View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Brunel University Research Archive

A Deflection, Buckling and Stress Investigation into the Telescopic Cantilever Beam

A Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

Jeevan George Abraham

School of Engineering and Design

Brunel University

January 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I wish to thank the Lord Almighty for his infinite blessings during this long and hard period, and his grace, comfort and solace at those times when all hope was thought to have been lost.

I wish to place on record my eternal gratitude to Dr. D. W. A. Rees, for his constant support, words of encouragement and guidance without which the timely completion of this project would not have been possible. It has been an honour and a privilege, to work with as distinguished a teacher as Dr. D. W. A. Rees, and for the experience I am most grateful. In the same vein, I would also like thank Catherine Pinder of Engineering Integrity Journal, for having approved and published the two papers that emanated from this work

None of the experimental work undertaken would have been possible without the help of a truly special man: Mr. K. Withers. If it were not for his constant efforts and moral support, the experimental work would have been an utter disaster. Special thanks are also due to Mr. G. Fitch and of course the dynamic duo of Les and Paul, in stores.

I humbly thank my parents Abraham Neyanthara George and Annamma Abraham, for their undying love, affection, prayers, support, encouragement and blessings throughout the course of undertaking this thesis. I could never begin to repay you for all that you have given me, I only hope and pray that I do justice, to the unwavering faith you have always had in me.

I also wish to thank Dr. S. Sivaloganathan and Mr. Omid Mobasseri for their invaluable advice and guidance during the course of the project.

Throughout the undertaking of this very turbulent thesis, there has been one constant: my brother from another Bhavin Engineer. You have always been there for me, and I can only hope to repay you in some way or form, for all that you have done for me. A very special thank you is due to Roshni Amin, Ali M. Sayed, Ali Shakeel, Franco Clark and Craig Clark. Last but not least I wish to convey my deepest gratitude to my guru, my teacher and my bhai, Farid Hosseini.

ABSTRACT

The telescoping cantilever beam structure is applied in many different engineering sectors to achieve weight/space optimisation for structural integrity. There has been limited theory and analysis in the public domain of the stresses and deflections involved when applying a load to such a structure. This thesis proposes (a) The *Tip Reaction Model*, which adapts classical mechanics to predict deflection of a two and a three section steel telescoping cantilever beam; (b) An equation to determine the Critical buckling loads for a given configuration of the two section steel telescoping cantilever beam assembly derived from first principles, in particular the energy methods; and finally (c) the derivation of a design optimization methodology, to tackle localised buckling induced by shear, torsion and a combination of both, in the individual, constituent, hollow rectangular beam sections of the telescopic assembly. Bending stress and shear stress is numerically calculated for the same structure whilst subjected to inline and offset loading. An FEA model of the structure is solved to verify the previous deflection, stress and buckling predictions made numerically. Finally an experimental setup is conducted where deflections and stresses are measured whilst a two section assembly is subjected to various loading and boundary conditions. The results between the predicted theory, FEA and experimental setup are compared and discussed. The overall conclusion is that there is good correlation between the three sets of data.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.. iii
LIST OF SYMBOLS..xii
LIST OF FIGURES..xv
LIST OF TABLES..xxxii

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE THESIS...1
1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM...3
1.3 AIM AND OBJECTIVES...3
1.4 SUMMARY FINDINGS...4
1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS...5

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE SURVEY

2.1 INTRODUCTION..8
2.2 CURVATURE – BENDING MOMENT RELATIONSHIP.....................................9
2.3 MACAULAY’S STEP FUNCTION METHOD.. 10
2.4 MOHR’S MOMENT AREA...11
2.5 DEFLECTION THEOREMS IN BRIEF..14
2.6 PRINCIPLE OF SUPERPOSITION..15
2.7 ENERGY METHODS..16
    2.7.1 PRELIMINARIES...17
    2.7.2 PRINCIPLE OF VIRTUAL WORK..20
    2.7.3 PRINCIPLE OF COMPLEMENTARY VIRTUAL WORK...............................21
    2.7.4 PRINCIPLE OF MINIMUM POTENTIAL ENERGY..23
    2.7.5 PRINCIPLE OF MINIMUM COMPLEMENTARY POTENTIAL ENERGY…..27
    2.7.6 CASTIGLIANO’S THEOREM PART I...28
    2.7.7 CASTIGLIANO’S THEOREM PART II..29

