

**BEHAVIOUR OF FIBRE-REINFORCED CONCRETE  
STRUCTURES UNDER SEISMIC LOADING**

A thesis submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy of the  
Imperial College London

by

**Sharifah Maszura Binti Syed Mohsin**

Structures Section  
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering  
Imperial College London

April 2012

PERPUSTAKAAN UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG	
No. Perolehan 067358	No. Panggilan TA 444 .M37 2012 rs. Thesis
Tarikh 11 OCT 2012	

**ABSTRACT**

The present research is concerned with the modelling of the structural behaviour of steel fibre-reinforced concrete (SFRC) using non-linear finite-element (FE) analysis. Key structural response indicators such as load-deflection curves, strength, stiffness, ductility, energy absorption and cracking were examined. In particular, the potential for fibres to substitute for a reduction in conventional transverse reinforcement was studied. Such reduction is highly desirable in practice as it helps alleviate reinforcement congestion, often experienced in the seismic detailing of critical regions such as beam-column joints. Thus two key parameters were considered, namely reducing transverse reinforcement while increasing the amount of fibres. The reduction in conventional reinforcement was achieved mainly by increasing stirrups spacing (and also by reducing double-hoop arrangement commonly used in seismic detailing of joints).

The behaviour of SFRC structural elements was studied under both monotonic and reversed-cyclic loadings (the latter used to mimic seismic action). Emphasis was initially focused on the study of available experimental data describing the effect of steel fibres on the post-cracking response of concrete. Consequently the SFRC constitutive model proposed by Lok and Xiao (1999) was selected. The numerical model was calibrated against existing experimental data to ensure the reliability of the FE predictions. Subsequently, further analyses were carried out investigating three main case studies namely, simply supported beams, two-span continuous (i.e. statically-indeterminate) columns, and both exterior and interior beam-column joints. Parametric studies were carried out covering the full practical range of steel fibre dosages and appropriate amounts of reduction in conventional transverse reinforcement. The results show that steel fibres increase the load-carrying capacity and stiffness (thus enhancing response at both the serviceability and ultimate limit states, which are important design considerations). Fibres were found also to improve ductility (as well as altering the mode of failure from a brittle to a ductile one).

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>ABSTRACT</b>	4
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	5
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	15
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	35
<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>	40
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES</b>	46
<b>1.1 Research background</b>	46
<b>1.2 Problem statement</b>	47
<b>1.3 Research aim, objectives and scope</b>	49
<b>1.4 Thesis outline</b>	51
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	53
<b>2.1 Introduction</b>	53
<b>2.2 Overview of fibres</b>	54
2.2.1 Basic properties and characteristics of SFRC	54
2.2.2 Behaviour of SFRC	56
2.2.3 Crack propagation	57
<b>2.3 Constitutive models for SFRC</b>	60
2.3.1 RILEM TC 162-TDF Recommendations for SFRC	60
2.3.2 Lim et al. (1987) proposed SFRC model	65
2.3.3 Murugappan et al. (1994) proposed SFRC model	67
2.3.4 Lok and Pei (1998) proposed SFRC model	68
2.3.5 Lok and Xiao (1999) proposed SFRC model	71
2.3.6 Barros and Figueiras (1999) proposed SFRC model	72
2.3.7 Barros and Figueiras (2001) proposed SFRC model	74
2.3.8 Barros et al. (2005) proposed SFRC model	75
2.3.9 Tlemat <sup>a,b,c</sup> et al. (2006) proposed SFRC model	76

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>2.4 Experimental investigation for SFRC under static loading</b>	78
2.4.1 Monotonic loading	78
2.4.1.1 <i>SFRC at the material level</i>	78
2.4.1.2 <i>At the structural level</i>	80
2.4.2 Reversed-cyclic loading	84
<b>2.5 Experimental investigation for SFRC under seismic loading</b>	86
<b>2.6 Summary</b>	88
<b>CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY: NON-LINEAR FE ANALYSIS OF SFRC STRUCTURES</b>	91
<b>3.1 Introduction</b>	91
<b>3.2 Constitutive models for SFRC</b>	91
3.2.1 Background	91
3.2.2 Tension model	92
3.2.3 Compression model	93
3.2.4 Conclusions on SFRC constitutive models	93
<b>3.3 Review of material models in ABAQUS software</b>	94
3.3.1 Concrete models available in ABAQUS	95
3.3.1.1 <i>Smearred cracking concrete model</i>	96
3.3.1.2 <i>Brittle cracking concrete model</i>	98
3.3.1.3 <i>Damaged plasticity concrete model</i>	100
3.3.1.4 <i>Concrete model selection</i>	102
3.3.2 Steel model	103
3.3.3 Analysis procedure	104
3.3.3.1 <i>Analysis modules</i>	104
3.3.3.2 <i>Model definition</i>	105
3.3.4 Failure criterion	106
<b>3.4 Seismic design considerations</b>	107
<b>3.5 Scope of case/parametric studies</b>	109
3.5.1 Case study 1: Simply supported beams under monotonic and cyclic loading	110
3.5.2 Case study 2: Two-span continuous columns under monotonic and cyclic loading	111

