



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the Library Thesis Consent Form.

Application of the Double Torsion Specimen
to the Study of
Fracture in Fibre Reinforced Plastics

by

Niven Rhys Brown

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
(Engineering)

Department of Mechanical Engineering
School of Engineering
University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand

November 1993

Abstract

The increasing use of fibre reinforced polymers in structural components often requires an accurate assessment of the strength of the component. The strength of composite materials is usually based on the strength of an individual lamina. This is then combined in a manner depending on the orientation of the plies within the laminate. The actual failure process is often ignored in this type of analysis. Composite failure is the result of damage accumulation from a number of failure modes, in particular, fibre failure, matrix failure and failure of the interface between the fibres and matrix. Measurement of the interfacial strength requires specialised testing techniques in order to obtain accurate characterisation of the interfacial failure processes.

This research uses a double torsion specimen reinforced with fibres in a number of configurations. The testing techniques developed allow the interaction of a matrix crack with fibres, resulting in the failure of the interface. Finite element analysis has been used to gain an insight into the deformation mechanisms. A compliance change analysis has been developed so that the load in the fibres can be calculated. Results from the finite element analysis confirm the analytical procedures and show that, for the fibre/resin combination tested, the interface has a lower fracture toughness than the matrix material. The interaction between the fibres and matrix shows that the mechanism of fibre bridging inhibits the propagation of matrix cracks. This produces an apparent increase in the toughness of the composite system.

To confirm the failure processes occurring, the technique of acoustic emission has been used to monitor the development of the specimen failure. In line with other workers, it is shown that matrix failure produces low amplitude events and interfacial failure produces mid amplitude events. Fibre failure did not occur to any significant degree. This thesis shows how the contribution from the presence of an interface affects the fracture of composite materials and how, via the reinforced double torsion specimen, this contribution can be measured and interpreted.

Acknowledgements

The production of this thesis would not have been possible had it not been for the time and effort of many people. Some of them may not be mentioned here by name, but their contribution has not been forgotten. In particular, I would like to express my gratitude to the following:

- ◆ My supervisor, George Moltschaniwskyj, for his support and encouragement throughout the course of this work. His patience, thoughtfulness, wisdom and conscientiousness have been a source of great inspiration. Without his invaluable supervision and many hours spent discussing fibres, fracture, fishing and front-foot cover drives, this thesis would not have been possible. Thank you.
- ◆ Associate Professor Debes Bhattacharyya for his patience, enthusiasm and diligence in co-supervising this research work.
- ◆ Mr Terry Boyd and his team of technicians for their invaluable assistance in the experimental aspects of this work.
- ◆ The University Grants Committee for their financial assistance in the form of a Postgraduate Scholarship.
- ◆ The Yacht Research Unit, Strength of Materials Laboratory and Maskell Productions Ltd for providing financial support.
- ◆ Adhesive Technologies Ltd, Dow Chemicals and High Modulus NZ Ltd for providing materials and technical advice.
- ◆ Auckland Electric Power Board (now trading as Mercury Energy), and particularly Mr Kevin Mooney, for the use of their acoustic emission equipment.
- ◆ Industrial Research Ltd for employing me over the final stages of this project. In particular, Mr Graeme Finch for his flexibility in accommodating me and for allowing me to avail myself of their computing facilities.
- ◆ The undergraduate project students who have assisted in the experimental work: Mike Boyd, Phil Steeghs, Peter Dudson and Shane Williamson.

- ◆ The staff, visiting fellows and my colleagues at the University of Auckland for making postgraduate study an unforgettable experience. I would especially like to thank the members of the E-team, my office cohabitants, the gang of five: Richard, Mike, Mark and David, and, especially, my composites colleague Mark. All have helped to shape me in various ways.

- ◆ A special thank you to those who have tolerated my using, borrowing or begging of Macintosh time: Lynley, Henry and Barb, and, ultimately, Mike and Trish.

