

AFIT/GAE/AA/78M-14

0 AD A 0 5 6 5 1 C \square ni si si si JUL 19 1978 COPV EVALUATION OF THE THREE PARAMETER WEIBULL DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION FOR PREDICTING FRACTURE PROBABILITY IN COMPOSITE MATERIALS . Ł, THESIS 11 Dennis/Schneider/ Capt USAF AFIT/GAE/AA/78M-14 Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

78 07 07 00%

AFIT/GAE/AA/78M-14

EVALUATION OF THE THREE PARAMETER WEIBULL DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION FOR PREDICTING FRACTURE PROBABILITY IN COMPOSITE MATERIALS

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the School of Engineering of the Air Force Institute of Technology in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science

> by Dennis R. Schneider, B.S.A.E. Captain USAF Graduate Aeronautical Engineering March 1978

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Preface

The Weibull distribution function has been widely used as a statistical tool for predicting the fracture probability in structural materials. Application of this statistical method to composite materials addressing nonuniform stress distributions and the three parameter form of the theory has been very limited. I have performed an evaluation of the three parameter Weibull distribution function applied to a composite material under both uniform and nonuniform stress distributions which includes establishment of a parameter determination methodology as well as the evaluation of the theory's ability to predict fracture across a variety of failure modes.

I am deeply indebted to several individuals who assisted in the conduct of this thesis. I am very grateful to my thesis advisor, Dr. Anthony N. Palazotto, fcr his guidance, encouragement and counseling which aided immensely throughout this study; to Dr. James Whitney and Mr. Marvin Knight of the Air Force Materials Laboratory for their support and assistance in providing the experimental data required to conduct this thesis. A special thanks to my family for their patience during this trying time, and especially to my wife, Jean, for her many hours of dedicated typing support.

Dennis R. Schneider

<u>Contents</u>

· Alexandre

Service and an and a service s

ALL THE SALE AND ADD

6

	Page
Preface	ii
List of Figures	iv
List of Tables	viii
List of Symbols	ix
Abstract	xi
I. Introduction	
Background	1
Purpose.	
II. Theory	8
Weibull Distribution Functio	n 8
Weibull Equation for Composi	te Materials . 25
III. Experimental and Analytical Pro	cedures 32
Material, Equipment and Test Material Parameter Determina	Procedures 32 tion
IV. Results	
Parameter Determination Theoretical Equation Validat Alternate Parameter Determin	ion
V. Conclusions and Recommendations	
Bibliography	
Appendix A: Three-point Loading Equa	tion Derivation. 100
Appendix B: Experimental Data	104
Appendix C: Data Plots	111
Vita	
	a contra mar a ser a ser a ser a
	* *
	Γ • 43 ε • 3
iii	

List of Figures

Figure		Page
1.	Four-point Loading Arrangement and Extreme Fiber Stress Distribution	10
2.	Stress Distribution - Pure Bending	12
3.	Third-point Loading Arrangement and Extreme Fiber Stress Distribution	1 4
4.	Three-point Loading Stress Distribution	15
5.	Stress Distribution for Tension	17
6.	Lamina Axis System and Cross Section Geometry .	19
7.	Typical Stress Distribution - Composite with Unidirectional Ply Orientation	27
8.	Test Specimen Geometry	33
9.	Parameter Determination Method	38
10.	Typical Example of Weibull Parameter Deter- mination Plot	40
11.	Area of Curve Smoothing Sensitivity	42
12.	Optimum Parameter Determination	44
13.	Comparison of Sample Experimental Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function Using Published Parameters	46
14.	Comparison of Sample Experimental Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function Using Derived Parameters	47
15.	Error Minimization Process	50
16.	O-degree Pure Bending Parameters	55
17.	O-degree Pure Bending Parameters	56
18.	90-degree Pure Bending Parameters (without strain gaged specimen)	57
19.	90-degree Pure Bending Parameters (without strain gaged specimen)	58

A COLOR MANAGER

Figure		Page
20.	90-degree Pure Bending Parameters (including strain gaged specimen)	59
21.	90-degree Pure Bending Parameters (including strain gaged specimen)	60
22.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function O-degree Specimen	63
23.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen*	64
24.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen**	65
25.	Comparison of Experimental Tension Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function O-degree Specimen - using Bending Parameters .	69
26.	Comparison of Experimental Three-point Loading Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function O-degree Specimen - using Bending Parameters	72
27.	Comparison of Experimental Three-point Loading Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen - using Bending Parameters*	74
28.	Comparison of Experimental Three-point Loading Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen - using Bending Parameters	75
29.	O-degree Tension Parameters	78
30.	O-degree Tension Parameters	79
31.	90-degree Tension Parameters	80
32.	90-degree Tension Parameters	81
33.	Comparison of Experimental Tension Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen	82

*including strain gaged specimen ** without strain gaged
specimen

Figure

•inc	90-degree Specimen** 110 luding strain gaged specimen **without strain gaged
50.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function
4C.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen**
3С.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen**
20.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function O-degree Specimen
10.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function O-degree Specimen
40.	Comparison of Experimental Three-point Loading Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen 93
39.	Comparison of Experimental Three-point Loading Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 0-degree Specimen 92
38.	Comparison of Experimental Three-point Loading Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen - using Tension Parameters
37.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen** - using Tension Parameters
36.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen* - using Tension Parameters 87
35.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function O-degree Specimen - using Tension Parameters . 86
34.	Comparison of Experimental Tension Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen

Figure

the statistic structure of the state of the

Male & Mar

Page

60.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen*	117
7C.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen**	118
8C.	Comparison of Experimental Bending Data and Theoretical Cumulative Distribution Function 90-degree Specimen**	119

List of Tables

a alva

And the second states and

Constant of the second of the second

F

Martin a South N

A STATISTICS

Table		Page
I.	Summary Correlation Chart	53
IJ.	Weibull Parameters Using Bending	54
III.	Bending Data Fit Error	61
IV.	Correlation Results - Bending Parameters	76
۷.	Weibull Parameters using Tension	77
VI.	Tension Data Fit Error	77
VII.	Correlation Results - Tension Parameters	90
∀III.	Weibull Parameters Using Three-point Loading	91
IX.	Four Point Loading Data - 0-degree Specimen .	105
х.	Four Point Loading Data - 90-degree Specimen.	106
XI.	Tension Loading Data - 0-degree Specimen	107
XII.	Tension Loading Data - 90-degree Specimen	108
XIII.	Three Point Loading Data - O-degree Specimen.	109
XIV.	Three Point Loading Data - 90-degree Specimen	110

List of Symbols

9

Strates Lands

B	risk of rupture
Ъ	width of specimen in y-direction, in.
E11 ^{,E} 22	modulus of a unidirectional composite in the longitudinal and transverse direction of the fiber axes, respectively, lb/in ² .
Ē	effective bending modulus of a laminated beam, lb/in ² .
G ₁₂	shear modulus of a unidirectional composite in the 1-2 plane, lb/in^2 .
h	thickness of specimen, in.
^h k * ^h k-1	distance from the neutral axis to the two outer edges of the k th lamina within a laminated plate, in.
I	beam area moment of inertia, in .
k	lamina number within a laminated plate.
^K x, ^K y, ^K xy	curvature in a plate.
L	specimen length, in.
m	flaw density exponent (shape parameter).
ħ	interger less or equal to m.
M	bending moment applied to a beam. 1b-in.
M _x	bending moment per unit length of plate sur- face, lb-in/in.
N	axial force per unit length of plate surface. 1b.
P	load on specimen, 1b.
p	lamina in which $\sigma = \sigma_u$ occurs.
۹ _{ij} , ۹ _{ij}	terms in the composite laminate stiffness matrix in the material and load axes, respectively, lb/in ² .
r	dummy variable used in series notation.

ix

S	probability of fracture.
u,v,w	displacements of a specimen in the x,y,z directions, respectively, in.
v	volume of a specimen, in ³ .
X,y,z	load axis of a specimen.
1,2,3	material property axis of a specimen.
	fractional portion of the term m.
€ ₁ ,€ ₂ ,€ ₁₂	strains in the material axis, in/in.
€x,€y,€xy	strains in the load axis, in/in.
$\epsilon_{x}^{\circ}, \epsilon_{y}^{\circ}, \epsilon_{xy}^{\circ}$	strains in the mid surface of a plate, in/in.
	Poisson's ratio in the longitudinal and transverse material directions, respectively.
^σ 1 ^{,σ} σ ^{,σ} 12	stresses in the material axis, lb/in ² .
^o x' ^o y' ^o xy	stresses in the load axis, lb/in ² .
σ	stress in a specimen, lb/in ² .
σъ	bending stress in a specimen, 1b/in ² .
$\sigma_{\mathbf{m}}$	mean failure stress of a distribution, lb/in^2 .
σο	scale parameter, lb/in ² .
ot	scale parameter for tension normalized for volume, lb/in ² .
ot	scale parameter for tension normalized for the distribution, 1b/in2.
⁰ 03pt	scale parameter for three-point loading normalized for volume, 15 in .
σu	zero probability strength parameter (location parameter), lb/in ² .

X

Abstract

This thesis is an evaluation of the three parameter Weibull distribution function for predicting fracture in a composite material subjected to failure under both uniform and nonuniform stress distributions. The specific forms of the three parameter Weibull equations for these failure modes are derived for a general laminated composite and simplified for the special case of a unidirectional composite. An analysis into a parameter determination methodology which is mathematically reproducible is presented. The resulting expressions and methodology are applied to experimental bending, tension and three-point loading failure data for 0-degree and 90-degree unidirectionally laminated graphite-epoxy specimer. Weibull parameter sets are derived from both the bending and tension experimental data. Each set is then used to evaluate the theory's ability to predict the probability of failure throughout the three failure modes and thereby to establish a single set characteristic of the material. Although a set of parameters peculiar to each failure distribution was obtained, a characteristic set of values capable of predicting failure across the variety of failure modes was not found for this composite material.

Xi

EVALUATION OF

THE THREE PARAMETER WEIBULL DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION FOR PREDICTING FRACTURE PROBABILITY IN COMPOSITE MATERIALS

I. Introduction

Background

The classical theory of strength can readily be shown to be incompatible in material failure prediction when compared with experimental measurements. This is most easily demonstrated by the dispersions in ultimate strength which occur in experimental measurements.

In the past this variability of ultimate strength has generally been treated as relatively unimportant, since it could easily be taken into account through the use of large factors of safety. However, with requirements for greater econumy, weight restrictions, and increased performance, significant effort towards the development of more accurate failure prediction techniques is being expended. To bridge the inconsistencies between the theoretical strength predictions and experimental data, statistical theories of fracture have become a widely used tool.

The most widely accepted statistical theory of fracture is that based on the Weibull distribution function [6.2]. This theory is based on a weakest-link failure concept and relates the probability of fracture to the actual

stress observed at fracture [2]. To fit the physical facts of the experimental variability, the theory has been corrected to a semi-empirical distribution based on experimental data [2]. Two basic criteria of fracture; size and normal tensile stress, are used in the theory, and it is postulated that failure in an isotropic, homogeneous material is fully described by three material dependent parameters; the zero probability strength (location parameter), the flaw density exponent (shape parameter) and a scale parameter [7]. Within the validity of these criteria, the theory can describe failure for any type of stress distribution [6].

Use of this theory has been applied to a large variety of materials, from ceramics to laminated composites. Daniel and Weii [6] investigated the effects of a stress gradient on the fracture characteristics of brittle materials; Bortz and Weii [2] investigated the applicability of Weibull's semi-empirical distribution function to ceramic oxides, deriving the Weibull material parameters under various condition of test temperature, heat treatment, surface conditions as well as specimen size; Kaminski [ii] studied the effects of specimen geometry on the predictability of the strength of a composite material; and Knight and Hahn [i2] performed experiments on randomiy-distributed short fiber composites, looking at the statistical characteristics of the experimental data by use of the Weibull distribution

function.

Most of the efforts investigating fracture using statistics have dealt with homogeneous isotropic materials, with a lesser emphasis towards composite materials. However, with present day interest, especially within the aerospace industry, being placed on such factors as weight, strength, and performance, the composite material has taken on an important role in the development of lighter-weight highstrength aerospace structures. Even though modern manufacturing procedures of this material allow for carefully controlled manufacturing conditions, its precise breaking strength cannot be accurately predicted [9]. The variability of breaking strengths in a composite is identical in nature to that found for other materials, even when specimen are tested under assumed identical test conditions. It is this variability among a controlled population which necessitates accurate statistical approaches to the fracture process.

The Weibull distribution function can be applied to experimental data in either a two parameter or three parameter form. Each characterization has been investigated using both uniform and nonuniform stress distributions.

A discussion of the parametric equations and related functions is provided in Section II of this thesis, however, it is important at this point to mention some previous efforts relative to the Weibull theory.