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

3.5.3 Case study 3: Beam-column joints under cyclic loading	112
<b>3.6 Summary</b>	113
<b>CHAPTER 4: CASE STUDY 1: SIMPLY SUPPORTED BEAMS UNDER MONOTONIC AND REVERSED-CYCLIC LOADING</b>	114
<b>4.1 Introduction</b>	114
<b>4.2 Case Study 1(a): Calibration with Campione and Mangiavillano (2008) tests</b>	115
4.2.1 Results for beams under monotonic loading (Case Study 1(a)-M)	117
4.2.2 Results for beam under reversed-cyclic loading (Case Study 1(a)-C)	118
<b>4.3 Case Study 1(a)-M: Parametric study on simply supported beams under monotonic loading</b>	120
4.3.1 Load-deflection curves	121
4.3.2 Strength	121
4.3.3 Ductility	127
4.3.4 Cracking pattern	127
4.3.4.1 <i>Principal strain contours</i>	128
4.3.4.2 <i>Principal strain vectors</i>	130
4.3.4.3 <i>Deflected shapes</i>	132
4.3.5 Comparative study with control specimen using non-dimensional ratios	133
4.3.5.1 <i>Strength ratio</i>	134
4.3.5.2 <i>Ductility ratio</i>	135
4.3.5.3 <i>Energy absorption ratio</i>	136
4.3.6 Comparison between FE-based predictions and design calculations	136
<b>4.4 Case Study 1(a)-C: Parametric study on simply supported beams under reversed-cyclic loading</b>	138
4.4.1 Load-deflection curves	139
4.4.2 Strength	139
4.4.3 Ductility	145
4.4.4 Cracking pattern	145
4.4.4.1 <i>Principal strain contours</i>	145
4.4.4.2 <i>Principal strain vectors</i>	148

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

4.4.4.3 <i>Deflected shapes</i>	150
4.4.5 Comparative study with control specimen using non-dimensional ratios	151
4.4.5.1 <i>Strength ratio</i>	151
4.4.5.2 <i>Ductility ratio</i>	152
4.4.5.3 <i>Energy absorption ratio</i>	152
4.4.5.4 <i>Number of cycles ratio</i>	153
4.5 <b>Case Study 1(b): Calibration with Campione et al. (2006) experimental work</b>	154
4.6 <b>Case Study 1(b): Parametric study on shear failure of simply supported beams under monotonic loading</b>	158
4.6.1 Load-deflection curves	159
4.6.2 Strength	159
4.6.3 Ductility	162
4.6.4 Cracking patterns	163
4.6.4.1 <i>Principal strain contours</i>	163
4.6.4.2 <i>Principal strain vectors</i>	166
4.6.4.3 <i>Deflected shapes</i>	167
4.6.5 Comparative study with control specimen using non-dimensional ratios	169
4.6.5.1 <i>Strength ratio</i>	169
4.6.5.2 <i>Ductility ratio</i>	170
4.6.5.3 <i>Energy absorption</i>	171
4.6.6 Comparison between FE-based predictions and design calculations	172
4.7 <b>Conclusions</b>	174
<b>CHAPTER 5: CASE STUDY 2: TWO-SPAN CONTINUOUS SFRC COLUMN UNDER MONOTONIC AND REVERSED-CYCLIC LOADING</b>	177
<b>5.1 Introduction</b>	177
<b>5.2 Calibration with experimental data</b>	178
5.2.1 Results for column under monotonic loading	181
5.2.2 Results for column under reversed-cyclic loading	183

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>5.3 Case Study 2(a): Parametric study of SFRC column under monotonic loading</b>	186
5.3.1 Strength	187
5.3.2 Ductility	189
5.3.3 Cracking pattern	193
5.3.3.1 Principal strain contours	194
5.3.3.2 Principal strain vectors	196
5.3.3.3 Deflected shapes	197
5.3.4 Comparative study with control specimen using non-dimensional ratios	198
5.3.4.1 Strength ratio	198
5.3.4.2 Ductility ratio	200
5.3.4.3 Energy absorption ratio	201
5.3.5 Comparison between FE results and analytical calculation	203
<b>5.4 Case Study 2(b): Parametric study analysed under combined axial force and reversed-cyclic loading</b>	205
5.4.1 Strength	205
5.4.2 Ductility	208
5.4.3 Cracking pattern	210
5.4.3.1 Principal strain contours	211
5.4.3.2 Principal strain vectors	213
5.4.3.3 Deflected shapes	214
5.4.4 Comparative study with control specimen using non-dimensional ratios	215
5.4.4.1 Strength ratio	215
5.4.4.2 Ductility ratio	216
5.4.4.3 Energy absorption ratio	217
5.4.4.4 Number of cycles analysed ratio	218
<b>5.5 Conclusions</b>	218
<b>CHAPTER 6: CASE STUDY 3: BEAM-COLUMN JOINTS UNDER REVERSED-CYCLIC LOADING</b>	220
6.1 Introduction	220