- ◆ Untold thanks must go to my parents and family for bringing me up and supporting in a plethora of ways.

- ♥ And the final acknowledgement must go to my wife, Lynette. Her love, and encouragement (and our Kucing) have been my inspiration over the duration of my doctoral studies. Je t'aime.

*Imagination
is more
important
than
knowledge.*

ALBERT EINSTEIN

Table of Contents

	Page
Title page	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Contents	vi
List of Symbols	viii
List of Figures	xi
List of Tables	xvii
1. Introduction	1
2. Review	5
2.1. Fracture mechanics	7
2.1.1. Fracture concepts	7
2.1.2. Fracture toughness measurement	15
2.1.3. Fracture of polymers	18
2.1.4. Fracture of non-homogeneous materials	22
2.2. Composite strength and failure	24
2.2.1. Description of failure processes	24
2.2.2. Strength models for composites	27
2.2.3. Determination of properties	33
2.3. Theory of debonding	35
2.3.1. Stresses on the interface	35
2.3.2. Interfacial failure	38
2.3.3. Methods for testing the interface	41
2.4. Acoustic emission for composites	50
2.4.1. Overview	50
2.4.2. Discrimination of failure modes	60
2.4.3. Strength determination using acoustic emission	62
3. The Double Torsion Test	66
3.1. Description of technique	68
3.1.1. Features of the double torsion specimen	68
3.1.1.1. Specimen geometry	69
3.1.1.2. Mode of failure	71
3.1.1.3. Crack shape and velocity	74
3.1.2. Analysis of the unreinforced specimen	84
3.1.3. Double torsion testing on reinforced specimens	87
3.1.4. Specimen configurations	92

List of Symbols

		units
a	crack length, half crack length for centre notched plate	m
A	area of fracture, cross-sectional area	m^2
\dot{a}	nominal crack velocity	$m.s^{-1}$
B	thickness	m
c	crack length of embedded fibre	m
C	compliance	$m.N^{-1}$
COD	crack opening displacement	m
d	fibre diameter	m
E	Young's Modulus	Pa
F	pull-out force, work done by load, strength parameter	N, J, -
G	shear modulus	Pa
G	strain energy release rate	$Pa.m$
h	length used to determine crack shape factor	m
K	stress intensity factor	$Pa.\sqrt{m}$
K	torsional stiffness constant	m^4
l	length of debond	m
L	specimen length, embedded fibre length	m
n	subcritical crack growth parameter	-
N	number of cycles	-
P	load on specimen, load on fibres	N
r	fibre radius, radial coordinate, distance from crack tip	m
R	interfibre distance	m
R_o	crack resistance characteristic	$Pa.m$
\dot{r}	crack front translational velocity	$m.s^{-1}$
S	ultimate shear stress, crack shape factor	Pa, -
t	thickness	m
T	applied moment	N.m
t_n	thickness at notch	m
u	displacement	m
U	strain energy	N.m
v	displacement perpendicular to the crack surface	m
v	crack velocity	$m.s^{-1}$

w_m	moment arm from load-point to support	m
W	width of double torsion specimen, energy	m, J
X	ultimate tensile strength in the fibre direction	Pa
X'	ultimate compressive strength in the fibre direction	Pa
y	load-point displacement	m
Y	ultimate tensile strength in the transverse direction	Pa
Y'	ultimate compressive strength in the transverse direction	Pa

Greek characters

δ, Δ	load-point displacement	m
δ_f	crack opening displacement at crack front	m
σ	stress	Pa
τ	shear stress	Pa
θ	angle of twist, angle coordinate	radians
ν	Poisson's ratio	-
ϕ	angle to base of crack front translational speed	radians
ξ	local crack speed normal to crack front	m.s ⁻¹
ϵ	strain	-

Subscripts/superscripts

0	initial position
1	reference to section 1, reference to fibre direction
2	reference to section 2, reference to transverse direction
6	reference to in-plane shear
I	mode I fracture
II	mode II fracture
III	mode III fracture
c	critical mode, reference to cracked half specimen
d	reference to debond
f	reference to fibre
FE	reference to finite element solution
i	contracted notation index
j	contracted notation index