Daniel and Weil [6] addressed in detail the three parameter form of the Weibull equation for both uniform and nonuniform stress distributions. Columbia Resin (CR-39) was used as the experimental material. The theoretical derivations for different stress fields are presented based on elementary beam theory applied to a prismatic beam under four-point loading. The resulting set of statistical equations provides a means with which the probability of fracture can be predicted for a variety of loading conditions and stress distributions assuming the three material parameters are known. The hypothesis in their development is that the three parameters are in fact "material" constants. This is substantiated by graphically confirming a close correlation between theoretical and experimental data. Although a set of three material parameters was established and verified for one set of experimental data, no verification of this set of parameters with data from different stress distributions was provided. Similar efforts have since been completed using composite materials, however, detailed theoretical validation is very limited.

Daniel and Weil also developed analytical means for determining the unknown material parameters from a given set of experimental data. Their method involved the simultaneous solution of a system of three equations with three unknowns. However, due to computational difficulties which were experienced, the graphic method devised by Weibull [16]

proved to be much easier for parameter determination.

Since the composite material provides a material with unique characteristics when compared to conventional structural materials, the applicability of the approach developed by Daniel and Weil is of significant interest. Furthermore, the verification of whether a given set of material parameters will allow the prediction of fracture probability throughout a variety of loading conditions would confirm that the parameters are in fact material related. More important, this evidence could provide a significant cost savings in terms of the number tests required to determine general fracture characteristics of a material.

Purpose

There are four separate purposes to be investigated in this thesis.

The first purpose is to establish the basic forms of the Weibull equation for a composite lamina under uniform and nonuniform stress distributions using the approch developed by Daniel and Weil for a homogeneous isotropic beam [6]. Classical laminate theory is expanded in the Weibull equation form for bending, tension and three-point loading conditions. The equations are derived using general composite material notation and then reduced to a simplified, single lamina form, for the specific specimen being used in this study. Composites with only unidirectional ply orientations (0-degree and 90-degree) are investigated.

The second purpose is to obtain experimental fracture data for graphite-epoxy to allow validation of the above equations. The material parameters are derived from experimental pure bending data gathered to form the characteristic fracture distribution of the material. Twenty-five tests will form this distribution. Both the analytical methods described in [7] as well as the trial and error graphical method recommended by Weibull [16] are used to determine the material parameters. Procedures to permit reproducibility of the parameters and parameter associated sensitivities are addressed.

The third purpose of this thesis is to investigate the extendability of the three parameters found from bending tests to other failure modes. This will investigate the hypothesis that the parameters are in fact material related numbers. A minimum of 25 tests for both tension and threepoint loading will establish the fracture distributions for each. The theoretical equations developed for the first purpose of this study will be solved using the three parameters found from the bending test distribution. The criteria for conformance is the closeness of fit between each experimental distribution and theoretical prediction. Methods of obtaining additional accuracy of fit will also be evaluated.

The fourth purpose is to compare the three parameter and two parameter Weibull function in prediction accuracy.

The two parameter model also considers nonuniform stress, however the third parameter, the location parameter, is assumed to be zero. Factors in comparison include the mathematical difficulty of establishing the three parameter model and variations in fit accuracy when compared to the two parameter model. In addition, suitability of each model across the variety of failure modes is to be addressed.

18 1

•

II. Theory

The theory development for this investigation is presented in three sections. The first two sections will provide a brief background into the basic Weibull theory and classical composite theory. The third section will provide the derivations and equations used in this thesis, which are a combination of the theories described in the first two sections.

Weibull Distribution Function

This section is intended to provide a background of the theoretical considerations of the Weibull theory for the prediction of fracture [6,16] as well as its extension to a variety of stress distributions.

The Weibull theory [16] is based on the concept that brittle materials contain a large number of flaws, which tend to lower the fracture stress of a material below the theoretical rupture stress [2]. These flaws are assumed to be of a random size and distribution throughout the body, and to be the cause of the scatter which is found in experimental fracture data. Two basic critera of failure used in the Weibull distribution function are size and normal tensile stress. For a uniaxial stress field in a homogeneous isotropic material, the probability of fracture for a volumetric flaw distribution is given by

$$S = I - \bar{e}^{\mathsf{B}} \tag{1}$$

where

R 1

$$B = \int_{V} \left(\frac{C - G_{u}}{G_{o}} \right)^{m} dV$$
 (2)

and

- B is the risk of rupture
- σ_u is the zero probability strength (location parameter)
- o is the scale parameter
- m is the flaw density exponent (shape parameter)

Equation (1) shows that no special allowance is made for nonuniformity of stress. Each elemental volume with a normal tensile stress is added to form the overall risk of rupture for the specimen. To address the question of nonuniformity [6], one can look at specific case derivations using a prismatic beam under desired loading conditions or stress distributions. The three loading conditions which are investigated in this thesis are; pure bending, threepoint loading and tension.

The development of equations accounting for tensile stress gradients can be accomplished using elementary beam theory. Figure 1 shows a prismatic beam under four-point loading and the resulting extreme fiber stress distribution. The section between the minor span is assumed to be in pure bending, while the section between the minor and major span has the type of stress distribution found in a three-point loading condition. These sections can now be addressed separately.





For a pure bending failure, let (k) in Figure 1 be equal to infinity, thereby placing the total length of the beam under pure bending. Using elementary beam theory, the stress distribution within the beam is described by

$$\sigma = \frac{2\sigma_{\rm b}}{\rm h} Z \tag{3}$$

this assumption can be realized in a four-point bending test using only failures occurring between the minor span as the data samples.

The risk of rupture, Equation (2) can now be rewritten in integral form as follows

$$B = \int_{0}^{b} \int_{z_{u}}^{L} \left(\frac{2 \overline{c_{b}} Z}{h} - \overline{c_{u}} \right)^{m} dv \qquad (4)$$

where

$$Z_{u} = \frac{G_{u}h}{2G_{b}}$$
(5)

Equation (5) is necessary since the three parameter form of the Weibull equation is being used, thereby making the assumption that a stress value exists below which the probability of fracture is zero. A physical interpretation of Z_u is shown in Figure 2 in which the shaded area represents the region where the zero probability failure parameter, (σ_u) , is exceeded. The stress gradient for pure bending is as shown for every point along the x - axis. Integrating Equation (4) results in the risk of rupture equation for pure bending



1.24

Fig. 2. Stress Distribution - Pure Bending

$$B = \frac{V}{2(m+1)} \frac{(G_{b} - G_{u})^{m+1}}{G_{b} - G_{u}^{m}}$$
(6)

where V is a dimensionless number expressing the quantity of unit volumes subjected to a uniform tensile stress [2]. Using Equation (6) in Equation (1) the probability of fracture for a beam subjected to pure bending can be found.

The derivation of the risk of rupture for a center or three-point loading condition requires that (k) in Figure 1 be equal to two. This is representative of a beam with a varying moment as shown in Figure 3. According to elementary beam theory, the stress distribution within the beam is described by

$$\mathbf{C} = \frac{4}{h} \frac{\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{E}}}{L} \times \mathbf{Z} \qquad \mathbf{O} \le \mathbf{X} \le \frac{L}{2} \qquad (7)$$

Equation (2) can now be rewritten using this definition and the following integral limits

$$B = 2 \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{4G_{b}}{hL} \times Z - G_{a}}{G_{0}} \right) dV$$
(8)

where

$$X_{u} = \frac{G_{u} h L}{4 G_{b} Z}$$
(9)

and Z_u is given in Equation (5). The limit expressed by Equation (9) represents the point in the x - direction at which the stress reaches the value σ_u . A physical interpretation of x_u is shown in Figure 4. The superimposed





(b) Extreme Fiber Stress Distribution



and the second second second second second

stress curves show how the stress gradient and extreme fiber stress varies with respect to the x and y axis for this loading condition. Using simple proportions it can be shown that

$$\frac{\overline{\int u/2}}{\chi_u} = \frac{\overline{\int b/h/2}}{L/2}$$
(10)

from which Equation (9) is derived. Integrating Equation (8) results in the risk of rupture equation for a thirdpoint loading condition

$$B = \frac{V}{2(m+1)} \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} \left\{ (G_{b} - G_{u})^{m+1} \sum_{r=1}^{m} \frac{1}{m+1-r} \left(1 - \frac{G_{b}}{G_{u}} \right)^{r} + (-G_{u})^{m+1} \int_{z_{u}}^{h/2} \frac{\left(\frac{2G_{b}}{h} Z - G_{u} \right)^{u}}{Z} dz \right\}$$
(11)

where

$$\mathbf{m} = \overline{\mathbf{m}} \Rightarrow \boldsymbol{\alpha} \tag{12}$$

and (\overline{m}) is the largest integer less than or equal to (m) and (\blacktriangleleft) is the decimal fractions of (m). The term (r) is introduced as a dummy variable for the summation term.

Due to the complexity of the mathematics involved in the derivation of Equation (11), a detailed derivation is provided in Appendix A.

The derivation for the risk of rupture under tension loading is the simplest of the three loading conditions being investigated. Figure 5 shows that the stress distribution for this loading results in a uniform stress over the entire thickness of the beam and therefore is expressed as



6.1

Fig. 5. Stress Distribution for Tension

$$G = G_{1}$$
 (13)

The risk of rupture equation therefore becomes

$$B = \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{G_{\overline{t}} - G_{\overline{u}}}{G_{0}}\right)^{m} dV$$
(14)

Integrating Equation (14) results in the risk of rupture for tension loading

$$B = V \left(\frac{G_{t} - G_{u}}{G_{o}} \right)^{m}$$
(15)

Once the failure distribution of a material has been established, another characteristic of interest is the distribution mean. Once the three material parameters m, σ_u and σ_o have been established, the mean failure stress c_m can be determined and used as a further check on the use of the Weibull theory for a given set of data [2].

$$\int m = \int u + \int_{G_u} e^{-B} dG \qquad (16)$$

Equations (6). (11) and (15) represent the basic approach and format of the risk of rupture expressions which will be extended to composite materials.

Classical Composite Theory

the second state of the second state of the second states

This section outlines some of the basic laminated plate relationships (for background see [1,3,10]. Figure 6 indicates the axis system relationships which are used in the derivations, as well as some of the geometry of a laminated composite.





The stresses in an orthotopic composite plate, or lamina, can be calculated with the following relationships

where (Q_{ij}) is referred to as the lamina stiffness matrix and whose components are

$$Q_{11} = E_{11} / (1 - V_{12} V_{21})$$

$$Q_{22} = E_{22} / (1 - V_{12} V_{21})$$

$$Q_{66} = G_{12}$$

$$Q_{12} = V_{12} E_{22} / (1 - V_{12} V_{22}) = V_{21} E_{11} / (1 - V_{12} V_{21})$$

$$Q_{16} = Q_{26} = 0$$
(13)

and (k) the k th lamina within a laminated composite. The matrix of Equation (17) provides the equations for finding the stress due to loading the material axis. If the stress is desired due to loading in other than the material axis, (x,y,z in Figure 6), rotated some angle θ off the material axis, the stress is found using the following relationship

$$\begin{cases} G_{x} \\ G_{y} \\ G_{xy} \\ K \end{cases} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{Q}_{11} & \overline{Q}_{12} & \overline{Q}_{16} \\ \overline{Q}_{12} & \overline{Q}_{22} & \overline{Q}_{26} \\ \overline{Q}_{16} & \overline{Q}_{26} & \overline{Q}_{44} \\ \overline{Q}_{16} & \overline{Q}_{26} & \overline{Q}_{44} \\ K & \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_{x} \\ \varepsilon_{y} \\ \varepsilon_{xy} \\ \kappa \end{pmatrix}_{K}$$
(19)

where

$$\begin{split} & \overline{Q}_{41} = Q_{41} \left(\cos^{4}\Theta + 2 \right) \left(Q_{12} + 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{2}\Theta \left(\cos^{2}\Theta + Q_{22} \right) \sin^{4}\Theta \\ & \overline{Q}_{22} = Q_{41} \left(\sin^{4}\Theta + 2 \right) \left(Q_{12} + 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{2}\Theta \left(\cos^{2}\Theta + G_{22} \right) \cos^{4}\Theta \\ & \overline{Q}_{66} = \left(Q_{44} + Q_{22} - 2Q_{12} - 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{2}\Theta \left(\cos^{2}\Theta + Q_{66} \right) \sin^{4}\Theta + \left(\cos^{4}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{12} = \left(Q_{44} + Q_{22} - 4Q_{66} \right) \sin^{2}\Theta \left(\cos^{2}\Theta + Q_{12} \right) \sin^{4}\Theta + \left(\cos^{4}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{44} - Q_{42} - 4Q_{66} \right) \sin^{2}\Theta \left(\cos^{2}\Theta + Q_{12} \right) \sin^{4}\Theta + \left(\cos^{4}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{44} - Q_{42} - 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta + \left(Q_{42} - Q_{22} + 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{41} - Q_{42} - 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta + \left(Q_{42} - Q_{22} + 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{41} - Q_{42} - 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta + \left(Q_{42} - Q_{22} + 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{41} - Q_{42} - 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta + \left(Q_{42} - Q_{22} + 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{41} - Q_{42} - 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta + \left(Q_{42} - Q_{22} + 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{41} - Q_{42} - 2Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta + \left(Q_{42} - Q_{22} + 2Q_{66} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} - 2Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta + \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \sin^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \cos^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\ & \overline{Q}_{46} = \left(Q_{46} - Q_{46} \right) \cos^{3}\Theta \left(\cos^{3}\Theta \right) \\$$

The convention used for positive rotation is shown in Figure 6.