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>6.2 Case Study 3(a): Exterior beam-column joint - Calibration with experimental data (Bayasi and Gebman, 2002)</b>	221
6.2.1 Experimental setup	221
6.2.2 FE analysis input data	222
6.2.3 Results of calibration work	224
<b>6.3 Case Study 3(a): Parametric study on exterior beam-column joint under reversed-cyclic loading</b>	226
6.3.1 Load-deflection curves	227
6.3.2 Strength	227
6.3.3 Ductility	232
6.3.4 Cracking pattern	236
6.3.4.1 <i>Principal stress contours</i>	236
6.3.4.2 <i>Principal strain contours</i>	239
6.3.4.3 <i>Principal strain vectors</i>	241
6.3.4.4 <i>Deflected shapes</i>	242
6.3.5 Comparative study with control specimen using non-dimensional ratio	244
6.3.5.1 <i>Strength ratio</i>	244
6.3.5.2 <i>Ductility ratio</i>	245
6.3.5.3 <i>Energy absorption ratio</i>	246
6.3.5.4 <i>Number of the cycles ratio</i>	247
<b>6.4 Case Study 3(b): Interior beam-column joint - Calibration with experimental data (Filiatrault et al, 1995)</b>	248
6.4.1 Experimental setup	248
6.4.2 FE analysis input data	251
6.4.3 Results of calibration work	253
<b>6.5 Case Study 3(b): Parametric study on interior beam-column joint under reversed-cyclic loading</b>	259
6.5.1 Storey shear-drift curves	261
6.5.2 Strength	266
6.5.3 Ductility	266
6.5.4 Cracking pattern	269
6.5.4.1 <i>Principal stress contours</i>	269

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

6.5.4.2 <i>Principal strain contours</i>	272
6.5.4.3 <i>Principal strain vectors</i>	274
6.5.4.4 <i>Deflected shapes</i>	275
6.5.5 Comparative study with control specimen using non-dimensional ratios	276
6.5.5.1 <i>Strength ratio</i>	277
6.5.5.2 <i>Ductility ratio</i>	278
6.5.5.3 <i>Energy absorption ratio</i>	279
6.5.5.4 <i>Number of cycles</i>	280
<b>6.6 Conclusions</b>	280
<b>CHAPTER 7: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DESIGN</b>	283
7.1 Introduction	283
7.2 Case Study 1: Simply-supported beams	284
7.3 Case Study 2: Two-span continuous columns	288
7.4 Case Study 3: Beam-column joints	290
7.5 Summary of design recommendations	293
<b>CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	294
8.1 Summary of research work	294
8.2 Summary of conclusions	296
8.3 Recommendations for future work	299
<b>REFERENCES</b>	302
<b>APPENDIX A: MODEL CALIBRATION WORK</b>	310
A.1 Background	310
A.2 Ductile failure: Hughes and Speirs (1982)	311
A.2.1 Experimental data and analysis procedure	311
A.2.2 Discussion of ABAQUS simulation results	312
A.3 Brittle failure: Bresler and Scordelis (1963)	312
A.3.1 Experimental data and analysis procedure	312
A.3.2 Discussion of ABAQUS simulation results	313

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>A.4 Three-point bending test (tensile failure): Barros et al (2005)</b>	314
A.4.1 Experimental data and analysis procedure	314
A.4.2 Discussion of ABAQUS simulation results	315
<b>A.5 Four-point bending test (tensile failure): Tlemat<sup>a,b</sup> et al (2006)</b>	317
A.5.1 Experimental data and analysis procedure	317
A.5.2 Discussion of ABAQUS simulation results	319
<b>A.6 Three-point bending test (tensile failure): Barros and Figueiras (1999)</b>	321
A.6.1 Experimental data and analysis procedure	321
A.6.1 Discussion of ABAQUS simulation results	323
<b>A.7 Four-point bending test (tensile failure): Trottier and Banthia (1994)</b>	324
A.7.1 Experimental data and analysis procedure	324
A.7.2 Discussion of ABAQUS Simulation Results	325
<b>A.8 Four-point bending test: Cho and Kim (2003)</b>	326
A.8.1 Experimental data and analysis procedure	326
A.8.2 Discussion of ABAQUS simulation results	328
<b>A.9 Four-point bending test: Oh et al (1998)</b>	329
A.9.1 Experimental data and analysis procedure	329
A.9.2 Discussion of ABAQUS simulation results	331
<b>A.10 Four-point bending test: Sharma (1986)</b>	332
A.10.1 Experimental data and analysis procedure	332
A.10.2 Discussion of ABAQUS simulation results	333
<b>A.11 Conclusions</b>	334
<b>APPENDIX B: DESIGN CALCULATION</b>	335
<b>B.1 Shear capacity</b>	335
<b>B.2. Bending moment capacity</b>	338