2.8 BUCKLING – AN INTRODUCTION..30

2.9 BUCKLING OF THIN WALLED STRUCTURES..31

2.10 RAYLEIGH – RITZ METHOD...35

2.11 THE RAYLEIGH QUOTIENT...37

2.12 LOCAL BUCKLING...39

2.13 TORSION IN STRUCTURES..40

2.14 TORSIONAL AND FLEXURAL TORSIONAL BUCKLING.....................................42

2.15 LATERAL – TORSIONAL BUCKLING...43

2.16 SHEAR IN THIN WALLED CLOSED TUBE SECTIONS..44

2.17 TORSION IN THIN WALLED CLOSED TUBE SECTIONS.....................................45

2.18 COMBINED SHEAR AND TORSION IN THIN WALLED CLOSED SECTIONS…46

2.19 APPLICATIONS OF THE TELESCOPING CANTILEVER BEAM ASSEMBLY…..48

  2.19.1 DEFINITION OF MOBILE ELEVATING WORK PLATFORM.....................48

    2.19. (a) RELATED TERMINOLOGY..48

    2.19. (b) ACCESS PLATFORM TYPES...51

  2.19.2 TELESCOPIC RETRACTABLE ROOFING SYSTEMS..................................54

  2.19.3 TELESCOPING MARINE ASSEMBLIES..58

  2.19.4 TELESCOPING ADJUSTABLE COLUMNS..61

  2.19.5 TELESCOPING ADJUSTABLE WHEELCHAIR RAMPS..............................61

  2.19.6 TELESCOPING POLES AND ADJUSTABLE MASTS.................................62

  2.19.7 STEEL TELESCOPING TOWERS...64

  2.19.8 TELESCOPING STORAGE RACKS...67

CHAPTER 3 DEFLECTION ANALYSES

3.1 INTRODUCTION – DEFLECTION ANALYSES..70

3.2 TELESCOPIC BEAM THEORY...71

3.3 TIP REACTIONS...72

3.4 MACAULAY’S METHOD FOR DEFLECTION ANALYSIS.......................................72
3.4.1 THE C PROGRAM...74
3.5 MOHR’S MOMENT AREA METHOD...78
3.5.1 MOHR’S MOMENT AREA METHOD APPLIED TO THE TWO SECTION TIP LOADED CANTILEVER...80
3.5.2 MOHR’S MOMENT AREA METHOD APPLIED TO THE TWO SECTION CANTILEVER SUBJECTED TO UDL...83
3.5.3 DERIVATION OF DEFLECTION FOR THE TWO SECTION CANTILEVER BEAM SUBJECTED TO UDL AND TIP LOADING...85
3.6 CASTIGLIANO’S THEOREM...89
3.7 VIRTUAL WORK PRINCIPLE...97
3.8 SUMMARY...110

CHAPTER 4 BUCKLING ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION...112
4.2 DETERMINING THE SECTION PARAMETERS OF THE TAPERED COLUMN...113
4.3 SECTION PROPERTIES OF TAPERED BEAMS..119
4.3.1 SECTION CHANGING BREADTH..120
4.3.2 SECTION CHANGING DEPTH………...121
4.3.3SECTION CHANGING BI-DIMENSIONALLY AT THE SAME AND DIFFERENT RATES..122
4.4 THE CANTILEVER COLUMN...123
4.5 DETERMINATION OF THE BUCKLING LOAD FOR AN AXIALLY SYMMETRIC TRUNCATED CONE...125
4.6 DETERMINATION OF THE BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE PYRAMID..................131
4.6.1 BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE RECTANGULAR PYRAMID WHOSE SECTION’S CHANGES BREADTH 131

4.6.2 BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE RECTANGULAR PYRAMID WHOSE SECTION'S DEPTH CHANGES 134

4.6.3 BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE RECTANGULAR PYRAMID WHOSE SECTIONS CHANGE BI-DIMENSIONALLY AT THE SAME AND DIFFERENT RATES..137

4.7 BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE SINGLE THIN WALLED RECTANGULAR SECTION..142

4.8 BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE SINGLE STEPPED STRUT.......................................143

4.9 BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE THIN WALLED TWO SECTION CANTILEVER....150

4.10 SUMMARY...158

CHAPTER 5 SHEAR AND TORSION ANALYSES

5.1 INTRODUCTION..160

5.2 SHEAR IN UNIFORM THIN WALLED CLOSED RECTANGULAR SECTIONS... 161

5.3 TORSION IN UNIFORM THIN WALLED CLOSED RECTANGULAR SECTIONS...165

5.4 COMBINED SHEAR AND TORSION IN UNIFORM THIN-WALLED RECTANGULAR SECTIONS...168

5.5 SUMMARY..172

CHAPTER 6 STRESS ANALYSIS

6.1 INTRODUCTION...173

6.2BENDING STRESS..175

6.3 SHEAR STRESS..177

6.4 SUMMARY...186

CHAPTER 7 FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS

7.1 INTRODUCTION...188

7.2 DEFLECTION ANALYSIS USING ABAQUS........194
7.3 STRESS ANALYSIS USING ABAQUS........196
7.4 BUCKLING ANALYSIS USING ABAQUS........203
7.5 SUMMARY........205

CHAPTER 8 EXPERIMENTAL ANALYSIS

8.1 INTRODUCTION........207
8.2 THE TEST SPECIMEN........207
8.3 THE EXPERIMENTAL MOUNTING STAND........214
8.4 EXPERIMENTAL TIP DEFLECTION ANALYSIS........218
8.5 EXPERIMENTAL STRESS ANALYSIS........221
8.6 SUMMARY........238

CHAPTER 9 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

9.1 RESULTS........239
    9.1.1 DEFLECTION RESULTS........240
    9.1.2 STRESS ANALYSIS RESULTS........249
    9.1.3 BUCKLING RESULTS........274
9.2 CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE........277
9.3 LIMITATIONS........281
9.2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER WORK........282

