

The University of Bradford Institutional Repository

<http://bradscholars.brad.ac.uk>

This work is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our Policy Document available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this work please visit the publisher's website. Available access to the published online version may require a subscription.

Link to original published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijimpeng.2005.05.003>

Citation: Badr, A., Ashour, A. F. and Platten, A. K. (2006) Statistical variations in impact resistance of polypropylene fibre-reinforced concrete. *International Journal of Impact Engineering*, Vol. 32, No. 11, pp. 1907-1920.

Copyright statement: © 2006 Elsevier. Reproduced in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.



Statistical variations in impact resistance of polypropylene fibre-reinforced concrete

Atef Badr^{a,*}, Ashraf F. Ashour^b and Andrew K. Platten^a

^aDepartment of Built Environment, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, PR1 2HE, UK

^bEDT1, School of Engineering, Design & Technology, University of Bradford, Bradford, BD7 1DP, UK

Abstract

Impact resistance of polypropylene fibre-reinforced concrete was investigated using the repeated drop weight impact test recommended by ACI Committee 544. The results were analysed based on a statistical approach. The variation in results was examined within the same batch and between different batches. Statistical parameters were compared with reported variations in impact resistance of concrete composites reinforced with other types of fibres such as carbon and steel fibres. Statistical analysis indicated that the results obtained from this test had large variations and it is necessary to increase the number of replications to at least 40 specimens per concrete mix to assure an error below 10%. It is concluded that this test with its current procedures and recommendations should not be considered a reliable impact test. This study has highlighted the need for modifying this test in such a way as that increases its accuracy and reduces the large variation in results.

Keywords: fibres; polypropylene; statistical variation; impact resistance.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +44-1772-893205; E-mail address: asmbadr@uclan.ac.uk

1. Introduction

The Utilisation of fibre reinforced concrete (FRC) in construction is rapidly expanding due to the potential economical and technical benefits. Most fibres, which are added to concrete, are man-made fibres and can be classified in two main categories: metallic such as steel or synthetic for example polypropylene. Although steel fibres are dominant in the field of fibre reinforced concrete, polypropylene fibre has proved to have a high efficiency in many practical applications [1-5].

Many deficiencies of plain concrete could be encountered by using fibre reinforcement. Polypropylene fibres are capable of improving the ductility of concrete by enhancing properties such as flexural toughness and impact resistance of concrete [6-7]. Polypropylene fibre reinforced concrete has impact resistance that compare favourably with those observed in concrete made with other commercially available fibres at higher dosage rates [8].

Several impact tests have been used to demonstrate the relative brittleness and impact resistance of concrete and similar construction materials [9-12]. However, none of these tests have ben declared to be a standard test due to the lack of statistical data on the variation of the results. In this regard, the ACI Committee 544 [13] has proposed a drop weight impact test to evaluate the impact resistance of fibre concrete. The test is widely used since it is simple and economical. However, the results obtained from this test are often noticeably scattered [14]. The variation in the impact resistance as determined from this test is reported in the literature for some types of FRC but not for polypropylene fibre reinforced concrete (PPFRC). Clearly, the type of fibres could have

a great effect on the variation of the results due to the difference of geometry and physical properties of fibres. The main objective of this paper is to investigate the statistical variation in the impact resistance of PPFRC using the ACI Committee 544 drop weight impact test and to compare it with the variations reported for other types of FRC. The objective was achieved by testing 40 specimens (2 batches x 20 specimens) of PPFRC against impact loading according to the ACI Committee 544 drop-weight impact test. The results were subjected to comprehensive statistical analysis. Compressive strength tests were also conducted on cubes as a means of quality control.

2. Materials, mix proportions and sample preparation

2.1. Materials

Ordinary Portland cement (OPC) conforming to BS 12: 1996, was used in this study. The Chemical composition of the cement, as given by the supplier, is presented in Table 1. The coarse aggregate was quartzite natural gravel of 10-mm nominal maximum size. It has a specific gravity of 2.63 and bulk density of 1588 kg/m³. The fine aggregate was quartzite sand with a specific gravity and water absorption of 2.66 and 0.17 percent, respectively. Sieve analysis of this sand showed that it has grading which complies with zone M of BS 882, 1992. A superplasticiser based on naphthalene sulphonates polymer, which has a powerful dispersing effect on the cement particles, was used as a water-reducing admixture. Virgin polypropylene fibre (Fig. 1) was used. Table 2 presents the dimensions and physical properties of this fibre.