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1.1: Examples of the shapes available for steel fibres	47
Figure 2.1: Types of steel fibres (adapted from Concrete Society, 2007)	55
Figure 2.2: Relationship between (a) Moment-curvature response and (b) Tensile stress-strain behaviour (adapted from Lok and Xiao, 1999)	57
Figure 2.3: Schematic representation of changes in crack geometry and stress fields associated with crack extension (adapted from Kotsovos & Pavlović, 1995)	58
Figure 2.4: The principle of single and multiple cracking. The specimens are loaded in uniaxial tension and the schematic load versus deformation ( $P-\delta$ ) relationship is shown together with the cracking pattern (a) single cracking (or tension softening) (b) multiple cracking (or strain hardening) (adapted from RILEM TC 162-TDF, 2002)	59
Figure 2.5: Stress distribution for SFRC sections (adapted from Tlemat et al, 2006)	59
Figure 2.6: Arrangement for standard bending test on small notched beams (adopted from RILEM TC 162-TDF <sup>c</sup> Recommendation, 2003)	61
Figure 2.7: Load-deflection diagram (adapted from RILEM TC 162-TDF Recommendation, 2000)	61
2.8: Stress-strain diagram (RILEM TC 162-TDF Recommendation, 2000)	62
Figure 2.9: Stress-strain diagram and size factor, $\kappa_h$ (adapted from RILEM TC 162-TDF <sup>a</sup> Recommendation, 2003)	63
Figure 2.10: Geometry and loading of the bending test (adapted from RILEM TC 162-TDF <sup>c</sup> Recommendation, 2003)	65
Figure 2.11: Load – CMOD diagram (RILEM TC 162-TDF <sup>a</sup> Recommendation, 2003)	65
Figure 2.12: Composite stress-strain relations in tension (Lim et al., 1987)	66
Figure 2.13: Composite stress-strain relations in tension (Murugappan et al, 1994)	67
Figure 2.14: Compressive stress-strain relationship for SFRC (Lok and Pei, 1998)	68
Figure 2.15: Tensile stress-strain relationship for SFRC (Lok and Pei, 1998)	69

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

Figure 2.16: Constitutive stress-strain relationship (Lok and Xiao, 1999)	71
Figure 2.17: Compression stress-strain diagram (Barros and Figueiras, 1999)	73
Figure 2.18: Tensile stress-strain diagram (Barros and Figueiras, 1999)	74
Figure 2.19: Tri-linear softening diagram for hooked-ends SFRC (Barros and Figueiras, 2001)	75
Figure 2.20: Proposed uni-axial tensile stress-strain model for mesh 25 mm (Tlemat <sup>b</sup> et al., 2006)	77
Figure 2.21: Proposed uni-axial tensile stress-strain model (Tlemat <sup>c</sup> et. al, 2006)	78
Figure 3.1: Uniaxial behaviour of plain concrete (adapted from ABAQUS, 2007)	96
Figure 3.2: Tension stiffening model (adapted from ABAQUS, 2007)	96
Figure 3.3: Yield and failure surface in plane stress (adapted from ABAQUS, 2007)	97
Figure 3.4: Shear retention model (adapted from ABAQUS, 2007)	98
Figure 3.5: Rankine criterion in plane stress (adapted from ABAQUS, 2007)	99
Figure 3.6: Post-failure stress-strain curve. (adapted from ABAQUS, 2007)	99
Figure 3.7: Piece-wise linear form of the shear retention model (adapted from ABAQUS, 2007)	100
Figure 3.8: Illustration of the definition of the cracking strain ( $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i^{ck}$ ) used for the definition of tension stiffening data (adapted from ABAQUS, 2007)	100
Figure 3.9: Definition of the compressive inelastic (or crushing) strain ( $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i^{in}$ ) used for the definition of compression hardening data (adapted from ABAQUS, 2007)	101
Figure 3.10: Uni-axial load cycle (tension-compression-tension) assuming default values for the stiffness recovery factors: $w_t = 0$ and $w_c = 1$ (adapted from ABAQUS, 2007)	101
Figure 3.11: Stress-strain relations for steel material	103
Figure 3.12: RC beam modelled using stringer reinforcement (adapted from ABAQUS, 2007)	104
Figure 3.13: Example of boundary conditions for one quarter of a notched beam in (a) 2D and (b) 3D models	105
Figure 3.14: Example of FE mesh refinement sizes for 2D model for (a) fine, (b)	106