- L reference to ligament
- m reference to matrix, reference to mid-side nodes
- P reference to load
- s reference to in-plane shear
- t total
- v reference to vertex nodes
- x cartesian coordinate, reference to fibre direction
- y cartesian coordinate, reference to transverse direction

List of Figures

- 2.1. The Griffith criterion. a) Cracked plate with fixed ends and applied stress σ ; b) Elastic energy for crack lengths a and $a+da$.
- 2.2. Cracked plate with loads free to move.
- 2.3. Stresses about a crack in an infinite plate.
- 2.4. Crack loading modes.
- 2.5. Standard fracture toughness specimens: a) three-point bend test, and b) compact tension test.
- 2.6. Fracture toughness specimen where the crack grows into a compressive region: a) Brazilian specimen, and b) double-cleavage drilled compression specimen.
- 2.7. Controlled crack growth specimens: a) double-cantilever beam specimen, and b) double torsion specimen.
- 2.8. Fibres bridging a matrix crack. The interface may be intact or debonded.
- 2.9. Von Mises type failure envelope for unidirectional lamina. The axis intercepts represent the measured tensile and compressive strength in the longitudinal and transverse directions. Axes not to scale.
- 2.10. Maximum shear stress (Tresca) condition in strain space (Hart-Smith 1992b).
- 2.11. Stress state of a discontinuous fibre embedded in a matrix.
- 2.12. Cook & Gordon debonding mechanism: failure of the interface ahead of the matrix crack: a) due to tension and b) due to shear.
- 2.13. Outwater & Murphy debonding mechanism: failure of the interface behind the matrix crack tip.
- 2.14. Fibre pull-out notation.
- 2.15. Schematic diagram of acoustic emission characteristics.
- 2.16. Idealised (top) and more realistic propagation of an acoustic emission waveform (after Scott & Martin 1991).
- 2.17. Attenuation map of a bidirectional carbon fibre panel at two detection frequencies (Holroyd & Cox 1986).
- 2.18. Features of an acoustic emission waveform.

- 3.1. Double torsion specimen geometry.
- 3.2. Various groove geometries used with the double torsion specimen: a) single V-groove on tension side, b) single V-groove on compression side, c) double V-grooves, and d) square groove.
- 3.3. Linear displacement model for crack front modelling: a) surface generators, and b) crack front profiles for various proportions of the maximum crack opening displacement.

- 3.4. Crack front profiles with varying depth lower grooves (after Frassine et al. 1988). (a) Crack profiles do not superimpose if referred to the base-line of the grooves, while they do (b) if referred to the upper (ungrooved) side. In (b) the crack shapes have been shifted horizontally to show agreement.
- 3.5. Surface markings on fracture surface for polyester resin double torsion specimen.
- 3.6. Identification of the various crack propagation stages and crack speeds (after Frassine 1988).
- 3.7. Definition of parameters for crack shape factor (Leevers 1982).
- 3.8. Cross-section of the double torsion specimen showing the crack tip geometry as defined by Leevers (1982).
- 3.9. Twisted half of a double torsion specimen.
- 3.10. Half of a double torsion specimen showing the fibre pull-out analogy.
- 3.11. Fibre reinforced double torsion specimen: a) fibres in the direction of crack growth, and b) fibres at right angles to the crack growth.
- 3.12. Fibre configurations for the double torsion specimen: a) fibres normal to specimen and crack planes, b) fibres in plane of specimen but normal to crack, c) fibres normal to specimen but at an angle to crack plane, and d) fibres in plane of specimen and in line with crack plane.
- 3.13. Normalised crack opening displacement versus normalised crack length for cracked double torsion specimen.
- 3.14. Crack opening displacement versus normalised crack length for cracked double torsion specimen.
- 3.15. Crack opening displacement versus normalised crack length for double torsion specimen with fibres bridging crack.
- 3.16. Linear crack tip of double torsion specimen in polyester resin.
- 3.17. Crack opening displacement at fibre plane for various fibre depths: a) near the lower surface and b) at the lower surface.
- 3.18. Incremental crack growth showing fracture surface area, $\Delta A = t \Delta a$.
- 3.19. Incremental strain energy, ΔU , during crack growth via the load-displacement plot.
- 3.20. Compliance versus crack length showing extrapolated ligament compliance, C_0 , at $a = 0$.
- 3.21. Representative load versus displacement plot showing strain energy in ligament. δ_L is the load-point deflection equal to the deflection at the crack plane and P_L is the equivalent residual load in the ligament.