The strain components can be obtained from the following relationships

$$\begin{cases} \varepsilon_{x} \\ \varepsilon_{y} \\ \varepsilon_{xy} \end{cases} = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_{x}^{\circ} \\ \varepsilon_{y} \\ \varepsilon_{xy} \end{cases} + Z \begin{cases} K_{x} \\ K_{y} \\ K_{y} \end{cases}$$
(21)

where the $(^{\circ})$ superscript refers to the midplane strains of a laminated composite. The components of Equation (21) are as follows

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\varepsilon}_{x}^{*} \\ \hat{\varepsilon}_{y}^{*} \\ \hat{\varepsilon}_{xy}^{*} \end{cases} = \begin{cases} \partial u_{\partial X}^{*} \\ \partial v_{\partial Y}^{*} \\ \partial u_{\partial Y}^{*} + \partial v_{\partial X}^{*} \end{cases}$$
(22)

and

$$\begin{cases}
 K_{x} \\
 K_{y} \\
 K_{xy}
\end{cases} = \begin{cases}
 -\frac{\partial^{2}W}{\partial x^{2}} \\
 -\frac{\partial^{2}W}{\partial y^{2}} \\
 -2\frac{\partial^{2}W}{\partial x\partial y}
\end{cases}$$
(23)

where u, v, and w are displacements in the x, y, and z direction respectively. If one uses the relationships of Equations (21), (22) and (23), Equation (19) can be written as

$$\{\sigma\}_{k} = \left[\bar{Q}\right]_{k} \{\epsilon^{\circ}\} + Z\left[\bar{Q}\right]_{k} \{k\}$$
(24)

For convenience, a simpler system of forces and moments is now introduced which are defined as force resultants and moment resultants. The force resultant (N_x) is defined as a force per unit width and the moment resultant (M_x) as a moment per unit length. In general then, these values

can be given in terms of the stress vector as follows

$$\{ \operatorname{Ni} \} = \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \operatorname{Gi} \right\} dZ = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left\{ \left[\overline{Q} \right]_{k} \left\{ \operatorname{Ei}^{0} \right\} \int_{Z_{k-1}}^{Z_{k}} dZ + \left[\overline{Q} \right]_{k} \left\{ \operatorname{Ki} \right\} \int_{Z_{k-1}}^{Z_{k}} dZ \right\}$$

$$\{ \operatorname{Mi} \} = \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \operatorname{Gi} \right\} Z dZ = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left\{ \left[\overline{Q} \right]_{k} \left\{ \operatorname{Ei}^{0} \right\} \int_{Z_{k-1}}^{Z_{k}} Z dZ + \left[\overline{Q} \right]_{k} \left\{ \operatorname{Ki} \right\} \int_{Z_{k-1}}^{Z_{k}} Z^{2} dZ \right\}$$

$$\text{here}$$

$$i = (X, Y, XY)$$

W)

By rewriting these equations, a shorter notation can be obtained

$$\{N\} = [A] \{ \epsilon^{\circ} \} + [B] \{ K \}$$

 $\{M\} \cdot [B] \{ \epsilon^{\circ} \} + [D] \{ K \}$
 $\{M\} \cdot [B] \{ \epsilon^{\circ} \} + [D] \{ K \}$

where

$$A_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{M} \left[\overline{Q}_{ij} \right]_{k} \left(h_{k} - h_{k-i} \right)$$

$$B_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{M} \left[\overline{Q}_{ij} \right]_{k} \left(h_{k}^{2} - h_{k-i}^{2} \right)$$

$$O_{ij} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{k=1}^{M} \left[\overline{Q}_{ij} \right]_{k} \left(h_{k}^{3} - h_{k-i}^{3} \right)$$

$$(28)$$

and

[A] - extensional stiffness

[B] - coupling stiffness

[D] - bending stiffness

and $(h_k - h_{k-1})$ represent the individual lamina thicknesses.

When the laminate is symmetric in both geometry and material properties about the mid-plane, Equation (27) simplifies considerably. Due to the symmetry, the thickness terms cause the coupling stiffness (B_{ij}) to go to zero [10].

For the uncoupled axial and moment loads, Equation (27) unn be written as

$$\{N\} = [A] \{ \epsilon^{\circ} \}$$

$$\{M\} = [D] \{ K \}$$

$$(29)$$

Whitney, Browning and Mair [17] further simplified the moment resultant equation as follows: since from Equation (29)

$$\{K\} \cdot [D]^{-1}\{M\}$$
 (30)

Thus, for a pure bending moment this can be written as

$$\begin{cases}
\binom{\mathsf{K}_{x}}{\mathsf{K}_{y}} = \begin{cases}
-\frac{\partial^{2} W}{\partial \chi^{2}} \\
-\frac{\partial^{2} W}{\partial y^{2}} \\
-\frac{2}{\partial^{2} W}_{\partial \chi^{2} y^{2}}
\end{cases} = \begin{bmatrix}
D_{11}^{-1} & D_{12}^{-1} & D_{16}^{-1} \\
D_{12}^{-1} & D_{22}^{-1} & D_{26}^{-1} \\
D_{16}^{-1} & D_{26}^{-1} & D_{26}^{-1}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
\mathsf{M}_{x} \\
\mathsf{O} \\
\mathsf{O}
\end{pmatrix} (31)$$

$$\overset{\mathsf{M}_{x}}{\mathsf{x}} \text{ is the moment resultant defined by}$$

*

$$M_{x} = \frac{M}{b}$$
(32)

If one assumes that the specimen has a high length-to-width ratio then

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \chi^2} = -\frac{M}{EI}$$
 (33)

where

And a star way in a star way and a star starting to the starting of the starti

which is of the same form as classical beam theory with the isotropic modulus (E) replaced by an effective bending modulus (\overline{E}). Stress can now be obtained as

$$\{\sigma\}_{k} \cdot \left[\bar{\alpha}\right]_{K} Z \{K\}$$
⁽³⁴⁾
The state of the s

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{J}\mathbf{x}\mathbf{k} &= \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{f}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{k} \frac{\mathbf{M}}{\mathbf{I}} \\
\mathbf{G}\mathbf{y}\mathbf{k} &= \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{f}\mathbf{z}\mathbf{k} \frac{\mathbf{M}}{\mathbf{I}} \\
\mathbf{G}\mathbf{z}\mathbf{k} &= \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{f}\mathbf{z}\mathbf{k} \frac{\mathbf{M}}{\mathbf{I}} \\
\mathbf{G}\mathbf{z}\mathbf{k} &= \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{f}\mathbf{z}\mathbf{k} \frac{\mathbf{M}}{\mathbf{I}} \\
\mathbf{f}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{k}^{*} & \left[\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{m}\right] \left\{\mathbf{S}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{m}\right\} \\
\mathbf{i} &= 1, 2, 3 \\
\mathbf{M}^{*} &= 1, 2, 6 \\
\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{m}^{*} &= \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{i} \\
\mathbf{S}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{m} &= \mathbf{D}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{m} \mathbf{h}^{3}/12
\end{aligned}$$
(35)

where

Equation (36) then represents an equation applicable to a general class of symmetric laminates, derived by considering a beam as a special case of a laminated plate.

The axial stress equation, when considering only the normal force resultant N_x , can be derived as follows

$$\left\{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\mathbf{0}}\right\} \bullet \left[\boldsymbol{A}\right]^{-1} \boldsymbol{N}_{\mathbf{X}} \tag{37}$$

where

$$N_{x} = \frac{P}{b}$$
(38)

Since symmetric specimens will be used the equation for tension only is

$$\left\{ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\circ} \right\} = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \right\} = \left[\boldsymbol{A} \right]^{-1} \boldsymbol{N} \boldsymbol{x} \tag{39}$$

the normal stress can then be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Gx_k} &= \mathbf{\overline{Q}_{11k}} \in \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{\overline{Q}_{12k}} \in \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{\overline{Q}_{16k}} \in \mathbf{xy} \\
&= \left[\mathbf{\overline{Q}_{11k}} \mathbf{A}_{11}^{-1} + \mathbf{\overline{Q}_{12k}} \mathbf{A}_{12}^{-1} + \mathbf{Q}_{16k} \mathbf{A}_{16}^{-1} \right] \mathbf{Nx}
\end{aligned}$$
(40)

Weibull Equation for Composite Materials

This section deals with the extension of the Weibull distribution function forms, presented for a beam in Equations (6), (11) and (15), to composite materials. Derivations are based on the composite theory equation forms presented in the previous section. The final equations are then presented both in composite notation as well as in a simplified form applicable to the specific experimental specimens being analyzed in this study.

Since the Weibull theory is based on fracture due to normal tensile stress in materials containing random flaw distributions, the composite is also assumed to contain volumetric flaws and to be subject to normal tensile stress fracture. The derivation of the composite bending equations can be modified with this assumption, and Equation (35) reduces to

$$\sigma_{XK} = Z f_{IK} \frac{M}{I}$$
(41)

or

$$\overline{U}_{RK} = Z \left[\overline{Q}_{11K} D_{11}^{\dagger} + \overline{Q}_{12K} \overline{D}_{12}^{\dagger} + \overline{Q}_{16K} \overline{D}_{16}^{\dagger} \right] \frac{M}{5}$$
(42)

if we now define

$$C_{\mathbf{k}} = \left[\overline{Q}_{\mathbf{H}\mathbf{k}} \overline{D}_{\mathbf{h}}^{\dagger} + \overline{Q}_{\mathbf{12}\mathbf{k}} \overline{D}_{\mathbf{12}}^{\dagger} + \overline{Q}_{\mathbf{44}\mathbf{k}} \overline{D}_{\mathbf{16}}^{\dagger} \right] \frac{M}{b}$$
(43)

for simplified notation, then the stress in a laminate subjected to bending can be expressed as

$$\sigma_{\rm H} = Z C_{\rm H} \tag{44}$$

where (z) is the distance from the neutral axis.

The laminate specimen used in this investigation will consist of only unidirectional ply orientations and therefore act like a single lamina with respect to stress distribution. Equations (45) through (49) provide some basic definitions for later theory development and are graphically presented for a unidirectional laminate in Figure 7

$$h_{\sigma_{u}} = \left\{ h_{P-1} + \left(\frac{\sigma_{u_{p}} - \sigma_{u_{p+1}}}{\sigma_{p}} \right) (h_{P} - h_{P-1}) \right\}$$
(45)

where the subscript (p) refers to the p-th lamina which is the lamina in which $\sigma = \sigma_u$. The stress in the p-th lamina is defined as

$$\sigma = C_P Z = \left[Q_{11P} D_{11} + Q_{12P} D_{12} + Q_{16P} D_{16} \right] \frac{M}{b}$$
(46)

also

$$G_{Pi} = C_{Phr-1} \tag{48}$$

$$G_{P} = C_{P} h_{P}$$
 (49)

With the use of these equations the evaluation of the risk of rupture becomes

$$B = \int_{0}^{b} \int_{0}^{L} \int_{h_{Fu}}^{h_{P}} \left(\frac{C_{P}Z - G_{u_{P}}}{G_{0}} \right)^{m} dV + \sum_{k=P+1}^{n} \int_{0}^{b} \int_{0}^{L} \int_{h_{k-1}}^{h_{k}} \left(\frac{C_{k}Z - G_{u_{k}}}{G_{0}} \right)^{m} dV \quad (50)$$

where the first triple integral represents the number of unit volumes in the lamina in which the stress partially exceeds σ_u . The second triple integral represents the summation of this quantity for all other lamina in which the



Fig. 7. Typical Stress Distribution - Composite with Unidirectional Fly Orientation

and the second s

stress exceeds σ_u . Subscripts are provided to σ_u to account for variations of this value in multi-directionally oriented specimens and as such make this term ply dependent. The equation in this form represents the risk of rupture for pure bending of a general laminated composite. For ε unidirectionally laminated composite, as that being used in this thesis, σ_u is assumed to be identical for all plies and consequently subscripts are dropped from subsequent equations. Integrating this equation results in the expression for the risk of rupture for a unidirectionally laminated composite in the expression for the subjected to pure bending.

$$B = \frac{Lb}{G_{0}^{m}(m+1)} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} (C_{p}h_{p} - G_{u})^{m+1} \\ C_{p} \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{k \in P+1}^{n} \begin{bmatrix} (C_{k}h_{k} - G_{u})^{m+1} - (C_{k}h_{k+1} - G_{u})^{m+1} \\ C_{p} \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$
(51)