2.2. Mixing and samples preparation

The mix proportions are given in Table 3. A conventional rotary drum concrete mixer was used. The coarse aggregate, cement and sand were first mixed in the dry state for one minute before adding about half of the mixing water. After two minutes of mixing, the remaining mixing water and superplasticiser were added. Mixing was continued for another three minutes before adding the polypropylene fibres. The fibres were added slowly to the running mixer to avoid clumping. Mixing was continued for further five minutes to achieve uniform distribution of the fibre. Workability of the fresh concrete was assessed using the slump test according to BS 1881: Part 102, 1983. The slump values were 80 and 105 mm for the first and second batches, respectively.

Five standard cylinders with a diameter of 150 mm and a height of 300 mm were cast from each batch to prepare specimens for the impact test. Ten cubes (100 mm) were prepared from each batch according to BS 1881: Part 108: 1983 for the compressive strength test.

After casting, the concrete specimens were compacted using a vibrating table. The specimens were covered with wet hessian and polyethylene sheets overnight. They were then de-moulded after 24 hours and cured in a Fog room with curing conditions conform to BS 1881: Part 111: 1983 (20 ± 2 °C and 97 ± 3 %) for 7 days, after which the cylinders were cut using a diamond saw to get four discs, for the impact test, from each cylinder as shown in Fig. 2. All specimens and cubes were then transferred to an

environmental chamber maintained at 38 ± 2 °C and 45 ± 5 % relative humidity, until testing at the age of 28 days.

3. Test procedures

3.1. Impact test

The impact test was performed in accordance with the impact testing procedures recommended by ACI Committee 544. The test was carried out by dropping a hammer weighing 44.7 N (10-lb) from a height of 457 mm (18 inch) repeatedly on a 64 mm diameter (2 ½ inch) hardened steel ball, which is placed on the top of the centre of the cylindrical specimen (disc) as shown in Fig. 3.

The test continued until failure. For each specimen, two values were identified corresponding to initial and ultimate failure. The former value measures the number of blows required to initiate a visible crack, whereas the latter measures the number of blows required to initiate and propagate cracks until ultimate failure. According to the ACI Committee, the ultimate failure occurs when sufficient impact energy has been supplied to spread the cracks enough so that the test specimen touches the steel lugs. However, in this study if the specimen was separated completely into halves before touching the lugs, then the point of ultimate failure was declared.

3.2. Compressive strength

Compressive strength of the hardened concrete cubes was determined according to BS 1881: Part 116: 1983. The tests carried out using a digital automatic testing machine of a 3000 kN capacity.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Compressive strength

The results of the compression tests are given in Table 4. Compressive strength was determined at the age of 28 days, as a mean of quality control.

Fig. 4 presents the histogram of the 20 results obtained from the compressive strength tests. The figure shows that the results are almost normally distributed and fit well with the superimposed normal distribution curve of the same mean and standard deviation as the compressive strength results.

The average 28-day compressive strength was 41.3 MPa and the standard deviation was 4.17 MPa. The coefficient of variation was 10.09%. The mean compressive strengths within batches were 38.6 and 44.1 MPa with standard deviations of 2.80 and 3.46 MPa, respectively. The corresponding coefficients of variation within batches were 7.26% and 7.85%.

The overall standard deviation and the standard deviations within batches indicated good quality control over the production of the concrete specimens. A figure of 4 to 6 MPa is considered acceptable in the UK [15]. The values of the coefficient of variation show further evidence of good quality control. The overall coefficient of variation (10.09 %) is much lower than a limit of 15 % suggested by Swamy and Stavrides [16]

for good quality control; even though the coefficients of variation within batches are slightly higher than the 5% limit suggested by them. However, Day [15] suggested that a coefficient of variation between 5 and 10 % generally represents a reasonable quality control.

4.2. Impact resistance

Test results, first-crack (FC) and the ultimate impact resistance (UR) values, obtained from the impact test are given in Table 5 for both batches. The statistical parameters are also presented in Table 5 for all results (40 samples) and within batches (20 samples, each). The overall average of the ultimate impact resistance was 80 blows with a standard deviation of 40.4, which makes a coefficient of variation of more than 50 %. The mean ultimate impact resistance for the first batch was 84 blows, which is slightly higher than the overall mean. The standard deviation of the same batch was 43.9 and the corresponding coefficient of variation was 52.1 %. The counterpart values for the second batch were slightly less than the overall values, with a mean, standard deviation and coefficient of variation of 76 blows, 37.3 blows and 48.7 %, respectively.