REFERENCES........283

APPENDIX A – THE TWO SECTION TELESCOPIC CANTILEVER BEAM ASSEMBLY

A.1 DEFLECTION IN THE TWO SECTION TELESCOPING ASSEMBLY........293

A.2TIP REACTIONS..294

A.3 DERIVATION OF THE DEFLECTION CURVE FOR SECTION AC IN BEAM AB 296

A.4 DERIVATION OF THE DEFLECTION CURVE FOR SECTION CB IN BEAM AB 298

A.5 DERIVATION OF THE DEFLECTION CURVE FOR SECTION CB IN BEAM CD 299

A.6 DERIVATION OF THE DEFLECTION CURVE FOR SECTION BD IN BEAM CD...301

APPENDIX B – THE C PROGRAM..304

APPENDIX C – PART 1 – INLINE LOADING ANALYSIS OF INDUCED STRESS IN THE TWO SECTION TELESCOPIC ASSEMBLY

C.1 CALCULATION OF TIP REACTIONS..310

C.2SHEAR FORCE AND BENDING MOMENT DIAGRAMS FOR BEAM ACB……...311

C.3SHEAR FORCE AND BENDING MOMENT DIAGRAMS FOR BEAM CBD……...312

C.4 CALCULATION OF BENDING AND SHEAR STRESSES FOR BEAM ACB…….314

C.5 CALCULATION OF BENDING AND SHEAR STRESSES FOR BEAM CBD…….316

APPENDIX D – PART 2 – OFFSET LOADING ANALYSIS OF INDUCED STRESS IN THE TWO SECTION TELESCOPIC ASSEMBLY

D.1 CALCULATION OF TIP REACTIONS..322

D.2SHEAR FORCE, BENDING MOMENT AND TORQUE DIAGRAMS FOR BEAM ACB..324

D.3SHEAR FORCE, BENDING MOMENT AND TORQUE DIAGRAMS FOR BEAM CBD..325

D.4 CALCULATION OF BENDING AND SHEAR STRESSES FOR BEAM ACB….....327

D.5 CALCULATION OF BENDING AND SHEAR STRESSES FOR BEAM CBD…….329

APPENDIX E – THE TELESCOPIC CANTILEVER BEAM: PART 1 – DEFLECTION ANALYSIS…………………………………………………….....333

APPENDIX F – THE TELESCOPIC CANTILEVER BEAM: PART 2 – STRESS ANALYSIS………………………………………………………….……...334

APPENDIX G – FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS

G.1 PART MODULE..336

G.2 MATERIAL AND ELEMENT PROPERTIES DEFINITION..339

G.3 ASSEMBLING THE TWO SECTION TELESCOPIC CANTILEVER BEAM ASSEMBLY..345

G.4 THE STEP MODULE..347

- G.4.1 CREATION OF ANALYSIS STEPS..348

G.5 INTERACTION DEFINITIONS..351

G.6 LOADING CONDITIONS..355

G.7 BOUNDARY CONDITIONS..359

G.8 MESHING DEFINTIONS..354

- G.8.1 STRUCTURED MESHING..362
- G.8.2 SWEPT MESHING..363
- G.8.3 FREE MESHING..364

G.9 GENERATION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS..368

- G.9.1 TIP DEFLECTION RESULTS EXTRACTION..369
- G.9.2 STRESS ANALYSIS RESULTS EXTRACTION..374
- G.9.3 BUCKLING ANALYSIS RESULTS EXTRACTION..378

APPENDIX H –STRAIN GAUGING PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

H.1 THE STRAIN GAUGE……………………………………………………….......382

H.2 STRAIN TRANSFORMATION AND ROSETTE GAUGE THEORY……………....386

H.3 INSTRUMENTATION AND DATA ACQUISITION SYSTEM…………………….396

H.4 STRAIN GAUGE SELECTION……………………………………………………………..03

H.5 SURFACE PREPARATION STEPS………………………………………………………..408

H.6 STRAIN GAUGE BONDING PROCEDURE……………………………………………...413

H.7 LEAD WIRE ATTACHMENT…………………………………………………………...416

LIST OF SYMBOLS

$\boldsymbol{T_1}, \boldsymbol{T_2}, \boldsymbol{T_3}$**=** Stress Tensors acting on each face perpendicular to coordinate axes x_1, x_2, x_3