This equation can be simplified further by use of the characteristics peculiar to the specimens being incorporated into this thesis. For unidirectional fiber orientations

$$C_{\mathbf{P}} = C_{\mathbf{K}} = C \tag{52}$$

because the terms in the lamina stiffness matrix \overline{Q}_{ij} are identical for each lamina. This reduces Equation (51) to

$$B = \frac{Lb}{(m+1)} \frac{(Chn - Gu)}{C} \left(\frac{Chn - Gu}{Go}\right)^{m}$$
(53)

Equation (53) can also be written in terms of the extreme fiber stress as was Equation (6). The stress distributions for these composite specimens are linear, and therefore can be expressed as

$$\sigma = \frac{2 G_n}{h} Z = \frac{G_n}{hn} Z \qquad (54)$$

since

$$C_n \begin{pmatrix} h_2 \end{pmatrix} = C \begin{pmatrix} h_2 \end{pmatrix} = \overline{On}$$
 (55)

therefore

$$B = \frac{Lb}{(m+1)} \left(\frac{\overline{Gn} - \overline{Gu}}{C} \right) \left(\frac{\overline{Gn} - \overline{Gu}}{\overline{Go}} \right)^{m}$$
(56)

where

$$C = Gn\left(\frac{2}{h}\right)$$
 (57)

now

$$B = \frac{Lbh}{2(m+1)} \left(\frac{\overline{Gn} - \overline{Gu}}{\overline{Gn}}\right) \left(\frac{\overline{Gn} - \overline{Gu}}{\overline{Go}}\right)^{m}$$
(58)

where

Lbh = V

Equation (58) is identical to Equation (6) as is expected for the type of composite being considered, and therefore represents the risk of rupture equation for pure bending loading tests in the thesis. A similar approach is used in the derivation of the risk of rupture equation for threepoint loading. Some of the previously defined terms must, however, be modified to allow for a varying moment. The moment equation for three-point loading is

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} P_{2} \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} X$$
 (59)

where (P) is the applied load. Equation (42) can now be written

$$G_{\mathbf{K}} = Z \left[\overline{Q}_{11\mathbf{K}} \overline{D}_{11} + \overline{Q}_{12\mathbf{K}} \overline{D}_{12} + \overline{Q}_{16\mathbf{K}} \overline{D}_{16} \right] \frac{P}{2b} X \qquad (60)$$

defining

$$C'_{\kappa} = \left[Q_{11\kappa} D_{11} + Q_{12\kappa} D_{12} + Q_{16\kappa} D_{16} \right] \frac{P}{2b}$$
(61)

then

$$G_{k} = C_{k}^{\prime} Z X$$
 (62)

since the specimen $\sqrt[5]{}$ are unidirectional, the lamina subscript can be dropped. Figure 3b shows the extreme fiber stress distribution, and from this we define

$$G_b (beam) = G_n (composite) = C' \frac{hnL}{2}$$
 (63)

or

and a second second

$$C' = \frac{Gn2}{hnL}$$
(64)

where σ_n is the maximum extreme fiber stress, and h_n is defined in Figure 7. Using Equation (62) in Equation (2) results in the expression

$$B = 2 \int_{0}^{b} \int_{x_{ou}}^{y_{u}} \int_{z_{u}}^{y_{u}} \left(\frac{C_{k}ZX - Gu}{Go} \right)^{m} dV$$
 (65)

which when integrated takes the form

$$\frac{2b}{C G_0 m (M+1)} \left\{ \left[\sum_{r=0}^{m} \frac{(C'L/2 h_n - G_u)^{m+1-r}}{M+1} + (-G_u)^{r} \right] + (-G_u)^{m+1} \int_{Z_u}^{h_{\ell_2}} \frac{(C'L/2 Z - G_u)^{e_u}}{Z} dZ \right\}$$
(66)

which can be put in terms of the maximum extreme fiber stress σ_n by use of Equation (64). Using this definition the final risk of rupture for a composite under three-point loading then becomes identical to Equation (11).

The risk of rupture for a composite under tension is derived from Equations (25) and (27). In this case only the tension loading and extensional stiffness is considered. Using Equations (2) and (40) the integral equation for the risk of rupture under tension is

$$B = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \int_{0}^{b} \int_{0}^{L} \int_{h_{K-1}}^{h_{K}} \left(\frac{G_{kk} - G_{k}}{G_{c}} \right)^{m} dV$$
 (67)

which integrates to

$$B = Lb \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\frac{G_{kk} - G_{u}}{G_{0}} \right)^{m} (h_{k} - h_{k-1})$$
(68)

If one incorporates the unidirectional properties of the specimen as related to this thesis in addition to

Gxx = GE = Constant (69)

Equation (68) reduces to Equation (15).

This study will utilize Equations (15), (58) and (66) in predicting the risk of rupture for graphite-epoxy under the loading conditions for which each of the equations was derived, and then use these values in establishing the probability of fracture from Equation (1).

III. Experimental and Analytical Procedures

This section provides an overview of the methodology developed to obtain the material parameters in the Weibull distribution function. A description of experimental equipment and procedures as well as the analytical process used in manipulating the experimental data is provided. Also postulated in this section is some analysis theory directed at data evaluation and interpretation. A sensitivity analysis is provided in an attempt to show the dependency of the resulting theoretical equations on the specific experimental data being analyzed.

Material, Equipment and Test Procedures

Graphite-epoxy specimens are used exclusively in the experiments. Specimens were constructed of both sixteen and eight ply graphite fibers impregnated in epoxy. Fiber orientations were unidirectional within each specimen. The specimens were cut from a single 24 inch by 24 inch sheet, thereby obtaining both 0-degree and 90-degree oriented test samples from the same layup. A description of the specimens is provided in Figure 8. Two laminate thicknesses are used due to limitations on specimen size; sixteen ply specimen for both four-point and three-point loading tests and eight ply specimens for the tension tests. The lower ply specimens were chosen for tension so the necessary fracture loads would not deform or separate the end-tabs from the



Fig. 8. Test Specimen Geometry

specimen, thereby inducing measurement inaccuracies.

A standard Instron testing machine was used to conduct all testing. For each four-point and three-point loading test, the load was applied at .05 in/min. The tension tests were conducted with a stroke rate of .02 in/min. The application of loading continued until castastrophic failure or load resistance went to zero. A chart recorder recorded deflection versus load for each specimen. Approximately 20% of the specimens were equipped with strain gages. For these specimens strain versus load was recorded.

Accurate volumes were obtained for each individual specimen by conducting, individually, three measurements of thickness and width. These measurements were then averaged to obtain an average width and thickness per specimen. All testing followed in accordance with standard test procedures. In order to obtain a region of pure bending within the four-point loading tests, the cross-sectional dimensions were controlled to a span to depth ratio of 32 to 1 for each specimen. A minimum of 25 specimens were tested for each ply orientation and loading condition.

The succeeding paragraphs provide the steps followed by the author in arriving at the final procedures of deriving the material parameters using published information. With the accumulated experience obtained in the methodology process, a final technique is developed and presented.

Material Parameter Determination

Once the basic equations for the Weibull distribution

function are established, experimental data is gathered to validate the theory. The problem that now arises is the development of those values of the material parameters which make the theoretical probability of fracture curve fit the experimental data best.

Daniel and Weil [6] used as a suitable criterion the analytical method of minimization of the sum of the mean squares differences. In their procedure, experimental data obtained from pure bending tests was used in the parameter determination.

The procedure combines Equation (1) and (6). Taking the double log of Equation (1) yields

$$Y_{n} = L_{n}L_{n} \frac{1}{1-S_{n}} = L_{n}B = L_{n}\frac{V}{2} - L_{n}(M+1)$$
(70)
+ (M+1) L_{n}(G_{n}-G_{u}) - L_{n}G_{n} - M L_{n}G_{0}

The corresponding (estimated value for the probability of fracture obtained experimentally is

$$S_n = \frac{n}{N+1}$$
(71)

from which

$$y_n = L_n L_n \frac{N+1}{N+1-n}$$
(72)

where N = total number of specimen⁵ tested

n = specimen number when specimen are arranged in

ascending order of stress

The least squares method requires

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (y_n - y_n)^2 = MINIMUM$$
(73)

The necessary conditions for this minimization also require that the derivatives of Equation (73) when taken with respect to σ_u , σ_o and m to be set equal to zero. This then results in three equations with three unknowns which can be solved simultaneously. Convergence to zero results in the determination of a unique parameter set.

Although mathematically correct, convergence of these equations was found difficult to obtain. A possible reason being their highly non-linear nature [2].

Another more widely used approach is one suggested by Weibull [6]. This method is a trial and error procedure in which the experimental data is linearized. The recommended procedure is to rearrange equation (70) into the form of the equation of a straight line

$$Y = \mathbf{M}X + \mathbf{b} \tag{74}$$

this is accomplished as follows

LNLN
$$\frac{N+1}{N+1-n}$$
 + LN $G_n = (m+1)LN (G_n - G_u) + LN \frac{V}{2(m+1)} - mLNG_0$ (75)

Two axes (x and y) can now be established where

$$Y = LNLN \frac{N+l}{N+l-n} + LN \sigma_n$$
(76)

and

$$X = LN(G_n - G_u)$$
(77)

The correct value of σ_u is obtained through a trial and error procedure. Various σ_u values are picked until a straight line results from the plot of Equations (76) versus (77). If σ_u is too low, a curve concave down will result,

if too high the result will be a curve concave up [16]. The slope of the resulting straight line then becomes (m + 1). Once m and σ_u are established, all values of Equation (70) are known except for σ_0 . This value can now be determined by substituting the known values back into Equation (70).

This procedure was also employed by Daniel and Weil when their analytical method proved impractical. One drawback found during their experimentation showed that generally a very large number of guesses are required to finally obtain the desired linear result. Consequently they devised a process in which the upper and lower end slopes of the concave curves resulting from several estimates of σ_u are plotted against σ_u . This procedure is illustrated in Figure 9. Connecting the end slope points with a straight line results in a plot as shown in Figure 9d. The intersecting point provides the desired values for m and σ_u . This procedure significantly reduces the total number of estimates to identify σ_u .

The development of the methodology for the parameter determination for this study was based on two sets of experimental data, each with established material parameters. One data set was for a ceramic material and the other for a composite material.

The least squares analytical method of parameter determination was not investigated due to the findings by Daniel and Weil [7]. A detailed analysis, however, was conducted



Fig. 9. Parameter Determination Method

to establish an effective way to use the graphical approach. The ceramic material fracture data was used exclusively in this effort due to its more manageable magnitudes in stress values. The composite data allowed for additional verification of the final procedures.

The basic approach of the analysis followed the procedures outlined by Weibull, with modifications made as required. The following paragraphs outline the sequence of events and the rationale which led to the final methodology for determining the material parameters.

From the outset of the analysis, a variety of σ_u values were plotted using Equations (76) and (77) as plot coordinates. The resulting graphical data, however, showed refinement to the method was required. For all values of σ_u chosen, no singularly definable straight line or identifiable concavity could be established. Figure 10 shows a typical case of the experimental data when plotted using Equations (76) and (77).

To improve the method, a smoothed curve was fitted to the experimental data. Plotting the values along this curve instead of the individual data points, resulted in a definably straight line from which σ_u and m could be obtained. The problem with this technique, however, is the arbitrary approach used in fitting a smooth line to the experimental data. This became more evident when the published material parameters for the data could not be duplicated.

A more regimented approach for data smoothing was in-



Fig. 10. Typical Example of Weibull Parameter Determination Plot

stituted through the use of the least squares principle and thus various degree polynomial equations were studied which adequately approximated the data. This required a decision as to which degree polynomial provided the best results. A mathematical best fit could not be used since this would necessarily be a high degree polynomial, resulting therefore in an irregular curve rather than the desired smooth curve. Rather than limit the flexibility of this method, numerous polynomials were incorporated to approximate the data, and then evaluated with respect to the vaiability in the Weibull parameters. Although all higher degree polynomials produced distinctive values for m and σ_u , each polynomial resulted in distinctively different values. The published parameters were again not duplicated.

Analysis of the characteristics of each polynomial curve revealed an invariance in the curves in the region beyond the first three to six data points. A very high variability was found, however, in fitting these first few points. Figure 11 depicts this area. The characteristics of smoothing within this zone resulted in the following; a smoothed curve which flared as shown by curve 1 in Figure 11, resulted in σ_u values near zero or even negative, curves within the shaded area resulted in values falling between zero and the lowest failure data point depending on whether the curve fit was chosen in the upper or lower portion of this shaded section, finally if a fit approximated curve 2,



Fig. 11. Area of Curve Smoothing Sensitivity

values of σ_u greater than the lowest failure data point were required to obtain a straight line plot using Equations (76) and (77). As a result of these characteristics and due to its physical significance within the Weibull equation, σ_u was chosen as a bounding value. The lower limit of σ_u was chosen to be zero based on the physical interpretation that stress below this value must result in a probability of fracture equal to zero. The lowest experimental failure stress determined the upper limit for σ_u , thereby specifying that a finite probability of fracture exists above this value.