The standard deviation values obtained in this study are very high. However, a wide range of standard deviation is reported in the literature. Higher values of 59 and 66 were obtained by Nataraja et al. [17] for steel fibre reinforced concretes, whereas Soroushian et al. [18] reported lower value of 18 blows for carbon fibre reinforced composites. However, unlike compressive strength, it is not realistic to use the standard deviation to judge or compare the impact resistance results. This is because the impact test is not a standard test. In such cases it is more appropriate to use the coefficient of variation.

The coefficient of variation is considered a more meaningful index of variability because it accounts for the mean as well as the standard deviation. Day [15] stated that several ACI committees including 212 (Mixture Proportioning), 214 (Evaluation of Test Results) and 363 (High Strength Concrete) adopted the coefficient of variation as a measure of variability rather than the standard deviation.

The coefficient of variation of 50.2 % obtained for PPFRC in this study is in the same order of magnitude as reported for other fibre reinforced composites. Values of 54.6 and 57.3 were reported by Soroushian et al. [18] for carbon fibre reinforced composites and Nataraja et al. [17] for steel fibre reinforced concretes, respectively. These values are four times the recommended value for compressive strength. These very high values of the coefficient of variation of the impact resistance obtained from test results in different studies - despite the difference in the physical properties of the fibres- suggests a firm conclusion that the test with its current recommendations is not anywhere near the status of a standard test.

Similar conclusions can be obtained by driving similar discussion about the statistical parameters obtained for the first-crack impact resistance results. However, it is interesting to note that the coefficients of variations for the overall results and within individual batches are higher than the corresponding values for the ultimate impact resistance (Table 5). This can be easily attributed to the lower values of the means.

The histogram of the 40 impact resistance results is presented in Fig. 5, with superimposed normal distribution curve. It can be seen that the distribution of the results is departed from the normal distribution. The departure from the normal distribution was even clearer within each batch as shown in Figs. 6 and 7, giving another evidence of scatter in the impact resistance results. Again similar charts can be obtained for the case of first-crack impact resistance; for example the histogram of the 40 first-crack impact resistance results is presented in Fig. 8.

Figs. 9 and 10 present the normal probability plots of the results of batch 1 and batch 2. Two straight lines, chosen subjectively, have been drawn through the plotted points. It can be seen that the results for FC and UR for both batches are not close to straight lines, indicating that the results are not normally distributed. The goodness-of-fit test for the impact resistance indicated poor fitness of the results to normal distribution at 95 % level of confidence, confirming the conclusions drawn up from Figs. 5 to 10.

4.4. Minimum number of replications

The coefficient of variation of the test results calculated above has another valuable practical application. Swamy and Stavridis [16] showed that it can be used to determine the minimum number of tests, n , required in order to guarantee that the percentage error in the measured average value is below a specified limit, e , at a specific level of confidence, as given by Equation 1 below.

$$n = t^2 v^2 / e^2 \quad (1)$$

where:

v = coefficient of variation

t = value of t student distribution for the specified level of confidence and is dependent on the degree of freedom, which is related to the number of tests.

For a large sample size, “ t ” approaches 1.645 and 1.282 at 95 and 90 % level of confidence, respectively [19-20]. Table 6 presents the number of samples required to keep the error under various limits between 10 and 50 %, at 95 and 90 % level of confidence.

It can be seen that for PPFRC, if the error is to be kept under 10%, the minimum number of tests should be 68 and 41 at 95 and 90 % level of confidence even when considering the lower coefficient of variation obtained for ultimate impact resistance (50.2 %). Moreover, the table shows that if three samples are used to determine the impact resistance, then the error in the measured value could be between 40 and 50 % depending on the level of confidence.

5. Conclusions

For the PPFRC used in this investigation, the impact resistance results indicated a poor correlation to the normal distribution, and the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. Impact resistance of PPFRC, as determined from the ACI repeated drop-weight impact test, has large standard deviation and coefficient of variation. The observed coefficients of variation were about four-fold the recommended value for compressive strength. The values were about 60 and 50% for first-crack and ultimate impact resistance, respectively.
2. If this test is to be considered as a standard test it is necessary to increase the number of replications to at least 40 specimens per each test or concrete mix to assure an error below 10 %. This, however, is neither practical nor economical and goes entirely against the intention of this test which is to provide easy, simple and economical impact test.
3. It is crucial for this test to be modified in such a way that increases the accuracy and reduces the big variation of results. Alternatively, a new technique of testing concrete against impact should be developed.

