

**Judul Artikel:** Shear Strength of Reinforced Concrete T-Beams without Stirrups

**Penulis:** Thamrin, R., Tanjung, J., Aryanti, R., Nur, O.F., Devinus, A.

**Nama Jurnal:** Journal of Engineering Science and Technology (JESTEC)

**Volume Jurnal:** 11

**Nomor Jurnal:** 4

**Tahun Terbit Jurnal:** 2016

**Halaman:** 548 - 562

**ISSN:** 1823-4690

**Penerbit:** School Of Engineering, Taylor's University

**Tanggal Submitted: 19 Desember 2014**

Dear Dr.

Thank you for submitting your research paper to the Journal of Engineering Science and Technology (JESTEC)

Kindly note that we have received the paper entitled

EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ON SHEAR STRENGTH OF REINFORCED CONCRETE T-BEAM WITHOUT STIRRUP

Your paper ID is misc14\_082 (Please quote the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence with us.)

It is firstly required that the manuscript should be formatted according to JESTEC Template. Please use this link to read the Guidelines for Submission of Contributions <http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/instructions.html> and to download the template [http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/Template\\_Final\\_Paper.doc](http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/Template_Final_Paper.doc).

Prior to proceeding with the review process, you are kindly required to

- 1- send us your latest CV
- 2- fill in the JESTEC-Copyright transfer form (use this link to download <http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/JESTEC-Copyright%20transfer%20form.doc>)
- 3- your alternative email

Please submit the JESTEC-Copyright transfer form together with, the names, affiliations and e-mail addresses of four potential reviewers with Ph.D. Degree as minimum requirement.

Once submitted we will notify you via email when the review process starts. We will let you know the outcome once the review process is completed.

In order to complete the review process on time, we highly appreciate it if we can receive the Copyright Transfer Form and the Suggested Reviewers within one week from today.

Best regards

Dr. Abdulkareem Sh. Mahdi Al-Obaidi, CEng MIMechE  
Senior Lecturer, School of Engineering  
Head of Engineering Education Lab Research Group  
Executive Editor, Journal of Engineering Science & Technology  
<http://jestec.taylors.edu.my>  
Taylor's University  
Taylor's Lakeside Campus  
No. 1 Jalan Taylor's, 47500 Subang Jaya  
Selangor DE  
MALAYSIA  
Tel: ++603-56295263  
Fax: ++603-56295477  
[abdulkareem.mahdi@taylors.edu.my](mailto:abdulkareem.mahdi@taylors.edu.my)

## Proses Review 1: 14 Februari 2015

Dear Author

The **first round** of the review process has been completed.

I am glad to advise that your paper has been accepted for publication with no modification/**minor/major** corrections.

Attached herewith, please find one/two/three/**four**/five/six reviewers' reports.

Please notice the following:

- 1- Address all the concerns/recommendations of the reviewers
- 2- All additions/corrections are to be highlighted in red color in the revised paper.
- 3- Send the outlining how did you address the reviewers' concern/recommendations.
- 4- In order to complete the review process on time, we highly appreciate it if we can receive the revised paper within **three weeks** from today.

Best regards

*Dr. Abdulkareem Sh. Mahdi Al-Obaidi, CEng MIMechE*  
*Senior Lecturer, School of Engineering*  
*Head of Engineering Education Lab Research Group*  
*Executive Editor, Journal of Engineering Science & Technology*  
<http://jestec.taylors.edu.my>  
*Taylor's University*  
*Taylor's Lakeside Campus*  
*No. 1 Jalan Taylor's, 47500 Subang Jaya*  
*Selangor DE*  
*MALAYSIA*  
*Tel: ++603-56295263*  
*Fax: ++603-56295477*  
[abdulkareem.mahdi@taylors.edu.my](mailto:abdulkareem.mahdi@taylors.edu.my)

## Komentar Reviewer: 24 Februari 2015

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (JESTEC) MISC14_082</b></p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### REVIEWER 1 COMMENTS

No.	Comments	Revision
1.	suggestion for the keywords : reinforced concrete; t-beam; shear crack; longitudinal reinforcements ratio.	Correction has been made as suggested: See Keywords
2.	nomenclatures is not complete.	Revision has been made as suggested: See Nomenclatures

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (JESTEC) MISC14_082</b></p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### REVIEWER 2 COMMENTS

The authors thanks the reviewer for the valuable comments. Correction has been made for all suggested comments.