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

medium and (c) coarse meshes	
Figure 3.15: Capacity design for unbraced frames: (a) overall view and (b) forces at a beam-column joint, axial forces not shown (adapted from Booth and Key, 2006)	107
Figure 3.16: Simply supported beams case	110
Figure 3.17: Two-span continuous column case	111
Figure 3.18: Beam-column joint case showing (a) exterior and (b) interior joints	112
Figure 4.1: Dimensions and loading arrangement of the beams (adapted from Campione and Mangiavillano, 2008)	115
Figure 4.2: Quarter of the beam modelled in ABAQUS with defined boundary condition along symmetrical (a) front and (b) side views; and (c) FE mesh	116
Figure 4.3: Tensile stress-strain diagram adopted for calibration work of Campione and Mangiavillano (2008) beams	116
Figure 4.4: Loading histories input for (a) monotonic and (b) reversed-cyclic loading	117
Figure 4.5: Load-deflection curves for calibration work in Case Study 1(a)-M	117
Figure 4.6: Kinetic energy plots to determine failure for beams analysed under monotonic loading in Case Study 1(a)-M	118
Figure 4.7: Load-deflection hysteresis loops for calibration work in Case Study 1(a)-C	119
Figure 4.8: Kinetic energy plots to determine failure for beams analysed under monotonic loading in Case Study 1(a)-C	119
Figure 4.9: Tensile stress-strain relations for Case Study 1(a) for different fibre volume fractions ( $V_f$ )	120
Figure 4.10: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-M beams with $SI = 0\%$	122
Figure 4.11: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-M beams with $SI = 50\%$	122
Figure 4.12: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-M beams with $SI = 100\%$	122
Figure 4.13: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-M beams with $SI = 200\%$	123
Figure 4.14: Tensile strain in concrete at the mid-span crack opening region at the bottom of the beam ( $\varepsilon_{c,c}$ ) for Case Study 1 (a)-M with $SI = 50\%$	125
Figure 4.15: Tensile strain in steel bar at the mid-span crack opening region at the bottom of the beam ( $\varepsilon_{b,s}$ ) for Case Study 1 (a)-M beam with $SI = 50\%$	125

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

Figure 4.16: Load-deflection curve for Case Study 1 (a) series $SI = 50\%$ (shown up to a deflection of 4 mm)	126
Figure 4.17: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 0\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	128
Figure 4.18: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 50\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	129
Figure 4.19: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 100\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	129
Figure 4.20: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 200\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	130
Figure 4.21: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 0\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	130
Figure 4.22: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 50\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	131
Figure 4.23: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 100\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	131
Figure 4.24: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 200\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	131
Figure 4.25: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 0\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	132
Figure 4.26: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 50\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	132
Figure 4.27: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 100\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	133
Figure 4.28: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(a)-M with $SI = 200\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	133
Figure 4.29: Ratio of maximum load to that of the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction graph for Case Study 1(a)-M	134
Figure 4.30: Ratio of yield load to that of the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ )	134

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

versus steel fibre volume fraction graph for Case Study 1(a)-M	
Figure 4.31: Ratio of ductility ratio to that of the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction graph for Case Study 1(a)-M	134
Figure 4.32: Ratio of energy absorption to that of the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction graph for Case Study 1(a)-M	136
Figure 4.33: The loading condition, bending moment (M) and shear force (V) diagram from Case Study 1(a)	136
Figure 4.34: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-C for beams with $SI = 0\%$	139
Figure 4.35: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-C for beams with $SI = 50\%$	140
Figure 4.36: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-C for beams with $SI = 100\%$	140
Figure 4.37: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-C for beams with $SI = 200\%$	140
Figure 4.38: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	141
Figure 4.39: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	142
Figure 4.40: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 100\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	143
Figure 4.41: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 200\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	144
Figure 4.42: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	146
Figure 4.43: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	146
Figure 4.44: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 100\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	147
Figure 4.45: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 200\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	147
Figure 4.46: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 0\%$ and	148

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

(a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	
Figure 4.47: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 50\%$	149
and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	
Figure 4.48: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 100\%$	149
and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	
Figure 4.49: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 200\%$	149
and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	
Figure 4.50: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 0\%$ and (a)	150
$V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	
Figure 4.51: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 50\%$ and (a)	150
$V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	
Figure 4.52: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 100\%$ and (a)	150
$V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	
Figure 4.53: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(a)-C beams with $SI = 200\%$ and (a)	151
$V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	
Figure 4.54: Ratio between the maximum load of each beam and that of the control	151
specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction for Case Study	
1(a)-C	
Figure 4.55: Ratio between the ductility ratio of each beam and that of the control	152
specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction for Case Study	
1(a)-C	
Figure 4.56: Ratio between the energy absorption of each beam and that of the	153
control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction for Case	
Study 1(a)-C	
Figure 4.57: Ratio between the maximum number of cycles obtained before failure	154
of each beam and that of the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre	
volume fraction for Case Study 1(a)-C	
Figure 4.58: Dimensions, loading arrangement and reinforcement detailing of the	154
beams (adapted Campione et al, 2006)	
Figure 4.59: Symmetrical half of the beam modelled using ABAQUS with (a)	155

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

defined boundary conditions at middle-side view (plane of symmetry) and (b) FE mesh	
Figure 4.60: Load history input data for Case Study 1(b)	155
Figure 4.61: Tensile stress-strain diagram adopted for calibration work of Campione et al. (2006) beams	156
Figure 4.62: Calibration results for Case Study 1(b) for beams (a) with stirrups (i.e. S) and (b) without stirrups (i.e. NS) analysed under monotonic loading	156
Figure 4.63: Kinetic energy plots to determine failure for calibration work in Case Study 1(b)	157
Figure 4.64: Stress-strain relations in tension for parametric studies of Case Study 1(b)	158
Figure 4.65: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(b) with $SI = 0\%$	160
Figure 4.66: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(b) with $SI = 50\%$	160
Figure 4.67: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(b) with $SI = 100\%$	160
Figure 4.68: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 1(b) with no stirrups (NS)	161
Figure 4.69: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(b) beams with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	164
Figure 4.70: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(b) beams with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	164
Figure 4.71: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(b) beams with $SI = 100\%$ and ((a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	165
Figure 4.72: Principal strain contours for Case Study 1(b) beams with no stirrups (NS) and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	165
Figure 4.73: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(b) beams with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	166
Figure 4.74: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(b) beams with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	167
Figure 4.75: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(b) beams with $SI = 100\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	167
Figure 4.76: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 1(b) beams with no stirrups (NS)	167