- 3.22. Crack shapes modelled by Trantina; left to right: bilinear $40^{\circ}+30^{\circ}$, 30° , 45° , and 90° (vertical).
 - 3.23. Crack shapes used by Trantina and Tseng & Berry compared to an experimental shape.
 - 3.24. Double torsion crack profiles for polyester compared to those used by White and Tseng & Berry.
 - 3.25. 20-node quadratic displacement brick.
 - 3.26. Finite element mesh showing boundary nodes. The X-Y plane is the crack plane and the symmetry plane.
 - 3.27. Experimental apparatus.
 - 3.28. Apparatus used to photograph crack opening displacement.
 - 3.29. Specimen with gauge wire attached.
 - 3.30. Photograph used to determine the crack opening displacement.
 - 3.31. Apparatus for casting of double torsion specimens.
-
- 4.1. Measurement of a) vertical displacement and b) crack opening displacement on the finite element model.
 - 4.2. Comparison of vertical displacement for a cantilever plate with different boundary conditions.
 - 4.3. Comparison of crack opening displacements for a cantilever plate with different boundary conditions.
 - 4.4. Comparison of vertical displacement for different mesh densities and between 8-node and 20-node bricks.
 - 4.5. Comparison of vertical displacement for different mesh densities for 8-node bricks showing good convergence.
 - 4.6. Comparison of vertical displacement for different mesh biases for $16 \times 6 \times 4$ model using 8-node bricks.
 - 4.7. Comparison of vertical displacement for different mesh biases for $10 \times 4 \times 3$ model using 20-node bricks.
 - 4.8. Comparison of experimental crack profile for polyester resin and a finite element "curved" profile.
 - 4.9. Vertical displacement for vertical and "curved" crack fronts.
 - 4.10. Crack opening displacement for vertical and "curved" crack fronts.
 - 4.11. Finite element mesh with crack tip elements to model the crack tip singularity.
 - 4.12. Comparison of crack opening displacements of singularity model and vertical crack front with 20-node elements biased towards crack tip (bias=2).

- 4.13. Comparison of vertical displacement for singularity model and 8-node and 20-node brick element models.
- 4.14. Node plane notation for a 24x6x4 mesh. Nodes are represented by •.
- 4.15. Crack opening displacements for no fibres and full plane of fibres at node plane 8.
- 4.16. Comparison of crack opening displacements with fibres at various positions along the bottom of the specimen.
- 4.17. Comparison of crack opening displacements for a fibre at the bottom of node plane 6 and an unreinforced specimen with a moment equal to the moment beyond the fibre plane.
- 4.18. Variation in vertical displacement with a single fibre at various positions along the cracked portion of the specimen. The fibre is always located at the bottom of the specimen.
- 4.19. Variation in crack opening displacement with a single fibre at various positions through the thickness of the specimen. The fibre is always at node plane 8.
- 4.20. Variation of crack opening displacement through the thickness for fibres at different thickness planes.
- 4.21. Variation in vertical displacement with a single fibre at various positions through the thickness of the specimen.
- 4.22. Comparison of crack opening displacements for a fibre at thickness plane 3 and an unreinforced specimen with a moment equal to the moment beyond the fibre plane.
- 4.23. Comparison of vertical displacement for vertical plane of fibres (all nodes tied) versus one fibre at thickness plane 3 (greatest closure for a single fibre).
- 4.24. Crack opening displacement for a fibre at thickness plane 4 and thickness plane 3. Note that the maximum COD is less for the fibre at thickness plane 3.
- 4.25. Crack opening displacements for a fibre at thickness plane 4 and a fibre at thickness plane 3 with a fibre load to cause the same moment in both cases.
- 4.26. Detail at crack tip of crack opening displacements for finite element model with glass fibre, carbon fibre, and no fibre at crack tip, bias = 2.0.
- 4.27. Comparison of vertical displacements for finite element model with glass fibre, carbon fibre and no fibre at crack tip.