## SHEAR STRENGTH OF REINFORCED CONCRETE T-BEAMS WITHOUT STIRRUPS

### Abstract

This paper presents the test results of experimental study on shear strength of reinforced concrete beams without stirrups. The test variables in this study were type of beam cross section and ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. Six simple supported beams, consisting of three beams with rectangular cross section and three beams with T section, subjected to two point load were tested until failure. During the test, the values of the diagonal crack load and the maximum load were observed as well as the deformation of the beams. Existing theoretical equations for shear strength of concrete presented in the literature and design codes were used and then compared to that value obtained from the test. Comparison between test results and theoretical shear capacity show that all of equations conservatively estimate the occurrence of shear failure with the values of the test results 10 to 90% higher than the theoretical values. It was confirmed from the test that the shear capacity of T-beams were higher than for rectangular beams, with the values ranging from 5 to 25%, depending on the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. Also, it was observed that ratio of longitudinal reinforcement influences the shear capacity of the beam as well as the angle of diagonal shear crack. In addition, based on the test results, a simple model for predicting the contribution of flange to shear capacity in T-beam was presented.

Keywords: reinforced concrete, T-beam, shear crack, longitudinal reinforcements ratio, angle of diagonal crack.

Commented [U2]: Include findings in magnitude: added

Commented [U3]: Provide magnitude: added

Commented [U4]: In what magnitude: added

<b>Nomenclatures</b>	
$a$	shear span length
$b_f$	width of flange
$b_w$	width of web
$c$	neutral axis depth
$d$	effective depth
$f_c'$	concrete compressive strength
$h_f$	height of flange
$k$	$1.0 + \sqrt{(200/d)} \leq 2.0$
$V_c$	shear capacity of concrete
<b>Greek Symbols</b>	
$\alpha$	parameter taking into account the effect of flange in T section
$\rho_w$	ratio of longitudinal reinforcement (%)
<b>Abbreviations</b>	
ACI	American Concrete Institute
SNI	Standar Nasional Indonesia
LVDT	Linear Variable Differential Transformer
RCCSA	Reinforced Concrete Cross Section Analysis

## 1. Introduction

Study on shear performance of reinforced concrete structures has been carried out by other researchers over the last 60 years [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. The test variables used to investigate shear behavior of reinforced concrete structures frequently found in literature refer to the main parameters affecting the occurrence of shear failure e.g. concrete compressive strength, longitudinal reinforcement ratio, shear span to effective depth ratio and effect of member size. Most studies in this area focused only on reinforced concrete beams with rectangular cross section.

Bresler and McGregor [2] reported that shear failure is commonly initiated by the occurrence of diagonal cracks developing in the shear span. It is also stated in their paper that the flexural cracks always come before the occurrence of diagonal cracks in rectangular, I or T sections. Bresler and McGregor noted that the shape of the beam (I and T sections) influences the shear capacity and the behaviour of propagation of diagonal cracking due to the different magnitude of shearing stress developed in the web. However, not much attention has been given to the behavior of reinforced concrete beams with T sections.

In another report, Swamy and Qureshi [5] proposed an analytical procedure to calculate the ultimate shear strength of the compression zone of T-beams with long shear span. The theory of this procedure was derived using the concept of biaxial stress criterion and was based on Mohr's theory of failure. In this method the variables affecting the ultimate shear strength of the compression zone of T-beams are concrete compression strength, longitudinal reinforcement ratio, shear span length and effective depth of the section. Even though Swamy and Qureshi stated that their theory showed

good agreement with test results their computation procedure is not simple, it needs several steps of calculation and difficult to apply in practice.

A series of tests designed to study shear failure in reinforced concrete beams without stirrups has been carried out previously [7]. In this earlier study, the type of cross section was rectangular and the test variables were ratio of longitudinal reinforcement and shear span to effective depth ratio. It is reported from this study that most of the beams tested collapsed suddenly after the formation of diagonal shear cracks. On the other hand, diagonal shear cracks were not noticeable if the flexural capacity of the beams was lower than the shear capacity of the concrete and in this case the beams failed in flexural mode. It is also reported that the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement influences not only the shear capacity but also the angle of diagonal shear cracks.

So far, the codes have not covered the behavior of shear capacity of reinforced concrete beams with T sections. In addition, existing equations for shear capacity of concrete available in international design codes do not take into account the influence of the flange in T sections [8, 9]. Due to this fact, the main objective of this experimental work is to add to the data on this topic by focusing on the contribution of the flange to the shear capacity of reinforced concrete T-beams.