$\boldsymbol{T_i}$ = Universal stress tensor

$\boldsymbol{T}$**= S**tress tensors distributed over surface ***S***

n = Unit outward normal to the plane

h = Perpendicular distance from origin to plane ACB of tetrahedron

V= volume

∂W_E = External virtual work

∂W_I = Internal virtual work

U = Strain energy

U^*= Complementary strain energy

σ = Direct stress

e= Direct strain

$\prod$ =Total potential energy of the body

i, j = tensor notation

P = Applied tip load

P_{cr}= Critical buckling load

λ = Load displacement

δ = Lateral or out-of-plane displacement

I = Second moment of area

L = Length

E = Young's modulus of elasticity

x=z = Arbitrary length

z' = Non dimensional length parameter

ΔU_T = Change in total potential energy

ΔU_B = Change in bending strain energy

ΔU_P = Change in potential of external force or the work done by the load P

$w(x)$= $Y(z)$= Assumed deflection functions

$M(x)$= $M(z)$ = Bending moment functions

q = Shear flow

T = Torque

τ = Shear stress

F_y= Vertical force

A= Area

$$\mu = \left[\left(\frac{d_o}{d_e} \right) - 1 \right]$$

$$\psi = \left[\left(\frac{h_o}{h_e} \right) - 1 \right]$$

$$\eta = \left[\left(\frac{b_o}{b_e} \right) - 1 \right]$$

L_1= Length of fixed-end section

α=overlap ratio

a_1=Overlap length

L_2= Length of free-end section

ϕ=Length variation ratio

w_1= w=Self weight of fixed-end section

γ = Self weight ratio

w_2= Self weight of free-end section

H= d= Depth

B = b =Breadth

T = t =Thickness

y = Overall Deflection

y_0 = Deflection of single fixed-end section cantilever

I_1= Second moments of area of fixed-end section

I_2= Second moments of area of overlap section

I_3= Second moments of area of free-end section

I_z= Second moments of area of section at length z from datum

I_e =Second moments of area of section at apex

I_o =Second moments of area of section at base

β= Second moment area ratio

F^V = Virtual force

M^V =Virtual moment

$d_{e=}$ diameter of apex

d_z =diameter at arbitrary length z from datum

d_o=diameter at base

$\sigma_{0\,=}$Stress at d_o

b_e=breadth at apex

b_z=breadth at arbitrary length z from datum

$b_{o=}$ breadth at base

h_e =height at apex

h_z=height at arbitrary length z from datum

h_o=height at base

f = Shape factor

Q = Geometrical coefficient

W = Weight of section

K = Buckling coefficients

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Beam in bending (Adapted from [20])..9

Figure 2.2: Beam in bending (Adapted from [19])..14

Figure 2.3: Stress tensors and their components (Adapted from [28])……………………....17

Figure 2.4: Stresses on an infinitesimal tetrahedron (Adapted from [28])…………….….…....17

Figure 2.5: Stress-strain curve of a non-linearly elastic rod (Adapted from [28])…………22

Figure 2.6: Differentiation between (a) Bending and (b) Buckling (Adapted from [33])......31

Figure 2.7: Behaviour of buckling system showing the differentiation between the load and lateral displacements [33]..32

Figure 2.8: Stability of equilibrium [28]..34

Figure 2.9: Local buckling of edge supported thin plate with load-load induced displacement curve (P-λ) and the lateral displacement curve (P-δ) [33]..39

Figure 2.10: Local buckling of model box girder [33]..40

Figure 2.11: Examples of (a) Torsional Buckling (b) Flexural-Torsional Buckling (c) Lateral Buckling [33]..41

Figure 2.12: Net Shear Flow in a closed thin walled tube..44

Figure 2.13: Static Equivalence between torque ($F_y p$) and shear flow q_b [25]........................46

Figure 2.14: Terminology associated with the mobile elevating access platform (Taken from [2])..50

Figure 2.15: Straight or “stick boom” access platform [74]..52

Figure 2.16: Scissor lift [75]..52

Figure 2.17: Articulating boom machine (Taken from [2])..53

Figure 2.18: Trailer mounted machine (Taken from [2])..53

Figure 2.19: Vehicle mounted access platform [76]...54

Figure 2.20: A retractable roof enclosure (a) before deployment and (b) after deployment [77]...55

Figure 2.21: A retractable commercial garden roof canopy (a) before deployment and (b) after deployment [77]...55

Figure 2.22: A retractable pool enclosure [77]..56

Figure 2.23: A retractable awning [77]..56

Figure 2.24: Retractable stadium roof system consisting of two parts (a) before deployment and (b) after deployment [77]...57

Figure 2.24: Enclosure with a retractable stadium roof system consisting of three parts a) before deployment and (b) half way through full deployment [77]..57

Figure 2.25: The SL-DEX Type hydraulic overhead beam crane manufactured by Nautical Structures USA [78]...58

Figure 2.26: Applications of the SL-DEX Type hydraulic overhead beam crane [78]........59

Figure 2.28 (a) Single telescoping gangplank (b) Double telescoping gangplank and (c) Triple telescoping gangplank [78]...60

Figure 2.29: Telescoping adjustable column [79]..61

Figure 2.30: Telescoping adjustable wheelchair ramps [80]...62

Figure 2.31: Construction of the “Wonder Pole®” [81]...63

Figure 2.32: A telescoping “Wonder Pole®” in use [81]...63

Figure 2.33: Examples of trailer mounted US Tower manufactured telescoping towers [82]...64

Figure 2.34: A self contained US Tower manufactured Command, Control, Communications and Tactical Shelter or C3T Trailer [82]..65

Figure 2.35: Examples of vehicle mounted US Tower manufactured telescoping towers [82]...66

Figure 2.36: Aerial view of a large installation of SpaceSaver Racks in a steel service center [83]...67

Figure 2.37: SpaceSaver Racks installed outdoors [83]...68

Figure 2.38: ‘8 Tall SpaceSaver Rack’ installed with optional electric lift cage. For maximum density 8Tall models nearly twenty feet high are available [83]..69

Figure 2.39: ‘5 Tall SpaceSaver Rack’ storing 20’-24’ tubing at Marmon/Keystone. A rolling platform ladder is used to access the upper levels [84]...69

Figure 3.1: Two-section, telescopic cantilever...71

Figure 3.2: Deflection Plot obtained from Macaulay’s Theorem vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200mm and 1000mm respectively..................76

Figure 3.3: Two section telescopic cantilever...78

Figure 3.4: Cross sectional view of the two section telescopic cantilever..........................79

Figure 3.5: Mohr's Moment Area Method applied to the two section tip loaded cantilever beam...80

Figure 3.6: Mohr's Moment Area Method applied to the two section cantilever beam subjected to uniformly distributed loading...83

Figure 3.7: End Deflection Plot of Equation (3.11) obtained from Mohr's Moment Area Theorem vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200mm and 1000mm respectively...88

Figure 3.8: Cross sectional view of the two section telescopic cantilever..........................89