References

- [1] Brandt, A.M., Glinicki, M. A., Potrzebowski, J. Application of FRC in Construction of the Underground Railway Track. *Cement & Concrete Composites* 1996; 18(5):305-312.
- [2] Parameswaran, V. S. Fibre-Reinforced Concrete: A Versatile Construction Material. *Building and Environment* 1991; 26(3):301-305.
- [3] Badr, A., Brooks, J. J., Abdel Reheem, A. H., El-Saeid, A. Impact Resistance and Compressive Strength of Steel and Organic Natural Fibre Reinforced Concretes. *Proceedings of the 10th BCA Concrete Communication Conference, Birmingham University (UK), 2000.* p. 347-354.
- [4] Sethunarayanan, R., Chockalingam, S., Ramanathan, R. Natural Fibre Reinforced Concrete. *Transportation Research Record* 1989; 1226:57-60.
- [5] Newhook, J.P. and Mufti, A.A. A Reinforcing Steel-Free Concrete Deck Slab for the Salmon River Bridge. *Concrete International* 1996; 18(6):30-34.

- [6] Alhozaimy, A.M., Soroushian, P., Mirza, F. Mechanical Properties of Polypropylene Fibre Reinforced Concrete and the Effects of Pozzolanic Materials. *Cement & Concrete Composites* 1996; 18(2):85-92.
- [7] Soroushian, P., Mirza, F., Alhozaimy, A. Plastic Shrinkage Cracking of Polypropylene Fibre Reinforced Concrete. *ACI Materials Journal* 1995; 92(5):553-560.
- [8] Malhotra, V.M., Carette, G.G., Bilodeau, A. Mechanical Properties and Durability of Polypropylene Fibre reinforced High-Volume Fly Ash Concrete for Shotcrete Applications. *ACI Materials Journal* 1994; 91(5):478-486.
- [9] Kishi, N., Konno, H., Ikeda, K. Matsuoka, K.G. Prototype Impact Tests on Ultimate Impact Resistance of PC Rock-Sheds. *Int J Impact Engng* 2002; 27(9):969-985.
- [10] Ong K.C.G., Basheerkhan, M., Paramasivam, P. Resistance of Fibre Concrete Slabs to Low Velocity Projectile Impact. *Cement & Concrete Composites* 1999; 21(5-6):391-401.
- [11] Mindess, S. and Cheng, Y. Perforation of Plain and Fibre Reinforced Concretes Subjected to low-Velocity Impact Loading. *Cement and Concrete Research* 1993; 23 (1):83-92.
- [12] Barr, B. and Baghli, A. A Repeated Drop-Weight Impact Testing Apparatus for Concrete. *Magazine of Concrete Research* 1988; 40(144):167-176.
- [13] ACI Committee 544. ACI 544.2R-89: Measurement of Properties of Fibre Reinforced Concrete. *ACI Manual of Concrete Practice* 1996; Part 5: Masonry, Precast Concrete and Special Processes, American Concrete Institute.
- [14] Schrader, E.K. Impact Resistance and Test Procedure for Concrete. *ACI Materials Journal* 1981; 78(2):141-146.
- [15] Day, K.W. *Concrete Mix Design, Quality Control and Specification*. 2nd Edition. London: E&FN Spon, 1999.
- [16] Swamy, R.N., Stavrides, H. Some Statistical Considerations of Steel Fibre Reinforced Composites. *Cement and Concrete Research* 1976; 6(2):201 - 216.
- [17] Nataraja, M.C., Dhang, N., Gupta, A.P. Statistical Variations in Impact Resistance of Steel Fibre Reinforced Concrete Subjected to Drop Weight Test. *Cement and Concrete Research* 1999; 29(6):989 - 995.
- [18] Soroushian, P., Nagi, M., Alhozaimy, A.M. Statistical Variations in the Mechanical Properties of Carbon Fibre Reinforced Cement Composites. *ACI Materials Journal* 1992; 89(2):131-138.
- [19] Box, G.E.P., Hunter, W.G., Hunter, J.S. *Statistics for Experimenters*. USA: Wiley & Sons Inc., 1978.
- [20] Moore, D.S, McCabe, G.P. *Introduction to the Practice of Statistics*. New York: W.H.Freeman & Company, 1989.