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	
Figure 4.77: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(b) beams with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	168
Figure 4.78: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(b) beams with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	168
Figure 4.79: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(b) beams with $SI = 100\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	168
Figure 4.80: Deflected shapes for Case Study 1(b) beams with no stirrups ( $NS$ ) and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	168
Figure 4.81: Ratio between the maximum load and that in the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction for Case Study 1(b)	169
Figure 4.82: Ratio between the yield load and that in the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction for Case Study 1(b)	170
Figure 4.83: Ratio between the ductility ratio in each beam and that in the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction for Case Study 1(b)	170
Figure 4.84: Ratio between the energy absorption in each column and that in the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume ratio for Case Study 1(b)	171
Figure 4.85: Shear force ( $V$ ) and bending moment ( $M$ ) diagrams for Case Study 1(b)	172
Figure 5.1: Dimensions, loading arrangement and reinforcement detailing of the column (adapted from Kotsovos et al, 2007)	178
Figure 5.2: (a) constant axial force and (b) monotonic loading	179
Figure 5.3: (a) constant axial force and (b) reversed-cyclic loading	179
Figure 5.4: Symmetrical half of the column modelled in FE model in ABAQUS	180
Figure 5.5: Tensile stress-strain diagram adopted for calibration work of Kotsovos et al (2007) SFRC columns	180
Figure 5.6: Calibration results comparison for the column analysed under monotonic loading	181
Figure 5.7: Kinetic energy plots to determine failure for the column analysed under	182

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

monotonic loading	
Figure 5.8: Principal (a) stress and (b) strain contour distribution, (c) principal strain direction distribution and (d) deformation shape of the column analysed under monotonic loading	183
Figure 5.9: Calibration results comparison for the column analysed under reversed-cyclic loading	184
Figure 5.10: Kinetic energy figure to determine failure under reversed-cyclic loading	185
Figure 5.11: Principal (a) stress and (b) strain contours, (c) principal strain vectors and (d) deflected shape for the column analysed under monotonic loading	185
Figure 5.12: Tensile stress-strain relations for Case Study 2 for different fibre volume fractions ( $V_f$ )	186
Figure 5.13: Load-deflection curve for Case Study 2(a) column with $SI = 0\%$	188
Figure 5.14: Load-deflection curve for Case Study 2(a) column with $SI = 50\%$	188
Figure 5.15: Load-deflection curve for Case Study 2(a) column with $SI = 100\%$	188
Figure 5.16: Principal strain contours and vectors for Case Study 2(a) column with $SI = 0\%$ at $\delta_y = 9.3 \text{ mm}$ for: (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , and (c) $V_f = 2.5\%$	191
Figure 5.17: Principal strain contours and vectors for Case Study 2(a) column with $SI = 0\%$ at $\delta_{max} = 34.2 \text{ mm}$ for: (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , and (c) $V_f = 2.5\%$	192
Figure 5.18: Principal strain contours and vectors for Case Study 2(a) column with $SI = 0\%$ at $V_f = 39.4 \text{ mm}$ for: (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , and (c) $V_f = 2.5\%$	193
Figure 5.19: Principal strain contours for Case Study 2(a) column with $SI = 0\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	194
Figure 5.20: Principal strain contours for Case Study 2(a) column with $SI = 50\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	195
Figure 5.21: Principal strain contours for Case Study 2(a) column with $SI = 100\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	195
Figure 5.22: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 2(a) column with $SI = 0\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	196
Figure 5.23: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 2(a) column with $SI = 50\%$ for (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	196

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

$V_f = 2.5\%$

Figure 5.39: Load-deflection curve for Case Study 2(b) column with  $SI = 50\%$  for each fibre fraction: (a)  $V_f = 0\%$ , (b)  $V_f = 1\%$ , (c)  $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d)  $V_f = 2\%$  and (e)  $V_f = 2.5\%$  208

Figure 5.40: Load-deflection curve for Case Study 2(b) column with  $SI = 100\%$  for each fibre fraction: (a)  $V_f = 0\%$ , (b)  $V_f = 1\%$ , (c)  $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d)  $V_f = 2\%$  and (e)  $V_f = 2.5\%$  209

Figure 5.41: Principal strain contours for Case Study 2(b) column with  $SI = 0\%$  for (a)  $V_f = 0\%$ , (b)  $V_f = 1\%$ , (c)  $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d)  $V_f = 2\%$  and (e)  $V_f = 2.5\%$  211