Figure 3.9: Castigliano's Theorem applied to the two section cantilever beam.....................90

Figure 3.10: End Deflection Plot of Equation (3.18) obtained from Castigliano's Theorem vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200mm and 1000mm respectively...96

Figure 3.11: Principle of Virtual Work applied to the two section cantilever beam................97

Figure 3.12: End Deflection Plot of Equation (3.26) obtained from Virtual Work Theorem vs. Parame.ter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively...104

Figure 3.13: End Theoretical Deflection Plots vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively..105

Figure 3.13 (a): End Theoretical End Deflection Plots vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively, for a *wL/P* ratio of 10...106

Figure 3.13 (b): End Theoretical End Deflection Plots vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively, for a *wL/P* ratio of 1...107

Figure 3.13 (c): End Theoretical End Deflection Plots vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively, for a *wL/P* ratio of 0.1..108

Figure 3.13 (d): End Theoretical End Deflection Plots vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively, for a wL/P ratio of 0.01........109

Figure 4.1: Geometry of the tapered circular cantilever column........113

Figure 4.2: Geometry of the tapered circular cantilever column........114

Figure 4.3: Plot of d_o/d_e against z' from Equation (4.7), for the tapered circular cantilever column........116

Figure 4.4: Plot of σ/σ_e against z' from Equation (4.8), for the tapered circular, cantilever column........117

Figure 4.5: Plot of σ/σ_e (obtained from Equation (4.5)) against z', where z' varies from 0 to 1, in increments of 0.1, for the tapered circular, cantilever column. The curves in turn represent the values of d_o/d_e varying from 2 to 10........118

Figure 4.6: Section Properties of Tapered Beams (a) Section changing breadth; (b) Section changing depth; (c) Section changing bi-dimensionally at the same rate; (4) Section changing bi-dimensionally at different rates (Adapted from [93])........119

Figure 4.7: Geometry of the tapered rectangular cantilever column whose cross section changes in breadth........120

Figure 4.8: Geometry of the tapered rectangular cantilever column whose cross section changes in depth........121

Figure 4.9: Geometry of the cantilever column (Adapted from [15])........124

Figure 4.10: (a) A fixed-free column subjected to a tip load (b) Cross sections of an axially symmetric truncated cone (Adapted from [94])........125

Figure 4.11: Plot of Equation (4.31) vs. d_o/d_e, for the axially symmetric, truncated cone........130

Figure 4.12: (a) A fixed-free column subjected to a tip load (b) Cross sections of columns for a square pyramid whose section changes breadth........131

Figure 4.13: Plot of Equation (4.35) vs b_o/b_e, for the truncated, square pyramid, whose breadth changes........133

Figure 4.14: (a) A fixed-free column subjected to a tip load (b) Cross sections of columns for a square pyramid whose section changes depth........134

Figure 4.15: Plot of Equation (4.41) vs h_o/h_e, for the truncated square pyramid, whose depth changes........136

Figure 4.16: Plot of Equation (4.46) vs. η, ψ, for the truncated square pyramid, whose section changes bi-dimensionally at the same rate 140

Figure 4.17: Geometry of a thin walled rectangular section..142

Figure 4.18: Single Stepped composite strut..143

Figure 4.19: Geometry of the cantilever column..145

Figure 4.20: Cross sectional view of the single stepped composite strut...........................146

Figure 4.21: Plot of Equation (4.59) vs. ϕ, for the single stepped strut, having dimensions outlined in Table 4.3 and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively..149

Figure 4.22: Two section telescopic cantilever...150

Figure 4.23: Cross sectional view of the two section telescopic cantilever......................152

Figure 4.24: Plot of Equation (4.64) vs. α ,where α varies from 0 to 1, in increments of 0.1, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly, having dimensions outlined in Table 4.5, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively.......................155

Figure 4.25: Plot of Equation (4.64) vs. ϕ, where ϕ varies from 0 to 1, in increments of 0.1, for overlap ratios α varying from 0 to 0.6, determined for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly, having dimensions outlined in Table 4.5, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively..156

Figure 4.26: Plot of Equation (4.64) vs. ϕ, where ϕ varies from 0 to 1, in increments of 0.1, for overlap ratios α varying from 0.7 to 1, determined for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly, having dimensions outlined in Table 4.5, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively..157

Figure 5.1: Uniform, rectangular tube...161

Figure 5.2: Flexural shear flows q_B must be added to q_{net} with F_y be applied at the shear centre E..162

Figure 5.3: Rectangular tube with uniform thin-walled thickness....................................166

Figure 5.4: Uniform rectangular tube showing net shear flow..168

Figure 6.1: Moment of resistance within section at x-position..173

Figure 6.2: Telescopic beam assembly with two sections..175

Figure 6.3 (a) Cross section of the uniform rectangular tube (b) Net shear stress distribution in the cross section of the uniform rectangular tube..177

Figure 6.4: Inline Loading induced bending stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end for 400mm overlap along $A_1C_1B_1D_1$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in C.1..180

Figure 6.5: Inline loading induced shear stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end for 400mm overlap along $A_3C_3B_3D_3$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in C.1..181

Figure 6.6: Inline loading induced shear stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end for 400mm overlap along $A_2C_2B_2D_2$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in C.1..182

Figure 6.7: Offset loading induced bending stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end for 400mm overlap along $A_1C_1B_1D_1$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in D.1..183