Fig. 1: Polypropylene fibre used in this study





Fig. 2. Concrete disc specimens for impact test obtained from concrete cylinders



- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Concrete Specimen 150 mm Diameter | 4. Steel Plate 50 x 6 mm |
| 2. Steel Plate 50 x 50 x 13 mm | 5. Hardened Steel Ball 64 mm |
| 3. Steel Plate 50 x 86 x 6 mm | 6. Steel Pipe 64 mm Diameter |

Fig. 3. Impact test apparatus with the concrete disc in place




Fig. 4: Distribution of compressive strength test results




Fig. 5: Distribution of the ultimate impact resistance (All results)



Fig. 6: Distribution of the Ultimate Impact Resistance (Batch 1)




Fig. 7: Distribution of the ultimate impact resistance (Batch 2)




Fig. 8: Distribution of first-crack impact resistance (All results)




Fig. 9: Normal probability plot of batch 1 results




Fig. 10: Normal probability plot of batch 2 results

Table 1
Chemical composition of the cement

<i>Oxide</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>%</i>
CaO	63.28	
SiO ₂	20.77	
Al ₂ O ₃	4.93	
Fe ₂ O ₃	3.06	
MgO	2.42	
Na ₂ O	0.28	
K ₂ O	0.7	
L.O.I.	0.81	

Table 2
Physical properties and dimensions of PPF

<i>Physical Properties</i>		
Specific gravity	0.91	
Melting point	160-170 °C	
Ignition point	590 °C	
Tensile modulus	4.1	GPa
Tensile strength	560	MPa
<i>Dimensions</i>		
Length	12	mm
Nominal Diameter	18	µm

Table 3
Mix proportions

<i>Constituent</i>	<i>Content per m³ of Concrete</i>
Cement	410 kg
Coarse aggregate	1000 kg
Fine aggregate	800 kg
Water	185 litre
Superplasticiser	4.1 litre
Polypropylene fibre	3 kg

Table 4
Compressive strength test results

No.	Batch 1	Batch 2	Overall
1	34.3	38.8	-
2	35.9	40.8	-
3	36.4	41.3	-
4	37.1	41.9	-
5	37.9	43.2	-
6	38.9	44.9	-
7	39.7	45.9	-
8	40.2	46.4	-
9	41.8	47.7	-
10	43.4	49.9	-
Mean (MPa)	38.6	44.1	41.3
SD (MPa)	2.80	3.46	4.17
CoV (%)	7.26	7.85	10.09

SD= Standard Deviation; CoV= Coefficient of Variation

Table 5
Results from impact test (Blows)

Sample	Batch 1		Batch 2		Overall		
	FC	UR	FC	UR	FC	UR	
1	43	73	109	129	-	-	
2	17	30	66	81	-	-	
3	34	65	14	25	-	-	
4	11	18	15	28	-	-	
5	77	121	118	134	-	-	
6	65	95	24	43	-	-	
7	97	135	55	79	-	-	
8	28	40	90	141	-	-	
9	99	127	56	73	-	-	
10	54	100	58	89	-	-	
11	26	38	33	52	-	-	
12	108	141	70	85	-	-	
13	53	89	76	103	-	-	
14	79	121	12	20	-	-	
15	46	60	76	98	-	-	
16	12	27	68	101	-	-	
17	148	173	43	74	-	-	
18	32	41	9	16	-	-	
19	81	104	47	63	-	-	
20	67	89	64	95	-	-	
Mean	(Blow)	59	84	55	76	57	80
SD	(Blow)	36.2	43.9	31.2	37.3	33.4	40.4
CoV	(%)	61.4	52.1	56.6	48.7	58.6	50.2

SD= Standard Deviation; CoV= Coefficient of Variation

Table 6
 Number of replications required to keep the error under a specific limit

Error (<i>e</i> %)	95 % Level of confidence		90 % Level of confidence	
	FC	UR	FC	UR
<10	93	68	56	41
<15	41	30	25	18
<20	23	17	14	11
<25	15	11	9	7
<30	10	8	6	5
<35	8	6	5	4
<40	6	4	4	3
<50	4	3	2	2