Using various degree least square polynomials a variety of σ_u 's and m's were established within these limits of σ_u . If these values are displayed in graphical form a linear relationship results as shown in Figure 12. This data implied that an infinite number of combinations of both m and σ_u existed within the set limits, any of which could be used to theoretically duplicate the experimental data. The published material parameters for the sample data were also located on this line. Based on these interesting results, this technique had provided the means of duplicating the published material parameters as one of a very large set.

To verify that each set of values resulted in a valid theoretical prediction of the experimental distribution, randomly picked parameter sets were plotted using the Weibull equation and overlayed on the experimental data. Vis-



44

and the state of the

ually adequate fit was achieved with all sets. However, it was noted that sets with values of σ_u near zero or near the lowest fracture data point did not match the experimental data as well as those with intermediate σ_u values. It appeared therefore that a "best" set of parameters existed which could be mathematically isolated.

The mathematical analysis to isolate the best set of parameters employed the least squares method of summing the squares of the mean difference between the experimental data and theoretical Weibull equations. The error between these two models was calculated and plotted for a variety of material parameter sets. The dashed line shown in Figure 12 represents this sum of the mean difference squared plotted against the corresponding m and σ_{ij} values. As can be seen, a "best" set of parameters does exist among the family of sets represented by the straight line when analyzed in this manner. Eventhough the set which resulted from this procedure did not match the published set of parameters, the magnitude of the overall error in fit difference is very small. Figures 13 and 14 provide a graphical representation of the experimental data points overlayed using the published material parameters (Figure 13) and the best set determined by the aforementioned procedure.

The final step in establishing the procedures for the parameter determination was to check the sensitivity of fit accuracy between the experimental data and theoretical curve









due to small changes in each parameter of the Weibull distribution function. The results showed that all changes to σ_u and m would cause an increase in fit error. However, if σ_o is made the variable at a fixed m and σ_u the author was able to find values which decreased the fit error. The cause of this lies in the methodology used in the derivation of this parameter. The procedure, which is used to find σ_o , evaluates Equation (75) for each stress/probability value and establishes as many σ_o values as there are data points. These values of σ_o are then averaged to obtain the final σ_o . This final number therefore is very data sensitive since the addition of another failure value would generally result in a change to σ_o .

Based on this information, the value of σ_0 for each set of m and σ_u was allowed to vary approximately plus and minus one percent, and a new fit error was calculated for each resulting new set of parameters. Although the reduction in error is extremely small in overall magnitude (.02655698) versus (.02655657) the resulting set of "best" parameters is changed significantly (m = 4.868, σ_u = 1661.5 σ = 2342.06 versus m = 4.856, σ_u = 1670, σ_o = 2333.52).

Due to this sensitivity found in the σ_0 parameter, the procedure of graphically establishing m and σ_u was revised. The writing of a computer program became necessary, incorporating the experimental data in conjunction with Equation (76) and (77), to allow a numerical refinement for various

values of σ_u . From this numerical data, initial values of m could then be obtained. For each σ_u , the values of m and σ_o are allowed to vary until a combination of the three values is found which provides a minimum fit error to the experimental data. Figure 15 is a three dimensional representation of the physical interpretation of this error minimization process. This procedure greatly simplifies the more involved and subjective graphical method. It also provides immediate mathematical comparisons. The computerization verified the high sensitivity of fit accuracy to variations in σ_o when establishing an accurate theoretical model for an experimental failure distribution.

Since the above methodology demonstrated that for given values of σ_u , the fit error could be minimized, the analytical method of maximums and minimums should also be able to predict this point. Therefore an analytical check of these procedures was also conducted. The minimum error expression can be written as

$$\epsilon = \sum_{n=1}^{N} (S - S_n)^2 = MINIMUM$$
(78)

were

$$S = \frac{n}{N+1}$$
(79)

and S_n = Equations (1) and (6). Taking the derivative of this equation with respect to the

variables yields the following expressions





l

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} (S-S_n)^{\partial S_n} S_m = 0$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} (S-S_n)^{\partial S_n} S_m = 0$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} (S-S_n)^{\partial S_n} S_m = 0$$
(80)

Convergence of these equations was verified for all parameters evaluated.

The computerized analysis method which resulted from the refinement of the graphical trial and error procedure is used in analysing the data gathered for this thesis. The methodology is mathematically reproducible for a fixed set of experimental data, and therefore less subject to many inherent inaccuracies of graphical analysis techniques.

IV. <u>Results</u>

This section contains a compilation of results from the various analyses and data evaluations comprising this thesis. The discussion is divided into three subsections. The first two parts present the recults obtained from the Weibull parameter determination analysis and the theoretical equation validation using the experimentally obtained failure distribution. Peculiarities, which are reported in the first two efforts, led to a supplemental data analysis to further investigate the usability of the Weibull theory. The findings of this evaluation are discussed in the last part of this section. The detailed data from the experimental phase of this study are presented in tabular form in Appendix B.

Due to the complexity in describing the large assortment of analysis variations which occurred during the conduct of this thesis, the author feels it is necessary to present the reader with an overview of the total effort at the outset of this section. This is presented in Table 1. Also, a factor which must be pointed out at this time is a peculiarity which was discovered during the analysis of the 90-degree flexure specimen. It was discovered that all specimen which had been equipped with strain gages had failed at an above average stress. Consequently, it was decided to analyze this data as comprised of two independent samples: one containing 21 samples, the other containg 26. All 90-

Table I.

Parameters Derived from	Experimental Data checked for Correlation	Resulting <u>Correlation</u> X-Correlation nc/poor Correlation
0° Bending	0 Bending 0 Tension 0 J-Point	x x
90 ⁰ Bending "	90° Bending* 90° Tension 90° 3-Point	x
90 ⁰ Bending**	90° Bending** 90° Tension 90° 3-Point	x
0 ⁰ Tension	0° Bending 0° Tension 0° 3-Point	x x
90 ⁰ Tension	90° Bending* 90° Bending** 90° Tension 90° J-Point	 x
0° 3-Point $\sigma_{\mu} = 0$	0 ⁰ 3-Point	x
90° 3-Point $\sigma_{u} = \circ$	90 ⁰ 3-Point	X

Summary Correlation Chart

26 Specimen Data Sample 21 Specimen Data Sample

degree bending data will be analized in this manner.

Parameter Determination

The flexure data shown in Tables IX and X of Appendix B is used for the basic parameter determination. The computerized methodology described in Section III was employed in this analysis. Figures 16, 18, and 20 present the final sets of m and σ_u values for the 0 degree and two sets of 90degree specimen[§]/respectively. Additionally, Figures 17, 19 and 21 provide the values of σ_0 which correspond to these values. Superimposed on Figures 16, 18 and 20 are the fit error values which result from the correlation between the experimental and theoretical distributions when using the sets of m, σ_u and σ_0 . Table II is a summary of the best parameter values obtained as well as comparison of the experimental mean compared to the theoretical mean using the respective parameters.

Table II.

Specimen T yp e	Ħ	σ _u psi	^σ o psi	O _m psi Experimental/ Theoretical
0-degree	18.70	0	1 80010.2 6	249405.50 249307.14
90-degree•	.90	8498	1.30	9792.25 9736.34
90-degree**	.91	8175	2.95	10173.09 9981.98

Weibull Parameters Using Bending

21 Specimen Data Sample

** 26 Specimen Data Sample





Fig. 17. O-degree Pure Bending Parameters



(

57

A stand of the second second





20. 90-degree Pure Bending Parameters (including strain gaged specimen)

59

we the set they want for


These values are determined based on a fit error convergence factor of .0001 using the least squares method. Table III. gives the fit error values corresponding to the parameters shown in Table II.

Table III.

Bending Data Fit Error

Specimen Type	Fit Error
0-degree	.02198
90-degree	.04589
90-degree	.06114

The author questioned the difference in fit resulting between the 21 specimen and 26 specimen 90-degree parameters, but one has to realize the relationship of the parameters in the Weibull equation and the significant change in the shape of the distribution curve caused by the addition of the 5 instrumented specimen to the top of the distribution.

Computations became some-what erratic as estimates of σ_u approached the lowest failure data point where probability of failure values predicted by the Weibull expression became very sensitive to very small variations is the individual parameters. The author has attempted to attain as high an accuracy as possible, but practical considerations required the establishing of tolerances. As a consequence of this, the following minimums where placed on the parameters.

eter variation increments: $\sigma_u \pm 1.0 \text{ psi}; \text{m} \pm .01; \sigma_0 \pm .1$ psi and $\pm 1.0 \text{ psi}$. Two minimums were placed on σ_0 due to the magnitudes of this parameter for the 0-degree specimen. Error variation per unit change in σ_0 for the 0-degree data was less than .00001.

Figures 22, 23 and 24 show the experimental pure bending data and the Weibull equation plotted using the values shown in Table II. For comparative purposes additional plots with various parameter sets chosen from Figures 16, 18, and 20 are provided in Figures 1C through 8C of Appendix C.

The determining factor for the best 0-degree specimen parameters is the lower limit previously placed on σ_{n} . Mathematically, however, a better fit can be achieved using negative values of σ_{ij} . The minimum fit error occured at σ_{ij} = -290,000 psi. This value is approximate since a detailed analysis into establishing this exact value was not conducted. Figure 2C in Appendix C verifies that using negative values does provide a mathematically accurate fit to the experimental data. Within the physical interpretation of this parameter as the zero probability failure value, this of course cannot occur. The reason for the increased accuracy using a negative σ_{ii} value is again due to the mathematical relationship of the three parameters within the Weibull bending equation. This of course also points to the fact that placing a physical significance onto the σ_{i} parameter as it appears in the Weibull equation, may be incorrect.





And the second sec





• without strain gaged specimens





* including strain gaged specimens

Theoretical Equation Validation

The parameters developed in the previous section now permit the evaluation of the Weibull equations which where derived for tension and three-point loading failure. Based on the premise that the Weibull parameters are material related values, the resulting theoretical distributions should approximate the distribution established experimentally for each failure mode. The specific evaluation results are presented per failure criteria and specimen fiber orientation in the following subsections.

A. Tension equation - 0-degree specimen.

Equation (15) was evaluated in combination with the material parameters derived from the 0-degree bending failure distribution as given in Table II. Direct substitution of this parameter set into Equation (15) resulted in a failure distribution predicting 100 percent failure at stress values above 230,000 psi. This of course does not match the experimental data for 0-degree tension failure as can be seen in Table XI of Appendix B.

Since the derivation of the Weibull equations assumed a volumetric flaw distribution, the volumetric differences between the bending and tensile specimen were normalized using the following relationship

$$\frac{V_{b}}{G_{0}b^{m}} = \frac{V_{t}}{G_{0}t^{m}}$$
(81)

where b - bending

t - tension

from which a volumetrically normalized σ_{o} can be defined as

$$G_{0t} = G_{0b} V_{t} V_{b}$$
(82)

Equation (15) can now be written as

$$B_{t} = V_{t} \left(\frac{-\overline{U} - \overline{U} u}{\overline{U} \delta t} \right)^{m}$$
(83)

Using this equation and the parameter set established from O-degree bending specimen, the resulting theoretical distribution function improved slightly, however, the overall data match was still very poor.

Comparison of the experimental failure distributions obtained for bending and tension indicated that the basic failure stress extremes are nearly the same. Therefore, based on this characteristic, a theoretical curve similar to that obtained for bending should also provide very adequate predictions for the experimental tension distribution. The modification of the tension equation under these circumstances can now be accomplished as follows; since the parameter set being evaluated has a σ_u value equal to zero, the bending risk of rupture equation can be written

$$B_{b} = \frac{V_{b}}{2(m+1)} \left(\frac{C}{\overline{V_{0b}}}\right)^{m}$$
(84)

The tension risk of rupture equation under the same conditions is

$$B_{t} = V_{t} \left(\frac{\Gamma}{L_{pt}} \right)^{m}$$
(85)

Similar risk of rupture values are obtained for a given stress level only under the conditon where

$$\frac{V_{b}}{2(m+1)G_{0b}m} = \frac{V_{t}}{G_{0t}m}$$
(86)

therefore, defining

$$G_{0+} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 V_{+} (m+1) \\ V_{+} \end{bmatrix} G_{0+}$$
(87)

 σ_{ot} is used to differentiate this σ_{o} from that used in the expression normalizing the volumes. By substituting this expression into the tension risk of rupture equation, the resulting form of this equation is

$$B_{t} = V_{t} \left(\frac{G}{G_{ot}} \right)^{m}$$
(88)

for the specific set of experimental data being evaluated. This equation yields very good failure predictions for the experimental data, as is shown in Figure 25. For graphiteepoxy specimen with 0-dgree fiber orientation it is therefore possible to predict the probability of failure in tension using a set of Weibull parameters which have been established using experimental flexure data. However, the O_0 parameter must be modified to account for the differences in the nature of the two types of risk of rupture equations. The method utilized to modify the tension equation has also been used by Hahn and Knight [12] in studying short fiber composites.