In order to achieve the aim of this research, three beams with rectangular sections and three beams with T sections were tested. The effect of longitudinal reinforcement ratio to the shear capacity and the growth of diagonal shear cracks were examined during the test. In addition the angle of diagonal cracks was also measured in order to observe the influence of longitudinal reinforcement ratio on the distribution of stresses in the shear span zone. Theoretical equations for shear capacity of concrete available in literature and design code were also used in this study and then compared with shear strength obtained from the test. Finally, available experimental data from literature was added to the data obtained from this study and by using a simple statistical procedure a model for predicting the contribution of flange to the shear capacity of concrete in reinforced concrete beams with T sections was proposed.

## 2. Experimental Study

Six simply supported reinforced concrete beams without stirrups, consisting of three beams with rectangular cross sections and three beams with T cross sections, were tested in this study. The beams were monotonically loaded until failure with two point load using a 500 kN capacity hydraulic jack. Loading position and dimension of the beam are shown in Fig. 1. For all of the beams, the clear span was 2000 mm, the shear span length ( $L_s$ ) was 800 mm and the end anchorage length beyond the support ( $L_a$ ) was 150 mm. For all of the beams the shear span - effective depth ratio was about 3.7 ( $a/d > 2.5$ ).

Two types of cross section as shown in Fig. 1 were used. The rectangular section had dimensions of 125 mm width and 250 mm height, while T section had 250 mm flange width, 70 mm flange thickness, 125 web width and 250 height. Deformed steel bars with 13 mm diameter, 550 MPa yield strength, and 204 GPa modulus of elasticity were used as longitudinal reinforcement. Three ratios of longitudinal reinforcement (1, 1.5 and 2.5%) were used for both type of cross section as shown in Fig. 1. The bottom and side concrete covers were 30 mm and

Commented [U5]: Where is [6]? : corrected

Commented [U6]: Recheck statement – if this beam collapsed in flexural mode, diagonal shear crack is not seen? : corrected

20 mm, respectively. Two wooden plates placed at each end side of the beam's formwork and drilled at the position of longitudinal reinforcements were used to keep the bars in position during concrete casting. The longitudinal reinforcements were suspended using steel wire at the middle position of the beam.

Fresh concrete was produced in the laboratory with a concrete mixer using maximum aggregate size of 20 mm and target compressive strength of 30 MPa. Afterwards, the average concrete cylinder strength obtained from compression tests was 32 MPa at age 28 days. For all beams the deflections at midspan and at one of the loading points were measured using two displacement transducers connected to a data acquisition system as illustrated in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. Dimension of beam specimen and position of load.

### 3. Theoretical Concrete Shear Strength

Although many empirical equations for concrete shear strength have been suggested in the literature and design codes, only some of them are applied in this study. Four empirical equations listed in Table 2 were used to estimate shear capacity of the concrete. Equation (1) was selected from the literature because of its simplicity, ease of application, and because it takes into account the size effect and ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. This empirical equation is also well-known and frequently used by researchers. Zsutty's equation predicts the shear strength of reinforced concrete beams without stirrups with a high degree of accuracy. Eq. (2) was selected as representative of empirical equations developed in response to the needs of a high seismic intensity environment. It also has good agreement with the experimental results [13]. Although apparently complex, parameters used in Niwa's equation are not so different to those used in Eq. (1). Furthermore, Eq. (3) is an equation adopted from Eurocode2 [11] as representative of the international codes and Eq. (4) is an equation adopted from SNI 03-2847-2002 as representative of the local code [12]. SNI 03-2847-2002 has adopted a similar expression with the equation for concrete shear strength suggested in ACI 318M-08 code [14]. It is shown in Table 1 that all listed equations take into account the concrete compressive strength, longitudinal

Commented [U7]: 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 not in sequence. Please confirm format of citation.: done



reinforcements ratio, shear span to effective depth ratio, and size effect. The constant values in each of equation are different due to the choice of mathematical function used to model the observed data and statistical approaches used to analyse it.

**Table 1. Theoretical equations for shear capacity of concrete.**

Zsutty [3]	$V_c = 2.17 \left( \rho_w f_c' \frac{d}{a} \right)^{1/3} b_w d$	(1)
Niwa [10]	$V_c = 0.2 \left( \rho_w f_c' \right)^{1/3} \left( d^{-1/4} \left( 0.75 + 1.4 \frac{d}{a} \right) \right) b_w d$	(2)
Eurocode 2 [11]	$V_c = \left( 0.12 k (100 \rho_w f_c')^{1/3} \right) b_w d$	(3)
SNI [12]	$V_c = \frac{1}{7} \left( \sqrt{f_c'} + 120 \rho_w \frac{d}{a} \right) b_w d$	(4)