Figure 6.8: Offset loading induced shear stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end for 400mm overlap along $A_3C_3B_3D_3$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in D.1..184

Figure 6.9: Offset loading induced shear stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end for 400mm overlap along $A_2C_2B_2D_2$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in D.1..185

Figure 7.1: ABAQUS/CAE pictorial methodology...190

Figure 7.2: FEA generated deflection curves vs. Overlap ratio α, where α varies from 0.2 to 0.8, in increments of 0.2, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1...195

Figure 7.3: Inline Loading induced bending stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end along $A_1C_1B_1D_1$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm..197

Figure 7.4: Inline loading induced shear stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end along $A_3C_3B_3D_3$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm...198

Figure 7.5: Inline loading induced shear stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end along $A_2C_2B_2D_2$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm...199

Figure 7.6: Offset loading induced bending stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end along $A_1C_1B_1D_1$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm..200

Figure 7.7: Offset loading induced shear stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end along $A_3C_3B_3D_3$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm..201

Figure 7.8: Offset loading induced shear stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end along $A_2C_2B_2D_2$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm..202

Figure 7.9: FEA extracted values of P_{cr}/P_{Eu} vs. Overlap ratio α, where α varies from 0.2 to 0.8, in increments of 0.2, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly, having dimensions outlined in Table 7.1..204

Figure 8.1: The Experimental test rig..207

Figure 8.2: Loading arm through which loads are applied...208

Figure 8.3: Loading arm configuration for (a) Inline Loading (b) Offset Loading................209

Figure 8.4: Tufnell wear pads attached to beam 2. These four wear pads are located on the four walls of beam 2, at the end opposite to that where loads are applied............................209

Figure 8.5: Unattached wear pads, inserted into the gap at the three position’s A, B and C, at the start of the overlap between beam 1 and beam 2...210

Figure 8.6: Position where the strain gauges were bonded onto the telescopic assembly. positions W and X are 300mm from the Fixed End of Beam 1, whilst positions Y and Z are 200mm from the inner end of Beam 2..211

Figure 8.7: Strain gauge rosettes bonded at (a) position W (b) position X (c) position Y and (d) position Z, as shown in Figure 9.5...212

Figure 8.8: Front view of the telescopic assembly. The arrow indicates the position where dial gauge readings of deflection for different load magnitudes were taken...............................213

Figure 8.9: Frontal view of the experimental mounting jig clamped to support column.....214

Figure 8.10: Details of the mounting mechanism..215

Figure 8.11: (a) Front view of the mounting jig (b) Rear view of the mounting jig..........215

Figure 8.12: Left hand view of the mounting jig showing the method by which the same is clamped to the support column...216

Figure 8.13: Load Applied in Newton vs Tip Deflection in mm for the experimental test rig having dimensions outlined in Table 8.1..219

Figure 8.14: Extrapolated Deflection Curves vs. Overlap ratio α for the experimental test rig having dimensions outlined in Table 8.1..220

Figure 8.15: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....222

Figure 8.16: Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....222

Figure 8.17: Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....223

Figure 8.18: Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....223

Figure 8.19: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....224

Figure 8.20: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....224

Figure 8.21: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....225

Figure 8.22: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....225

Figure 8.23: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....226

Figure 8.24: Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....226

Figure 8.25: Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....227

Figure 8.26: Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....227

Figure 8.27: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....228

Figure 8.28: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....228

Figure 8.29: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....229

Figure 8.30: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....229

Figure 8.31: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....230

Figure 8.32: Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap....230

Figure 8.33: Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap....231

Figure 8.34: Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap....231

Figure 8.35: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap....232

Figure 8.36: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap....232

Figure 8.37: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap....233

Figure 8.38: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap....233

Figure 8.39: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap....234

Figure 8.40: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap....234

Figure 8.41: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap....235

Figure 8.42: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap....235

Figure 8.43: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap....236

Figure 8.44: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap....236

Figure 8.45: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap....237

Figure 8.46: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap....237

Figure 9.1: Comparison of Deflection Curves vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 8.1....243

Figure 9.1 (a): Comparison of Deflection Curves vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 8.1, for an applied load of 80N…………………………………………………………...........244

Figure 9.1 (b): Comparison of Deflection Curves vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 8.1, for an applied load of 50N…………………………………………………………...........245

Figure 9.1 (c): Comparison of Deflection Curves vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 8.1, for an applied load of 40N…………………………………………………………...........244

Figure 9.1 (d): Comparison of Deflection Curves vs. Parameter α, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 8.1, for an applied load of 30N…………………………………………………………...........244

Figure 9.2: Experimental Deflection linear Plots showing Load Applied in Newton vs Tip Deflection in mm, extended such that they meet the ordinate at 20Newtons........................248

Figure 9.3: Inline Loading induced Bending Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_1C_1B_1D_1$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm....................................251

Figure 9.4: Inline loading induced Shear Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_3C_3B_3D_3$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm..252

Figure 9.5: Inline loading induced Shear Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_2C_2B_2D_2$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm..253

Figure 9.6: Offset loading induced Bending Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_1C_1B_1D_1$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm.......................................254

Figure 9.7: Offset loading induced Shear Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_3C_3B_3D_3$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm..255

Figure 9.8: Offset loading induced Shear Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_2C_2B_2D_2$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm..256

