lopes 2005.	130
Figure 5.50 Comparison between the experimental results and the codes' provisions regarding degree of moment redistribution.	131
Figure 6.1 3-D Failure Surface for concrete in principal stress space.	135
Figure 6.2 : Failure surface in principale stress space with nearly biaxial stress.	136
Figure 6.3 : Solid 65 geometry.	138
Figure 6.4: Reinforcement orientation for solid 65 elements.	139
Figure 6.5: Link8 geometry.	146
Figure 6.6 : Solid 46 geometry.	147
Figure 6.7 Uniaxial stress-strain curve for concrete.	148
Figure 6.8 Volumes of concrete and the location of the steel plates.	150
Figure 6.9 Meshing of both the concrete volumes and the steel plates.	150
Figure 6.10 Location of longitudinal steel bars and stirrups.	151

Figure 7.1 Comparison between experimental results and analytical results for B1	153
Figure 7.2 Comparison between experimental results and analytical results for B2	154
Figure 7.3 Comparison between experimental results and analytical results for B3	155
Figure 7.4 Comparison between experimental results and analytical results for B4	155
Figure 7.5 Comparison between experimental results and analytical results for B5	156
Figure 7.6 Comparison between experimental results and analytical results for B6	157
Figure 7.7 Comparison between experimental results and analytical results for B7	157
Figure 7.8 Comparison between experimental results and analytical results for B8	158
Figure 7.9 Deflection ductility as obtained from experimental results and ANSYS program for all beams	159
Figure 7.10 Deformed shape for beam B1	160
Figure 7.11 Deformed shape for beam B2	160
Figure 7.12 Deformed shape for beam B3	161
Figure 7.13 Deformed shape for beam B4	161
Figure 7.14 Deformed shape for beam B5	162
Figure 7.15 Deformed shape for beam B6	162
Figure 7.16 Deformed shape for beam B7	163
Figure 7.17 Deformed shape for beam B8	163
Figure 7.18 Crack pattern for beam B1	164
Figure 7.19 Crack pattern for beam B2	165
Figure 7.20 Crack pattern for beam B3	165
Figure 7.21 Crack pattern for beam B4	166
Figure 7.22 Crack pattern for beam B5	166
Figure 7.23 Crack pattern for beam B6	167
Figure 7.24 Crack pattern for beam B7	167
Figure 7.25 Crack pattern for beam B8	168
Figure 7.27 Deformation pattern of beam B11	171
Figure 7.28 Deformation pattern of beam B12	171
Figure 7.29 Deformation pattern of beam B13	172
Figure 7.30 Deformation pattern of beam B14	172
Figure 7.31 Deformation pattern of beam B15	173
Figure 7.32 Deformation pattern of beam B16	173
Figure 7.33 Crack pattern of beam B11	174
Figure 7.34 Crack pattern of beam B12	174
Figure 7.35 Crack pattern of beam B13	175
Figure 7.36 Crack pattern of beam B14	175
Figure 7.37 Crack pattern of beam B15	176
Figure 7.38 Crack pattern of beam B16	177
Figure 7.39 Load deflection curve for the six beams used in the parametric study	177
Figure 7.40 Reinforcement ratio vs. deflection ductility as obtained from ANSYS for beams B11 to B16	178

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Tests carried out in four-point bending on beams with different sizes after Alca et al. 1997.....	42
Table 2.2 Summary of results from tests carried out on simply supported beams loaded in three-point bending, according to Cosenza et al. [1994] and Manfredi and Pecce [1997].....	43
Table 2.3 Redistribution coefficients according to Eurocode 2.....	51
Table 3.1 Concrete Geometry and Strength.....	55
Table 3.2 Reinforcement details of specimens	55
Table 3.3 Concrete mix proportions	58
Table 3.4 Results of cube testing	61
Table 4.1 Parameters considered for each specimen	65
Table 4.2 Specimens divided into groups	65
Table 5.1 Reinforcement ratio for beams B1, B2 and B3.....	95
Table 5.2 Values of steel strain at cracking, yielding and ultimate loads for B1, B2 and B3	97
Table 5.3 Values of deflection, deflection ductility, curvature ductility and energy ductility for B1, B2 and B3	100
Table 5.4 Values of deflection, deflection ductility and energy ductility for B1 and B4.....	101
Table 5.5 Values of deflection, deflection ductility and energy ductility for B6, B7 and B8.....	101
Table 5.6 Values of deflection, deflection ductility and energy ductility for B6 and B9.....	102
Table 5.7 Values of deflection, deflection ductility and energy ductility for B6 and B10.....	102
Table 5.8 Values of reinforcement ratio for B1, B2 and B3	116
Table 5.9 Values of reinforcement ratio for B6, B7 and B8.....	120
Table 5.10 Details of Specimens tested by Carmo and Lopes 2005 and Scott and Whittle 2005.....	128
Table 6.1 LINK8 Element Input Summary (ANSYS).....	145
Table 6.2 SOLID46 Element Input Summary (ANSYS).....	146