B. Tension equation - 90-degree specimen.

Equation (15) was evaluated using both the set of ma-



and the second state of the second second second



terial parameters defined using the 90-degree flexure data which included the strain-gaged specimen data points as well as the set which was established using only noninstrumented specimen data. Even after manipulations of Equation (15) in the manner described for the 0-degree tension data, no approximation of realistic failure probabilities could be obtained using the parameters from either flexure data. The immediately obvious reasons for this are the values of σ_u . These values are greater than 80 percent of the experimental data points. As a result, a negative exponentiated term appears in the risk of rupture equation.

Various combinations of Weibull parameters with our values lower than the lowest failure stress data point, cbtained using Figures 18 and 20, were analyzed but no suitable combination could be established. Due to the significant differences in the failure characteristics in the 90degree fiber oriented graphite-epoxy specimen when subjected to tension as compared to pure bending failure, no correlation was found in the use of a single set of Weibull parameters for failure probability prediction across these failure modes.

C. Three-point loading equation - O-degree specimen.

Equation (66) was evaluated using the Weibull parameters defined using the 0-degree experimental pure bending data. Since the value of σ_u in this set of parameters is equal to zero. Equation (66) can be rewritten in a much simpler form as follows.

$$B_{3PL} = \frac{V_{3PL}}{2(M+1)^2} \left(\frac{\sigma}{\sigma_{03PL}}\right)^m$$
(89)

where σ_{o3nt} is normalized for volume.

Substitution of the parameters shown in Table II into this form of the risk of rupture equation yielded failure predictions far too low. For example, replacing σ with the highest experimentally obtained failure stress for this failure mode resulted in a probability of failure of less than .22. Manipulation of Equation (89) in the manner described for the evaluation of the tension equation, allows the adjustment of the σ_{α} parameter as follows

$$\frac{V_{b}}{2(m+1)Gob^{m}} = \frac{V_{3PL}}{2(m+1)^{2}Go^{3PL}}$$
(90)

from which

$$Gospe = \left[\frac{V_{3Pe}}{(M+1)V_{b}}\right]^{\frac{1}{m}}Gob \qquad (91)$$

using this value for σ_0 in the three-point loading risk of rupture equation provides the best correlation attainable for this set of parameters. The resulting curve is shown in Figure 26. As is evident, this curve provides a poor correlation to the experimental data and therefore, it is concluded that theoretical prediction of a 0-degree three-point loading failure mode using 0-degree bending parameters is not possible.

D. Three-point loading equation - 90-degree specimen. Evaluation of Equation (66) was attempted using both





sets of 90-degree bending parameters. Due to the complexity of the basic form of Equation (66), no solution could be obtained using the values as listed in Table II. However, since the criteria for establishing Figures 18 and 20 is that all sets of the listed m, σ_u and σ_o values provide a fit with the corresponding error, then utilizing the set of values corresponding to $\sigma_{ij} = 0$ should provide an adequate measure of whether correlation between the experimental 90degree three-point loading and the three-point loading equation given in Equation (89) exist. The resulting theoretical curves are shown in Figures 27 and 28. As can be seen in Figure 28, the theoretical prediction curve using the parameters derived from the 90-degree flexure data without the instrumented specimen is fairly good. However, the useability of the theoretical data in Figure 27 is questionable. The reader should be aware that these curves were plotted by direct substitution of the material parameters from the flexure analysis into Equation (89) using Equation (87). Manipulation of Equation (89) as shown in Equation (91) was not necessary. This of course means that the parameters are true material parameters for the 90-degree bending to 90-degree three-point data. The reader should recall that for the 0-degree data, the nature of the failure distribution had to be considered in order to achieve correlation. A point should be made at this time, and that is that the three bending derived material parameters are not common to

the same the second second





• 90-degree data - including strain gaged specimens





* 90-degree data - without strain gaged specimens

this group of experimental data, but are more oriented to the type of test. As a summary of this section the following correlation overview is provided.

Table IV.

Equation	Data	Fit Obtained		
Bending	0-degree	Excellent		
	90-degree*	Excellent		
	90-degree**	Excellent		
Tension	0-degree	Good		
	90-degree	None		
Three- Point	0-degree 90-degree	None Poor using 90 flexure* Good using 90 flexure**		

Correlation Results - Bending Parameters

- ** not including strain-gaged specimens.
- including strain-gaged specimens.

Alternate Parameter Determination Methods

The problems encountered in obtaining correlation between the experimental data and theoretical predictions using bending parameters led to the evaluation of using an alternate parameter determination method. Since Equation (15) could easily be rewritten in the form of Equation (75), it could therefore be used in the same manner as the bending equation for parameter determination. The total param-

eter determination effort was therefore reaccomplished using the tension data. Figures 29 and 31 provide the values for m and σ_u while Figures 30 and 32 provide the values for σ_o which resulted from this analysis. Table V provides a listing of the best fit values contained on these charts. Table VI lists the fit error corresponding to the parameters shown in Table V.

Table V.

Specimen Type	m	σ u psi	o psi	𝒪 psi Experimental∕ Theoretical
0-degree	17.53	0	229965.27	251869.99 252128.76
90-degree	4.95	2120	3604.64	7228.64 7222.43

Weibull Parameters Using Tension

Table VI.

Tension Data Fit Error

Specimen Type	Fit Error
0-degree	.03782
90-degree	.03316

Figures 33 and 34 show the resulting theoretical curves overlayed on the 0-degree and 90-degree specimen tension data points. Evaluation of parameter correlation to the









Fig. 32. 90-degree Tension Parameters





and the supervision of the super





other failure modes for each specimen type is presented below.

A. Bending equation - O-degree specimen.

Equation (6) was evaluated using the 0-degree parameters presented in Table V. Results similar to those obtained for the previous discussed analysis correlating bending to tension using the bending parameters were obtained in this effort. Using the definition provided in Equation (87) and solving the equation for σ_{ob} , the following expression results

$$\mathsf{B}_{\mathsf{b}} = \frac{\mathsf{V}_{\mathsf{b}}}{2(\mathsf{m}+1)} \left(\frac{\mathsf{C}}{\mathsf{G}_{\mathsf{b}}}\right)^{\mathsf{m}} \tag{92}$$

The theoretical curve obtained using this expression is shown in Figure 35. This result show that parameters derived from either tension or bending yield favorable comparisons to either theoretical equation.

B. Bending equation - 90-degree specimen.

Both of the 90-degree bending data samples were evaluated in this analysis. Poor correlation resulted for all equation manipulations attempted. This is further substantiated by the fact that the parameter sets in Figures 18, and 20 compared to those in Figure 31 for a given value of σ_u do not agree. The resulting best theoretical curves attained are shown in Figures 36 and 37.

C. Three-point loading equation - 0-degree specimen. Equation (66) in the form of Equation (89) was evalu-

ated. No correlation was obtained using the 0-degree tension parameters from Table V. This is expected based on the results of the previous analysis using the bending parameters. A distribution with a very small range of maximum to minimum failure stress values would be expected to require a high value for the flaw density exponent (m) in order to establish correlation between the theoretical curve and experimental data.

D. Three-point loading equation - 90-degree specimen.

Equation (89) was evaluated using Weibull parameters corresponding to $\sigma_u = 0$ from Figure 31. Poor correlation, as shown in Figure 38, resulted. This is expected since the 90-degree bending and 90-degree tension produced poor correlation, while 90-degree bending compared favorably with 90-degree three-point loading.

In summary, the results obtained in this section also did not produce a set of parameters which allowed fracture prediction through the range of desired failure modes. The resulting set of tension data derived parameters proved to be even less suitable than those derived from the bending data. An overview correlation summary is in Table VII.

Since the general results of this thesis were unable to produce a singular set of Weibull parameters from which suitable theoretical failure probabilities could be established for the range of failure modes investigated, the author felt that it would be interesting to at least estab-





A STORES





including strain gaged specimens





• without strain gaged speciments





I.

Table VII.

Correlation Results - Tension Parameters

Equation	Data	Fit Obtained
Bending	0-degree	Good
	90-degree*	None
	90-degree**	None
Tension	0-degree	Excellent
	90-degree	Excellent
Three-Point	0-degree	None
	90-degree	None

without strain.

** with strain.

lish one set of parameters for each experimental failure distribution which allowed accurate theoretical duplication of that distribution. Parameter sets to provide excellent theoretical curves for both bending and tension have already been established, however, no set for the three-point loading data has as yet been determined. Equation (co) is not suited to the manipulation conducted in Equation (co) is not ever, the special case of Equation (co) presented by Equation (89) can be rearranged into a similar form. This then allows the determination of a best set of m and σ_0 for $\sigma_u =$ 0 and as such represents best theoretical prediction of the three-point loading data obtained in this thesis. The resulting values are shown in Table VIII.

Table VIII.

	m	σ _u	σο	Error
0-degree	42.97	0	211702.27	.023202
90-degree	12.01	0	6150.49	.041770

Weibull Parameters Using Three-Point Loading

The corresponding distribution functions are shown in Figures 39 and 40.









the second s

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

The objectives of establishing a set of Weibull parameter using experimental data and then correlating these parameters to other data samples was accomplished. As a result of the methodology used in the parameter determination, comparisons of various values of m. σ_u and σ_o are available for all data samples analyzed. Listed below are some specific conclusions derived from this thesis:

- (1) The graphical procedures for parameter determination described by Weibull and modified by Daniel and Weil are not reproducible. The procedures result in approximations of the material parameters. These approximations can easily be replaced by parameter sets with equal failure prediction ability.
- (2) The use of the above mentioned procedure does provide a fair initial guess at a linear distribution of parameter values from which, after mathematical refinement, a best set of values can be isolated through the use of a mathematical fit difference routine like the least square method.
- (3) The determination of the σ_0 parameter is not mathematically possible when a best fit is desired. The parameter must be determined through a trial and error process in which σ_u is fixed and combinations of m and σ_a are allowed to vary. Accu-

rate fit becomes very sensitive to the σ_0 parameter.

- (4) The overall analysis was found to be very sensitive to data sample size. Large variations of data points in any specific section of a distribution was found to have significant effect on all parameters. Random variations of a few data points, however, have little impact on m and σ_{ij} but tend to affect σ_{o} . Addition or deletions of data points from a distribution also tended to alter the resulting best fit set of parameters at the sample size being used in this thesis. The linear representation of m and $\sigma_{n,n}$ however, was generally insensitive to this. As a result of this characterization, a minimum sample size should be determinable for which fit error convergence starts to occur.
- (5) Except for the 0-degree tension and 90-degree three-point loading data the Weibull equations using a single set of material parameters were not correlatable through the three loading conditions studied for graphite-epoxy. Possible causes for these results could be attributable to the relatively small data samples used and possibly poor 90-degree tension data. However, the nature of the discrepancies does not totally support this.
- (6) A check of parameter sets other than those providing the best fit per σ_u was not accomplished due to time constraints. It is conceivable that a parameter set of poorer accuracy, not falling on the linear m versus σ_u presentation exists which would allow better correlation between several failure modes.
- (7) The physical interpretation generally placed on σ_u is felt not to exist. This is demonstrated by the mathematical improvement which results in the O-degree bending data when negative values of σ_u are used.
- (8) Using the three parameter form of the Weibull equation was found to provide better fit than the two parameter (σ_u assumed zero) form. For the data used in this thesis, an assumption of $\sigma_u = 0$ would have resulted in a significantly increased fit error.
- (9) There are a great number of limitations in the use of the Weibull equations. For the composite studied and sample size used, the Weibull theory is only useful if the parameters are derived based on specific experimental data. Correlation was established between 0-degree tension and bending only after manipulation of the Weibull equation based on the characteristics of the available experimental data. Thus, the use of the Weibull

equations does not lead to a reduction in test requirements and the associated cost savings for composite materials. From the available data used in this study, it is appropriate to say that the only true correlation may have between the 90-degree three-point loading and 90-degree bending without instrumented specimen data samples. However, a more conclusive evidence could be developed with additional experimental information.

(10) It is recommended that the experimental data established in this study be extended with additional test data to investigate the variability of the Weibull parameters as additional data is added. Care must however be taken to insure specimen homogeneity in both geometry and material. Once a substantial sample size has been obtained, the error to parameter sensitivity can be investigated by random deletions or additions of data points within this sample.