Figure 9.9: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap..258

Figure 9.10: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap..258

Figure 9.11: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....259

Figure 9.12: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....259

Figure 9.13: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....260

Figure 9.14: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....260

Figure 9.15: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....261

Figure 9.16: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....261

Figure 9.17: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....262

Figure 9.18: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....262

Figure 9.19: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....263

Figure 9.20: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....263

Figure 9.21: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....264

Figure 9.22: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....264

Figure 9.23: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....265

Figure 9.24: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....265

Figure 9.25: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....266

Figure 9.26: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....266

Figure 9.27: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....267

Figure 9.28: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap..267

Figure 9.29: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap..268

Figure 9.30: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap..268

Figure 9.31: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap..269

Figure 9.32: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap..269

Figure 9.33: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap..270

Figure 9.34: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap..270

Figure 9.35: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap..271

Figure 9.36: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap..271

Figure 9.37: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap..272

Figure 9.38: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap..272

Figure 9.39: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap..273

Figure 9.40: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap..273

Figure 9.41: Comparison between buckling curves generated from theoretical predictions and FEA, for the telescopic assembly whose individual part dimensions are outlined in Table 7.1...276

Figure A.1: Deflected shapes of the two section telescoping cantilever beam assembly......293

Figure A.2: Fixed-end beam loading..294

Figure A.3: Free-end beam loading...295

Figure A.4: A Section in AC...296

Figure A.5: A Section in CB..298

Figure A.6: Deflection of Beams AB and CD...299

Figure A.7: Deflection of Beam CD..301

Figure C.1: Tip Reaction Model – Beam Assembly and Reactions on Individual Beams....310

Figure C.2: Shear Force and Bending Moment Diagrams for the Individual Sections..........313

Figure C.3: A Telescopic Beam Assembly with Two Sections and the Vertical and Horizontal planes of symmetry shown..314

Figure C.4: Telescopic beam bending stresses induced by inline loading, from tip reaction analysis...319

Figure C.5: Telescopic beam shear stresses induced by inline loading, from tip reaction analysis...320

Figure D.1: Tip Reaction Model – Beam Assembly and Reactions on Individual Beams....322

Figure D.2: Shear Force, Bending Moment and Torque Diagrams for the Individual Sections...326

Figure D.3: A Telescopic Beam Assembly with Two Sections and the Vertical and Horizontal planes of symmetry shown..327

Figure D.4: Telescopic beam bending stresses induced by offset loading, from tip reaction analysis...331

Figure D.5: Telescopic beam shear stresses, induced by offset loading from tip reaction analysis...332

Figure G.1: Sketcher Window in ABAQUS/CAE..337

Figure G.2: Extrusion of the Part Instance sketched in Figure 7.2, the arrow indicates the depth to which the part is extruded..337

Figure G.3 (a) Dimensioned Sketch of the second or free end beam instance, (b) Extrusion of the second beam instance (as sketched in 7.4(a)), (c) Dimensioned Sketch of the wear pad instance, (d) Extrusion of the wear pad instance (as sketched in I.3(c))................................338

Figure G.4: Assigning Normals to the shell elements (Purple is the negative direction while Brown is the positive direction)..339

Figure G.5: Property Module Tools..340

Figure G.6: Steps to create and define Material Properties..340

Figure G.7: Tabs to be filled in order to create material section having properties of Steel..341

Figure G.8: Tabs to be filled in order to create material section having properties of Tufnel...341

Figure G.9: Creating a Homogeneous, Shell section of thickness 1.55mm, having properties of Steel...342

Figure G.10: Creating a Homogeneous, Solid section having properties of Tufnell.............343

Figure G.11: Assigning the Homogeneous, Solid Tufnell section to the part highlighted…343

Figure G.12: Assigning the Homogeneous, Shell Steel section to the part highlighted........344

Figure G.13: Assembly Module Tools..345

Figure G.14: Creation of part instances and their assembly to constitute the overall Two Section Telescopic Cantilever Assembly...346

Figure G.15: Step Module Tools...350

Figure G.16: Creation of Buckling Step as outlined in ABAQUS 6.10 Documentation and § G.4.1...350

Figure G.17: Interaction Module Tools...351

Figure G.18: Definition of constraints (Tie Contacts) between surfaces..............................353

Figure G.19: Definition of coupling constraint..353

Figure G.20: Existing Tie Definitions that can be controlled and edited from the Constraint Manager Tab...354

Figure G.21: Loading and Boundary Condition Tool Sets...355

Figure G.22: Application of self weight or gravity on the assembly....................................356

Figure G.23: Application of the concentrated end force at the free end of the assembly......356

Figure G.24: Application of the twisting moment at the free end of the assembly................357

Figure G.25: Application of ‘Dead’ load on the assembly...357

Figure G.26: Application of ‘Live’ load on the assembly...358

Figure G.27: Position where the Telescopic Assembly is constrained as indicated by the arrow, in all degrees of freedom to simulate an ‘Encastre’ type fixing...............................359

Figure G.28: Two-dimensional structured mesh patterns...362

Figure G.29: The swept meshing technique for an extruded solid......................................363

Figure G.30: The sweep direction can influence the uniformity of the swept mesh..............364

Figure G.31: Controlling the screen view by switching of the irrelevant parts which provides more control in selecting parts in meshing process..365

Figure G.32: Adjustment of Mesh Size...366

Figure G.33: Meshed Telescopic Boom Assembly...367

Figure G.34: Submitting a job for analysis and monitoring its progress............................368