- 4.28. Crack opening displacement versus normalised crack length for finite element analysis and measured values for PMMA.
 - 4.29. Crack opening displacement versus normalised crack length for finite element analysis and unreinforced polyester resin.
 - 4.30. Crack opening displacement versus normalised crack length for finite element analysis and glass reinforced polyester with the fibres at the bottom.
 - 4.31. Crack opening displacement versus normalised crack length for finite element analysis and glass reinforced polyester with the fibres at mid thickness.
 - 4.32. Cracks at the notch tip in polyester resin.
 - 4.33. Fracture surface of PMMA compact tension specimen showing the transition between fast and slow fracture.
 - 4.34. Graph of typical load versus crosshead displacement for polyester double torsion specimen.
 - 4.35. Debonding near the notch tip. Note how the matrix crack is offset from the razor cut.
 - 4.36. Debonding along crack in double torsion specimen with a plane of fibres over the top of the specimen.
 - 4.37. Interference of crack front with fibre plane.
 - 4.38. Crack surrounding fibre bundle.
 - 4.39. Crack arrested at fibre bundle.
 - 4.40. Crack opening displacement versus normalised crack length for glass reinforced polyester with the fibres at mid thickness.
 - 4.41. Schematic diagram of apparatus for acoustic emission testing.
 - 4.42. Number of hits versus amplitude for duration of test for an unreinforced polyester resin.
 - 4.43. Cumulative hits versus amplitude for specified time period.
 - 4.44. Progression of acoustic emission with time.
 - 4.45. Number of hits versus amplitude for reinforced polyester resin loaded twice.
-
- A.1. Notation for compact tension specimen.
 - A.2. Notation for three-point bend specimen.
 - A.3. Notation for double torsion specimen.
 - A.4. DCDC stress intensity factor as a function of c/R for various R/h .

- B.1. Load versus time for typical acoustic emission analysis.
- B.2. Hits versus time for typical acoustic emission analysis.
- B.3. Hits versus amplitude for typical acoustic emission analysis.
- B.4. Counts versus time for typical acoustic emission analysis.
- B.5. Counts versus amplitude for typical acoustic emission analysis.
- B.6. Hits versus energy for typical acoustic emission analysis.
- B.7. Duration versus time for typical acoustic emission analysis.
- D.1. Load plot for reinforced double torsion specimen showing load drops from crack initiation and load variations from debonding.
- E.1. Measurement of COD via clip gauge: a) clip gauge method with blocks attached at crack plane, and b) clip gauge method with blocks attached away from the crack plane.
- E.2. Comparison of actual and measured gauge sizes for circular and rectangular gauges.

List of Tables

- 4.1. Forces and moments transferred by fibres for a single fibre at thickness plane 3 and a vertical plane of fibres.
 - 4.2. Summary of fracture toughness tests on unreinforced polymers.
 - 4.3. Fracture toughness based on first crack arrest length and load after initiation.
 - 4.4. Results from the application of a Griffith energy approach.
-
- C.1. Three-point bend test fracture toughness results.
 - C.2. Compact tension test fracture toughness results.
 - C.3. Double cleavage drilled compression test fracture toughness results.
 - C.4. Double torsion test fracture toughness results.