Bibliography

- 1. Ashton, J. E., J. Halpin, and P. Petit. <u>Primer on</u> <u>Composite Materials: Analysis</u>. Westport, Conn.: Technomic Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.
- Bortz, S. A. and Weil, N. A., <u>Effect of Structural</u> <u>Size: The "Zero Strength</u>." ASD-TR-61-628 Part 11, 11-74. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio; Aeronautical Systems Division: April 1963.
- 3. Brooks, G. <u>A General Study of Hybrid Composite</u> <u>Laminates</u>. Thesis. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio: Air Force Institute of Technology, December, 1977.
- Carnahan, B., Luther, H. A. and J. O. Wilkes. <u>Applied</u> <u>Numerical Methods</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969.
- 5. Chou, P. C., Wang, A. S. D. and J. Awerbuch. "Statistical Failure Analysis of Composite Materials." <u>Mechanics of Composites Review</u>. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio: Air Force Materials Laboratory, Air Force Office of Scientific Research and Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory: October, 1977.
- Daniel, I. M. and Weil, N. A. "Analysis of Fracture Probabilities in Nonuniformly Stressed Brittle Materials." Journal of the American Ceramic Society, 47: 268-274. (June, 1964).
- Daniel, I. M. and Weil, N. A., "The Influence of Stless Gradient upon Fracture of Brittle Materials." <u>American</u> <u>Society of Mechanical Engineers</u>, 63-WA-228, 1963.
- Hahn, H. T. and R. Y. Kim. "Proof Testing of Composite Materials." <u>Journal of Composite Materials</u>, <u>9</u>: 297-311 (July, 1975).
- 9. Halpin, J. C., Kopf, J. R. and W. Goldberg, "Time Dependent Static Strength and Reliability for Composites." <u>Journal of Composite Materials</u>. 4: (October, 1977).
- 10. Jones, R. M. <u>Mechanics of Composite Materials</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Bock Company, 1975.
- 11. Kaminski, B. E., "Effects Of Specimen Geometry On The Strength of Composite Materials," <u>Analysis Of The Test</u>

Methods For High Modulus Fiber And Composites, ASTM STP 521, ASTM, pp. 181-191. (1973).

- 12. Knight, M. and H. T. Hahn. "Strength and Elastic Modulus of a Randomly-Distributed Short Fiber Composite." <u>Journal of Composite Materials</u>, 2: 77-90 (January, 1975).
- 13. Kopf, J. R. <u>Application of the Fracture Properties of</u> <u>a Composite Material to the Development of a Reliability</u> <u>Plan. Thesis. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio:</u> Air Force Institute of Technology, June, 1970.
- 14. Tsai, S. W. and H. T. Hahn. <u>Composite Material Workbook</u>. AFML-TR-77-33. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. March, 1977.
- 15. Weibull, Walloddi. <u>A new Method for the Statistical</u> <u>Treatment of Fatigue Data</u>. Linkoping, Sweden: Aircraft Company. May, 1954.
- Weibull, W. A., <u>Statistical Theory of the Strength of</u> <u>Materials</u>. Stockholm: Generalstabens Litografisk Anstalt Forlag, 1939.
- 17. Whitney, J. M., Browning, C., and Mair, A., "Analysis of the Flexure Test for Laminated Composite Materials." <u>Composite Materials Testing and Design</u> (<u>Third Conference</u>), <u>ASTM STP 546</u>, pp. 30-45 (1974).
- 18. Young, H. D. <u>Statistical Treatment of Experimental</u> Data. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

APPENDIX A

Three-Point Loading Equation Derivation

This appendix provides the detailed steps required to obtain the form of the risk of rupture equation shown for Equation (11). Starting with Equation (8)

$$B = \frac{2}{G_0^m} \int_0^b \int_{X_u}^{Y_2} \int_{Z_u}^{h/2} \left(\frac{4G_0}{hL} \times Z - G_u \right)^m dv$$
(1A)

where

$$X_{u} = \frac{G_{u}hL}{G_{b}+Z}$$
(2A)

and

$$Z_{u} = \frac{G_{u} h}{G_{b} Z}$$
(3A)

Integrating with respect to Y yields

$$B = \frac{2b}{G_{\bullet}^{m}} \int_{X_{u}} \int_{Z_{u}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{4G_{\bullet}}{hL}XZ - G_{u}\right)^{m} dX dZ$$
(4A)

Integrating with respect to X yields

$$B = \frac{2b}{c_o} \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}u}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \left[\frac{\left(\frac{4}{hL} \times Z - C_u\right)^{m+1}}{\frac{4}{hL} Z (m+1)} \right]_{X_u}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} dZ$$
(5A)

taking out the constants

$$B = \frac{(hbl)^2}{4G_0 G_0 (m+1)} \int_{Z_u}^{V_2} \frac{1}{Z} \left(\frac{4G_0}{hL} X Z - G_0 \right)^{m+1} \Big|_{X_u}^{L/2} dZ \qquad (6A)$$

substituting the integration limits yields

$$B = \frac{V}{2(m+1)} \int_{0}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{z_{u}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{2G_{b}}{h} z - G_{u}\right)^{m+1} dz \qquad (7A)$$

Defining

والتحمد بالمحال والمحافظة والأخذاف المحالية المتحاف والمحافية والمحافظ والمحافظ والمحافظ والمحافظ والمحافية و

$$I = \int_{a_{m}}^{b_{2}} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2G_{a}}{h} Z - G_{a} \right)^{m} dZ \qquad (8A)$$

The integration of this integral is now addressed separately in the following manner.

Defining

L .

$$\sigma = \frac{2\sigma_0}{h}$$
(9A)

then

$$I = \int_{Z_u}^{\gamma_2} \frac{1}{Z} \left(GZ - G_u \right)^{m+1} dZ$$
(10A)

Integration of this term results in the following

$$I = \frac{(\sigma Z - \sigma_{u})^{m+1}}{m+1} \Big|_{Z_{u}}^{\frac{h}{2}} \frac{(-\sigma)(m+1)}{(m+1)} \int_{Z_{u}}^{\frac{h}{2}} \frac{1}{Z} (\sigma Z - \sigma_{u})^{m}$$
(11A)

Further integration of the resulting integral leads to a form which can be expressed in series notation

$$I = \left\{\sum_{r=0}^{N} \frac{(G_{r} - G_{u})^{m+1-r}}{m+1-r} (-G_{u})^{r}\right\} + (-G)^{N+1} \int_{z_{u}}^{h/2} \frac{1}{z} \left(\frac{2G_{u}z}{h} - G_{u}\right)^{m-N} dz$$
(12A)

using the following definitions

$$m = \overline{M} + \alpha \tag{13A}$$

leads to the form defined in Equation (11)

$$I = \left\{ \sum_{r=0}^{\overline{m}} \frac{(\overline{G_0} - \overline{G_u})^{m+1-r}}{m+1-r} (\overline{G_v})^r \right\} + (-\overline{G_u})^{\overline{m}+1} \int_{z_u}^{y_z} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2\overline{G_0} \overline{z}}{\overline{h}} - \overline{G_u} \right)^{\alpha} dz$$
(15A)

Substitution of this final expression for I into the risk of rupture equation will result in the form of this equation shown in Equation (11).

 $B = \frac{V}{2(m+1)C_{b}C_{b}} \left\{ \left(C_{b}-C_{u}\right)^{m+1} \sum_{r=0}^{\overline{m}} \frac{1}{m+1-r} \left(1-\frac{C_{b}}{C_{u}}\right)^{-r} + \left(-C_{u}\right)^{m+1} \left(\sum_{zu}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{2C_{b}z}{h} - C_{u}\right)\right) \right\}$ (16A)

APPENDIX_B

Experimental Data

and the second se

This appendix provides a compilation of the experimental data gathered for this study.

	Specimen
IX.	- 0-degree
able	Data
F	Loading
	Point
	h

Specimen Number	Thickness (in)	Width (in)	Volume (in)	Load (1b)	Stresg ^{••} (1b/in ²)
14	.0779	500th.	5120.	373.0	21.044242
1.5	080.	6664.	1620.	5.460	240208.92
YE	.0782	5264	6120	399.0	258173.25
444	.0783	.4995	.0514	340.0	216995.37
Y	.0810	5003	0	429.0	257794.57
	2615.	2007	1200	410.0	201520.00
2.0	0100			0.724	12 200000 2000000
24	5617.	いいたよい	2220	0.004	(((())))))
- C		いいたま		0.27	サイ・エンパイナン
122	n-1000000000000000000000000000000000000				00 +001+0
			1100		25.215.36
1.5		1990	200	2.05	237077.95
164	6252.	6005	0533	0.024	252707.56
174	127.	6164.	0000	400.0	256774.44
*1÷A	. 5817	415641 .	.0537	332.0	230775.11
194	1	5557	0030	414.0	247225.04
2.7	- 5514	5000	.0535	430.0	255555 75
214	6560.	.4965	0.523	434.0	270185.51
224	1262.	1:395	5750.	405.0	260340.74
636		6225.	6212	411.0	26.2749.52
24.12	. 6611	- 43 C tr	. 5536	147.0	268754.89
5.5	5263.	36641.	5150.	414.0	271555.71
- C 10 - C 10 +	5665.	666.1	0.521	5:00	235435.60
-1. h	6363	.5001	. 5556	0.640	232773.16
+	. 577.	6264.	6020.	320.0	211513.23

	Specimen
Χ.	- 90-degree
able	Data
E -1	Loading
	Point
	Four

And the second second

Specimen Number	Thickness (in)	Width (in)	Volume (in ³)	Load (15)	Stresge* (lb/in ²)
IB	6220.	.4982	0150.	13.2	8512.16
E C	.0785	. 5040	.0520	15.5	9844.16
.u .	0789	. 5041	.0523	15.9	60.4666
0) (2 \	-0784	t56t.	1120.		9133.73
1) 1	.0777	.5025	.0513	14.9	9537.30
	.0775	6600	6640.		69.2246
1) (1) (1)	0420	1020	.0550	- - -	6162-90
26	0220	. 5049	0518	0 1 1	11943.50
105	0773	0564	.0503	13.9	9259.74
	5.20.	. 5040	6250.	1.0	8201.58
125	.0760	. 5033	.0515	17.0	10950-90
135	.0775	4964.	.0509	14.0	9219.39
145	1620.	. 5035	4250.	15.2	9517.18
165	1270.	h 36h.	.0503	18.1	12099.15
•17B	.0759	. 5038	.0523	19.5	12264.21
165	.0778	+203.	.0515	17.1	11659.82
198	.0722	8564	.0504	14.0	9326.72
213	.0725	- 5020	.0520.	15.8	10712.30
223	.0772	2564.	.0503	14.0	9355.85
235	0520.	.5037	.0523	15.9	9976.73
245	0560	4105.	1320.	15.9	10022.49
おいと	0772	6364.	.0504	14.2	9461.86
393+	0520	. 5028	.0520	19.8	12445.05
275	2640.	. 5022	.0523	15.9	9955.05
3,5.	0260	. 5015	.0518	18.0	11459.71
804+	.0754	.5030	.0505	15.0	10749.35
• Strain	-gaged Specime:	7	++ Calcula	ted - usi	$ng \sigma = x_c/I$

Speciaen Number	Thickness (in)	Width (in)	Volume (in3)	Load (11)	Stresg•• (1b/in ²)
	6363	4987	ઉત્તાલ.	4785	250520.81
• 0 •	0300	1251	.1175	1001	233505.23
-0 -	0362	66.54	.1158	5625	272664 35
+0-+	4620.	. 5000	.1162	5300	269035.53
\$ • •	4650.	6664.	.1132	0500	261752.24
- 2	10.0	11611	.1146	5010	262767 02
6 - 3	1950.	366.11.	.1152	4325	228047-02
- D	36.0.	1005.	.1155	0151	249445.06
0 + 0	5550	5002	.1198	5050	23.160622
0-10		5000	11211	54:30	272564 32
[[-]]	54.1	すいのと	.1110	0121	261562.31
0-12		3664	.1152	0554	256360.26
6-13	01.14		1212	5115	271195 42
5-14	6.52	5010	1154	1710	242925.00
2 - J 5		6335	.1162	5125	20.041-9.62
	000	2005.	3611.	5025	259437.00
6-12		4453	1165	5000	66.375.73
6-19	0.5.5	66.6.11.	.1170	5040	253615.71
0-10		466.41.	.1176	5060	255473.43
5-20	1.2.2	5.66.11	.1188	11220	212892.51
6-21		1532	4611.	56347	235301.10
0-22	5.250.	366.41.	.1152	1000	252249.77
6-23	5625	6664.	4611.	5075	254105.75
10-0	5.2.2	2.51	1100	0634	235352.97
5-25	26.5.	3664.	11.52	4160	210717.20

Table XI.