Figure G.35: Selecting the displacement tab and its component in the negative y-direction...369

Figure G.36: The displacement at each of the nodes as is plotted along the assembly........370

Fiigure G.37: Node Label display options...371

Figure G.38: Node Labels displayed on Part..371

Figure G.39: Report generation procedure for deflection magnitude extraction at individual nodes... 372

Figure G.40: Report arranged according to Node Labels..372

Figure G.41: Obtaining deflection values diretly using the probe function available in ABAQUS...373

Figure G.42: Selecting the desired stress component tab..374

Figure G.43: The stress distribution is shown after the analysis is completed......................375

Figure G.44: Report generation procedure for stress determination at individual nodes.......376

Figure G.45: Report arranged according to Node Labels..376

Figure G.46: Obtaining Stress values directly using the Probe function available in ABAQUS..377

Figure G.47: Determination of Critical Buckling Load for the two section telescoping assembly, for an overlap ratio of 0.2...378

Figure H.1: Simple illustration for the strain measurement...381

Figure H.2: Uniaxial strain gauge..383

Figure H.3: Biaxial rosette..383

Figure H.4: Three element rosette..384

Figure H.5: Shear patterns..384

Figure H.6: Basic Mohr’s circle geometry...387

Figure H.7: Strain transformation of θ 389

Figure H.8: Some useful Mohr’s circle configurations..390

Figure H.9: Typical strain gauge rosettes (a) Rectangular rosette (b) Delta rosette (c) Delta rosette (d) Stacked delta rosette...390

Figure H.10: Normal and Shear Strains..391

Figure H.11: Rectangular rosette strain orientation...392

Figure H.12: Mohr’s circle for rectangular rosette..395

Figure H.13: Schematic strain measurement system...396

Figure H.14: Quarter bridge strain gauge circuit..398

Figure H.15: Quarter bridge strain gauge circuit with addition of two resistors....................398

Figure H.16: Three-wire, quarter-bridge strain gauge circuit...399

Figure H.17: Fishbone diagram-Factors which affect the selection of an instrumentation system..400

Figure H.18: Strain indicator..401

Figure H.19: Data acquisition system..402

Figure H.20: Characteristic of a strain gauge...403

Figure H.21: Uni-axial strain gauge...403

Figure H.22: Bi-axial strain gauge...403

Figure H.23: 0°-45°-90° Rectangular Rosette & 0°-120°-240° Delta Rosette......................404

Figure H.24: Stacked Strain Gauge Configuration...404

Figure H.25: Planar Gauge Configuration..404

Figure H.26: Use a liberal amount of degreaser...408

Figure H.27: Wipe the specimen surface thoroughly with a gauze sponge...........................408

Figure H.28: To avoid recontamination, discard soiled sponges and continue until the sponge comes up clean...409

Figure H.29: Flood the gagging area with conditioner………….....................................409

Figure H.30: A dozen strokes are usually adequate...409

Figure H.31: Wipe dry with a gauze sponge. Use only once through the gauging area. With a refolded or fresh sponge, wipe away from the gauging area...410

Figure H.32: Remove any excess chemicals from the work surface.....................................410

Figure H.33: With a clean straight edge, and a 4H pencil firmly burnish a layout line. Hold the pencil perpendicular to the surface..410

Figure H.34: Use a liberal amount of conditioner to remove all graphite from the burnished layout line by scrubbing along the line with a cotton-tipped applicator...............................411

Figure H.35: Keep scrubbing, but check the applicator tip for soiled appearance. Continue until the tip comes up clean..411

Figure H.36: Now, flood and re-clean the entire gagging area...411

Figure H.37: Replace the applicators when they become soiled. As before, continue scrubbing until the tip comes up clean..411

Figure H.38: Refold, and dry the remaining area..412

Figure H.39: Removing the gauge from transparent envelope...413

Figure H.40: Positioning the gauge on the layout line..413

Figure H.41: Lift the tape to allow applying catalyst..414

Figure H.42: Applying M-Bond 200..414

Figure H.43: Applying adhesive...415

Figure H.44: Applying gauge on the test specimen...415

Figure H.45: Applying uniform pressure...416

Figure H.46: Remove the tape..416

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Nominal dimensions and sectional properties of rectangular hollow sections – Excerpt from ISO/FDIS 2633-2:2011 (E).....74

Table 3.2: Flow Chart of the 'C' program to calculate tip deflection.....75

Table 3.3: Individual rectangular section properties.....79

Table 4.1: Comparison of critical buckling loads for a rectangular pyramid, whose section changes bi-dimensionally at different rates.....141

Table 4.2: Individual rectangular section properties.....144

Table 4.3: Nominal dimensions and sectional properties of solid rectangular sections [95].....148

Table 4.4: Individual rectangular section properties.....151

Table 4.5: Nominal dimensions and sectional properties of rectangular hollow sections – Excerpt from ISO/FDIS 2633-2:2011 (E).....153

Table 7.1: Dimensional properties of the simulated two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly.....189

Table 7.2: ABAQUS/CAE procedure for tip deflection analysis.....191

Table 7.3: ABAQUS/CAE procedure for bending and shear stress analysis.....192

Table 7.4: ABAQUS/CAE procedure for determining critical buckling load.....193

Table 8.1: Sectional properties of the individual beams of the test specimen.....208

Table 8.2: Position of gauges along the telescopic beam assembly.....211

Table G.1: Materials and Elements defined in the analysis.....342