Figure 5.42: Principal strain contours for Case Study 2(b) column with  $SI = 50\%$  for (a)  $V_f = 0\%$ , (b)  $V_f = 1\%$ , (c)  $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d)  $V_f = 2\%$  and (e)  $V_f = 2.5\%$  212

Figure 5.43: Principal strain contours for Case Study 2(b) column with  $SI = 100\%$  for (a)  $V_f = 0\%$ , (b)  $V_f = 1\%$ , (c)  $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d)  $V_f = 2\%$  and (e)  $V_f = 2.5\%$  212

Figure 5.44: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 2(b) column with  $SI = 0\%$  for (a)  $V_f = 0\%$ , (b)  $V_f = 1\%$ , (c)  $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d)  $V_f = 2\%$  and (e)  $V_f = 2.5\%$  214

Figure 5.45: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 2(b) column with  $SI = 50\%$  for (a)  $V_f = 0\%$ , (b)  $V_f = 1\%$ , (c)  $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d)  $V_f = 2\%$  and (e)  $V_f = 2.5\%$  214

Figure 5.46: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 2(b) column with  $SI = 100\%$  for (a)  $V_f = 0\%$ , (b)  $V_f = 1\%$ , (c)  $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d)  $V_f = 2\%$  and (e)  $V_f = 2.5\%$  214

Figure 5.47: Deflected shapes for Case Study 2(b) column with  $SI = 0\%$  for (a)  $V_f = 0\%$ , (b)  $V_f = 1\%$ , (c)  $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d)  $V_f = 2\%$  and (e)  $V_f = 2.5\%$  215

Figure 5.48: Deflected shapes for Case Study 2(b) column with  $SI = 50\%$  for (a)  $V_f = 0\%$ , (b)  $V_f = 1\%$ , (c)  $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d)  $V_f = 2\%$  and (e)  $V_f = 2.5\%$  215

Figure 5.49: Deflected shapes for Case Study 2(b) column with  $SI = 100\%$  for (a)  $V_f = 0\%$ , (b)  $V_f = 1\%$ , (c)  $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d)  $V_f = 2\%$  and (e)  $V_f = 2.5\%$  215

Figure 5.50: Ratio between the maximum load and that in the control column ( $SI = 0\%$ ,  $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction graph for Case Study 2(b) 216

Figure 5.51: Ratio between the ductility ratio in each column and that in the control column ( $SI = 0\%$ ,  $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction graph for Case 216

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

Study 2(b)	
Figure 5.52: Ratio between the energy absorption in each column and that in the control column ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction graph for Case Study 2(b)	218
Figure 5.53: Ratio between the maximum number of cycles before failure in each column and that in the control column ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus steel fibre volume fraction graph for Case Study 2(b)	218
Figure 6.1: Dimensions and steel reinforcement details for (a) full-scale and (b) $\frac{1}{2}$ - scale exterior beam-column joint (adopted from Bayasi and Gebman, 2002)	222
Figure 6.2: Tensile stress-stain diagram for SFRC adopted for the calibration work of the Bayasi and Gebman (2002) beam-column joints	222
Figure 6.3: Stress-stain diagram for conventional steel reinforcement adopted for the calibration work of the Bayasi and Gebman (2002) beam-column joints	223
Figure 6.4: ABAQUS input data for reversed-cyclic loading	223
Figure 6.5: Load-deflection hysteresis loops for calibration work in Case Study 3(a)	224
Figure 6.6: Kinetic energy graph for calibration work in Case Study 3(a)	225
Figure 6.7: Stress-strain relations in tension for Case Study 3(a)	226
Figure 6.8: Load-deflection curve for Case Study 3(a) for specimens with $SI = 0\%$	228
Figure 6.9: Load-deflection curve for Case Study 3(a) for specimens with $SI = 50\%$	228
Figure 6.10: Load-deflection curves for Case Study 3(a) for specimens with $SI = 100\%$	228
Figure 6.11: Load-deflection curve for Case Study 3(a) for specimens with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	229
Figure 6.12: Load-deflection curve for Case Study 3(a) for specimens with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	230
Figure 6.13: Load-deflection curve for Case Study 3(a) for specimens with $SI = 100\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	231
Figure 6.14: Principal strain contours and vectors for exterior joints with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 2\%$ at $\delta_y = 6.25 \text{ mm}$	234