and the second

107

	Specimen
XII.	90-degree
le	I
Tab	Data
	ading
	Lo

Specimen Number	Thickness (in)	Width (in)	Volume (in)	Load (1b)	Stresg** (1b/in ⁾
+90- 1	.0393	. 9960	.1173	280	7153.30
- 96- 2#	.0392	. 9962	.1170	280	7170.10
	.0390	6466	1164	274	7065.92
-05- -05-	1620.	- 995°	.1157	202	5343.20 0388 02
06	1660.	6665	.1167	232	5093.07
#2 -06	.0387	6966.	.1158	325	8429.12
80-00 -00	.0395	- 9952 0061	1179	50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	7504.38
90-10	.0395	1066	.1179	2 V V V V V V	6484.23
90-11#	.0390	9956	1169	328	6447.43
21-06	0384	0465	0/11.	107	7360.00
90-14#	6560.	6566.	.1173	291	7439.55
90-15	.0393	4266.	.1173	331	8461.31
61-06	0660.	1#66.	1179 1179	000 000 000	7454.24
90-18	2660.	1966	.1179	309	7853.41
90-19	.0393	.9956	.1176	252	64.34.09
90-20	.0395	1.0001	.1185	313	8049.83
T2-06	1050	00200	1185	200	2681.03
#C2-06	6660.	.9962	.1176	282	7202.94
90-24	.0393	4966.	.1175	320	8171.91
90-25	.0393	4966.	.1176	360	9193.40
 Strain-e Calcula 	gaged Specimen ted - using	$\sigma = P/A$	actured at	tabs	

Three Point Loading Data - O-degree Specimen

and the second se

C-CCLOR	Mt & alender	145 245	Vol. 1.1.	T 2.2	Stores 1
Number	(in)	(in)	(in^3)	(11)	$(1b/in^2)$
Ċ	7000	1001	0.01	0 000	200000
- (A	0//0.	00/1.	otot	200.0	60.062612
*26A	.0796	th66th.	.1045	210.0	261813.25
27A	.0784	†66 †.	.1030	208.0	267318.91
28A	.0781	.4998	.1027	211.0	273043.06
29A	.0789	. 5005	.1039	211.0	267159.96
30A	.0795	. 4988	.1043	213.0	266542.16
32A	.0816	.4987	.1070	233.0	276810.94
354	.0799	. 4965	.1043	207.0	257634.81
HOA	.0783	.4961	.1022	213.0	276270.08
424	.0787	.4980	.1031	214.0	273704.52
43A	.0777	.4982	.1018	206.0	270189.50
*45A	.0776	.4967	4101.	200.0	263790.65
49A	.0768	-4997	.1009	202.0	270375.03
TC	.0772	.4932	1001.	204.0	273791.21
\$.0775	. 5013	.1022	206.0	269906.36
120	.0789	. 5002	.1038	216.0	273654.80
140	.0822	4664 .	.1080	223.0	260711.21
160	. 0784	.4981	.1027	204.0	262862.42
170	. 0807	. 5005	.1062	206.0	249323.42
+24C	.0806	.4998	.1059	208.0	252722.56
25C	.0789	. 5001	.1038	209.0	264839.30
*32C	.0811	. 5020	101.	216.0	258080.58
340	.0789	.4995	.1036	213.0	270232.21
360	.0787	. 5007	.1036	213.0	270956.49
440	.0780	. 5011	.1028	208.0	269151.46
* Strain-	gaged Specimen		** Calcul	lated - usi	$ng \sigma = Mc/I$

4

Three Point Loading Data - 90-degree Specimen

Sec. 10

And a second second

Specimen Number	Thickness (in)	Width (in)	Volume (in ⁾)	Load (1b)	Stresg** (lb/in ²)
*** ##################################	00000000000000000000000000000000000000	<u>+ ми</u> + ми+ ми+ ми+ ми+ мими 2002000000000000000000000000000000000		<pre></pre>	11111111111111111111111111111111111111
• Strain-	-gaged Specime:	*	alculated .	usirg	g = %c/I

APPENDIX C

Data Plots

This appendix provides graphical data verifying the linear relationship between the values of m and σ_u . Also, the validity of using the sum of the mean error technique for isolation of the best set of values can easily be seen by plot comparisons of similar data.



inera











* without strain gaged specimens











* without strain gaged speciments





including strain gaged speciment.



١.

A DESCRIPTION OF THE OWNER OWNER OF THE OWNER OWNER OF THE OWNER OWNER



• without strain gaged specimens





• without strain gaged specimens

<u>Vita</u>

Dennis R. Schneider was born on The secondary in The second in the secondary. He graduated from success to leave Pignesecond in the secondary, collisional an 1965. He graduated from Northrop Institute of Technology in 1967, with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering. He entered the Air Force in 1967 and has served as project officer for advanced strategic missile development projects as well as test manager for target drones, air to air missiles and laser guided bombs. In August of 1976, he enrolled in the Air Force Institute of Technology in the graduate Aeronautical Structures Engineering Program.

	1 IZALA ENTATENT	Ψ
REPORT DOCUMENTAT	ION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFCKE COMPLETING FORM
REPORT NUNDER	2 GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3 PECLEVENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
AFIT/GAE/AA/78M-14		
TITLE (and Subtrin)		S THE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
EVALUATION OF THE THREE 1	PARAMETER	
WEIBULL DISTRIBUTION FUNC	CTION FOR	MS THESIS
PREDICTING FRACTURE PROB.	ABILITY IN	S PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
<u>AUTHOR(#)</u>		. CONTRACT OF GRANT NUMBER(1)
Dennis R. Schneider		
Captain USAF		
PERFORMING DRGANIZATION NAME AND ADD	DRESS	10 PROGRAM FLEMENT, PROJECT, TASK, APERA WORK UNIT NUMBERS
Air Force Institute of To	echnology (AFIT/	
ENA)		
Wright-Patterson AFB, Oh	10 45433	
ALM DAMAA MAAANIATA TAL	matoms (ADMT)	Mamak 3 000
Wright_Pettarean AFR (h)	in 45432	NATCA 1978 13. NUMBER OF PAGES
HITRUC-LACCELSON WLD, OU.	10 43433	132
MONITORING AGENCY HAME & ADDRESS(IT &	fillstant from Controlling Office)	15 SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		6.47
		UNCLASSIFIED
		SCHEDULE
Approved for public relea	ase; distribution	unlimited
Approved for public relea	BSC: distribution	unlimited
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (at the electronic of SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Approved for JERREL F:	ase: distribution newed in Black 20, il different from or aquite release	unlimited m Report) I IAW AFR 190-17 SAF
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obsiliance of Supplementary notes Approved for JERREL F; Director (or	ase; distribution newed in Block 20, il different free or addition release UESS, Gaptain, US Cinformation	unlimited Maport) I IAW AFR 190-17 SAF
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electronic of SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Approved for JERREL F: Director(or) Composite l\minates	ase: distribution nered in Black 20, il different ins or addite release UESS, Gaptain, US <u>C Information</u> Weibull distribu	unlimited * Report I AW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (at the obsiliant of SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Approved for JERREL F. Director (or Composite luminates Weibull Theory	ase: distribution newed in Black 20, il different from SUESS, Gaptain, US <u>C Information</u> Weibull distribut Failure Stress	unlimited * Report : IAW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstract of SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Approved for JERREL F: Director (or Composite luminates Weibull Theory Composite Materials	ase: distribution ntered in Stock 20, it different free SUESS, Gaptain, US <u>C Information</u> serv and identify by Stock number Weibull distribu Failure Stress	unlimited Report IAW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electronic SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Approved for JERREL F; Director(or) Composite liminates Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure	ase: distribution ntered in Block 20, il different ins SUESS, Saptain, US <u>C Information</u> Weibull distribu Failure Stress	unlimited Report IAW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (at the ebstract of Approved for JERREL F: Director(or Composite liminates Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure	ase: distribution newed in Block 20, il different free SUESS, Gaptain, US <u>C Information</u> Weibull distribut Failure Stress	unlimited * Report : IAW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the absiliance of SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Approved for JERREL F; Director (or Composite luminates Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure	ase; distribution ntered in Stock 20, it different free SUESS, Gaptain, US <u>C Information</u> Meibull distribu Failure Stress	unlimited Report I AW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electronic SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Approved for JERREL F; Director(or) Composite lyminates Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure Approved for Director(or) Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure	ase: distribution nered in Black 20, il different ins SUESS, Saptain, US <u>C Information</u> Weibull distribut Failure Stress	unlimited Mepon I AW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function parameter Weibull dis-
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (at the electronic SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Approved for JERREL F; Director(or) Composite liminates Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure ADSTRACT (Continue on revenue side if necess This thesis is an eveluation tribution function for pro-	ase: distribution nerved in Black 20, il different free UESS, Gaptain, US <u>C Information</u> Weibull distribu Failure Stress weigentify by black number ion of the three p edicting fracture	unlimited Report I AW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function parameter Weibull dis- in a composite material d nonuniform
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract of JERREL F: Director (of JERREL F: Director (of Meibull Theory Composite Lominates Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure Asstract (Continue on records side if necess Inis thesis is an ev: luation tribution function for pro- subjected to failure under tributions. The specific	ase: distribution ase: distribution antered in Stock 20, it different free or and identify by file number Weibull distribut Failure Stress ary and identify by March number ion of the three p edicting fracture r both uniform and forms of the three	unlimited Report I IAW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function parameter Weibull dis- in a composite material d nonuniform stress dis- de marameter Weibult
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (at the electronic Approved for JERREL F; Director (or Composite luminates Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure This thesis is an evaluation tribution function for pre- subjected to failure under tributions. The specific Equations for these failure	ase; distribution ase; distribution antered in Block 20, il different inter- SUESS, Captain, US <u>CInformation</u> Weibull distribut Weibull distribut Failure Stress and identify by Mlock number ion of the three p edicting fracture r both uniform and forms of the three re modes are derive	unlimited Report I AW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function parameter Weibull dis- in a composite material d nonuniform stress dis- ee parameter Weibull wed for a general
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the electronic Approved for JERREL F: Director(o) Composite lyminates Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure Astract (continue on restant if necess This thesis is an ev; luation tribution function for pro- subjected to failure under tributions. The specific Equations for these failure laminated composite and st	ase: distribution nerved in Black 20, il different ins GUESS, Gaptain, US C Information Weibull distribut Failure Stress weibull distribut Failure Stress weibull fracture r both uniform and forms of the three re modes are derive implified for the	unlimited Mepon I AW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function parameter Weibull dis- in a composite material d nonuniform stress dis- ee parameter Weibull ved for a general special case of a uni-
Approved for public relea DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (at the evaluer: a Approved for JERREL F; Director (or Composite liminates Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure Asstract (Continue on reveaus side if necess This thesis is an evaluation tribution function for pro- subjected to failure under tributions. The specific equations for these failur laminated composite and side irectional composite. Ar	ase: distribution ase: distribution attered in Block 20, il different free SUESS, Gaptain, US <u>C Information</u> Weibull distribut Failure Stress atteres of the three r both uniform and forms of the three re modes are deriving implified for the h analysis into a	unlimited Report I IAW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function parameter Weibull dis- in a composite material d nonuniform stress dis- ee parameter Weibull ved for a general special case of a uni- parameter determination
Approved for public releases DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the exertises Approved for JERREL F; Director (or Composite luminates Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure Assistance (Continue on records side if necess Neibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure Assistance (Continue on records side if necess tribution function for pro- subjected to failure under tributions. The specific Equations for these failure laminated composite and side irectional composite. Ar methodology which is mathe	ase; distribution ase; distribution antered in Block 20, il different inter- SUESS, Gaptain, US <u>CInformation</u> Weibull distribut Weibull distribut Failure Stress and identify by block number ion of the three p edicting fracture r both uniform and forms of the three implified for the n analysis into a ematically reproduct	unlimited Report I AW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function parameter Weibull dis- in a composite material d nonuniform stress dis- ee parameter Weibull ved for a general special case of a uni- parameter determination ucible is presented.
Approved for public relea T. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (at the abstract of Approved for JERREL F; Director (or Composite lowing the there Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure Approved for Director (or LEY WORDS (Continue on recent the theorem Composite State in access Weibull Theory Composite Materials Failure Probability of failure Approved for pre- subjected to failure under tributions. The specific equations for these failur laminated composite and side	ase: distribution ase: distribution antered in Black 20, il different inter- SUESS, Captain, US <u>CInformation</u> Weibull distribut Failure Stress Failure Stress and identify by Mlack number ion of the three p edicting fracture r both uniform and forms of the three public for the three construction of the	unlimited Report I AW AFR 190-17 SAF ution function parameter Weibull dis- in a composite material d nonuniform stress dis- ee parameter Weibull ved for a general special case of a uni-

and the second second

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE INNon Dole Entered!

ŧ

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

The resulting expressions and methodology are applied to experimental bending, tension and three-point loading failure data for O-degree and 90-degree unidirectionally laminated graphite-epoxy specimen. Weibull parameter sets are derived from both the bending and tension experimental data. Each set is then used to evaluate the theory's ability to predict the probability of failure throughout the three failure modes and thereby to establish a single set characteristic of the material. Although a set of parameters peculiar to each failure distribution was obtained, a characteristic set of values capable of predicting failure across the variety of failure modes was not found for this composite material.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(Then Date Entered)