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

Figure 6.15: Principal strain contours and vectors for exterior joints with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 2\%$ at $\delta_2 = 12.5 \text{ mm}$	234
Figure 6.16: Principal strain contours and vectors for exterior joints with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 2\%$ taken at $\delta_3 = 24.9 \text{ mm}$	235
Figure 6.17: Principal strain contours and vectors for exterior joints with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 1\%$ at $\delta_4 = 49.9 \text{ mm}$	235
Figure 6.18: Principal stress contours for Case Study 3(a) joints with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	237
Figure 6.19: Principal stress contours for Case Study (a) joints with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	237
Figure 6.20: Principal stress contours for Case Study 3(a) joints with $SI = 100\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	238
Figure 6.21: Principal strain contours for Case Study 3(a) joints with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	239
Figure 6.22: Principal strain contours for Case Study 3(a) joints with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	240
Figure 6.23: Principal strain contours for Case Study 3(a) joints with $SI = 100\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	240
Figure 6.24: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 3(a) joints with $SI = 0\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	241
Figure 6.25: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 3(a) joints with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	242
Figure 6.26: Principal strain vectors for Case Study 3(a) joints with $SI = 100\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	242
Figure 6.27: Deflected shapes for Case Study 3(a) joints with $SI = 0\%$ and ((a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	243
Figure 6.28: Deflected shapes for Case Study 3(a) joints with $SI = 50\%$ and ((a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	243
Figure 6.29: Deflected shapes for Case Study 3(a) joints with $SI = 100\%$ and (a)	243

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

Figure 6.48: Principal (a) stress contour, (b) strain contour, (c) strain vectors and (d) deflected shape for Specimen S1	257
Figure 6.49: Principal (a) stress contour, (b) strain contour, (c) strain vectors and (d) deflected shape for Specimen S2	258
Figure 6.50: Principal (a) stress contour, (b) strain contour, (c) strain vectors and (d) deflected shape for Specimen S3	258
Figure 6.51: Stress-strain relations in tension for the Case Study 3(b)	260
Figure 6.52: ABAQUS history input for the parametric study in the Case Study 3(b)	261
Figure 6.53: Storey shear-drift curve for Case Study 3(b) joints with single stirrups	262
Figure 6.54 Storey shear-drift curve for Case Study 3(b) joints with $SI = 50\%$	262
Figure 6.55: Storey shear-drift curve for Case Study 3(b) joints with $SI = 100\%$	262
Figure 6.56: Storey shear-drift curve for Case Study 3(b) joints with single stirrups and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	263
Figure 6.57: Storey shear-drift curve for Case Study 3(b) joints with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	264
Figure 6.58: Storey shear-drift curve for Case Study 3(b) joints with $SI = 100\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	265
Figure 6.59: Principal strain contour and vectors for joints with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 2\%$ taken from storey drift at $\Delta_y = 28.6$ mm	267
Figure 6.60: Principal strain contour and vectors for joints with $SI = 50\%$ (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 2\%$ taken at $\Delta_{max} = 69.4$ mm	268
Figure 6.61: Principal strain contours and vectors for joints with $SI = 50\%$ and ((a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 2\%$ taken at $\Delta_u = 100.2$ mm	269
Figure 6.62: Principal stress contours for Case Study 3(b) joints with single stirrups and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	270
Figure 6.63: Principal stress contours for Case Study 3(b) joints with $SI = 50\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	271
Figure 6.64: Principal stress contours for Case Study 3(b) joints with $SI = 100\%$ and (a) $V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	271
Figure 6.65: Principal strain contours for Case Study 3(b) joints with single stirrups	272

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

$V_f = 0\%$ , (b) $V_f = 1\%$ , (c) $V_f = 1.5\%$ , (d) $V_f = 2\%$ and (e) $V_f = 2.5\%$	
Figure 6.30: Ratio of maximum load to that of the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus fibre volume fraction for Case Study 3(a)	244
Figure 6.31: Ratio of yield load to that of the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus fibre volume fraction for Case Study 3(a)	245
Figure 6.32: Ratio of ductility ratio to that of the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus fibre volume fraction for Case Study 3(a)	246
Figure 6.33: Ratio of energy absorption to that of the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus fibre volume fraction for Case Study 3(a)	247
Figure 6.34: Ratio of number of cycles to that of the control specimen ( $SI = 0\%$ , $V_f = 0\%$ ) versus fibre volume fraction for Case Study 3(a)	248
Figure 6.35: Prototype building (Adopted from Filiatrault et al, 1995)	248
Figure 6.36: Details of the beam-column joints showing (a) specimens S1 and S3, (b) specimen S2, (c) column cross-section and d) beam cross-section (adopted from Filiatrault et al, 1995)	249
Figure 6.37: Loading arrangement of in cyclic (left) and reversed cyclic (right) loading	250
Figure 6.38: Beam-column joint modelled using ABAQUS with boundary condition and reinforcement details for specimens (a) S1 and S3, (b) S2 and (c) mesh adopted	251
Figure 6.39: Tensile stress-strain diagram for plain and fibre-reinforced concrete adopted in the calibration work for Filiatrault et al (1995) beam-column joints	252
Figure 6.40: Stress-strain diagram for conventional steel reinforcement bars adopted in the calibration work for Filiatrault et al (1995) beam-column joints	252
Figure 6.41: ABAQUS history input for calibration work	253
Figure 6.42: Storey shear-storey drift curves comparison for Specimen S1	254
Figure 6.43: Storey shear-storey drift curves comparison for Specimen S2	254
Figure 6.44: Storey shear-storey drift curves comparison for Specimen S3	254
Figure 6.45: Kinetic energy graph for Specimen S1	256
Figure 6.46: Kinetic energy graph for Specimen S2	256
Figure 6.47: Kinetic energy graph for Specimen S3	256