**Commented [U8]:** Briefly discuss the difference in the constant value? Why?, done

#### 4. Results and Discussion

It was observed from the test that the earliest flexural cracks, for both types of beam cross section, developed in the pure moment zone when concrete reached its tensile strength at an average load value of 26 kN. Then, as the load increased, the flexural cracks extended to the shear span zone which then turned to become diagonal shear cracks at an average load value of 36 kN. Soon after that, all of the tested beams failed in shear (shear-tension failure) as expected. This type of shear failure is indicated by rapid propagation of diagonal shear cracks in the shear span zone shortly followed by sudden collapse of the beams. In addition, at failure stage the diagonal cracks continued to develop rapidly towards the support and compression surface of the shear span zone near the point load. The maximum shear load for each tested beam is listed in Table 2. It is shown that the maximum load for beams with T sections is higher than that for rectangular section with the values ranging from 5 to 25%, depending on the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. This fact confirms that the flange in T beams affects the shear stress distribution and propagation of the diagonal cracks in the web.

**Commented [U9]:** Which type – rectangular or T beam: information added


Failure modes and crack patterns of the beams are shown in Fig. 2. The diagonal shear cracks developed in the shear span zone for all beams tested. As shown in Fig. 2, in case of beams with rectangular sections, the height of flexural cracks along the beam length are relatively small especially for beams R-02E and R-03E. On the other hand, in case of beam T-01E, the flexural cracks were developed up to the flange. While for the other two beams with higher reinforcement ratio (T-02E and T-03E) the height of flexural cracks are relatively small. This indicates that the flange and ratio of longitudinal reinforcement not only affects the shear capacity of the beams but also influences the crack formation of the beams significantly.

**Commented [U10]:** Discuss why in terms of shear stress distribution between the two types.: done

This can be explained using calculated strain distributions of rectangular (R-01A, R-02A and R-03A) and T sections (T-01A, T-02A and T-03A) as shown in Fig. 3. These strain distributions were obtained numerically based on theoretical moment-curvature determination described in literature [15]. A numerical procedure based on layered element method was applied to determine the full

**Commented [U11]:** Discuss distribution of flexural stress in these sections.: done in terms of strain distribution (see Fig. 3)

response of a reinforced concrete cross section until the failure load obtained from the test. This procedure was implemented using a computer program named Reinforced Concrete Cross Section Analysis (RCCSA) developed by Thamrin, R. [16].



**Fig. 2. Failure mode and crack pattern of the beams.**

Figure 3 shows that at the level of failure load, the maximum compression strain of T sections is smaller than rectangular sections except for T-01A. This confirms that the flange of T sections significantly reduces the strain distributions in the compression zone. Consequently, the tensile strain of reinforcement in T sections are higher than tensile strain in rectangular sections. In addition, the strain in the compression surface of the section for both types of cross sections do not reach the maximum value of concrete compression strain (0.003). This detail also indicates that no concrete crushing occurs in the compression surface of the

pure bending zone (between two load points) as also shown in Fig. 2. While sections R-01A and T-01A reach the yield strain value (0.0027) of the bar due to a smaller ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. This means that, for these two beams, the shear failure occurs after the tensile reinforcement yield.




Fig. 3. Analytical strain distributions of rectangular and T section.

Figures 4(a) and (b) show load-deflection curves of the tested beams. It is shown from these figures that beam capacity increases as the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement increases. Comparison of load-deflection curves between beams with rectangular and T sections are shown in Figure 5. Due to the contribution of flange in the compression zone of the section, it is revealed that the capacity and stiffness of beams with T sections are higher than that of beams with rectangular sections.

Commented [U12]: Why?: the answer added in text

In addition, it is confirmed from Fig. 4(b) that beam T-01E failed in shear after longitudinal reinforcement yielded. This is indicated by the flat region in the end part of load-deflection curve. However, the reinforcement in beams T-02E and T-03E did not reach the yield strength until the occurrence of shear failure.




Fig. 4. Load-deflection curves obtained from test.




Fig. 5. Comparison between load-deflection curves of beams with rectangular and T section.

Figures 6 and 7 are plotted in order to compare the shear capacity of the beams from both theoretical (red line) and experimental results (dash line) with flexural capacity (black thick line) of the cross sections. Equation (4) is used as a representative value of theoretical shear capacity. Flexural capacities of the beams plotted in this figures were obtained numerically using the RCCSA program and in this calculation the maximum strain of concrete in compression is 0.003.

It is shown from Figs. 6 and 7 that none of the beams tested reached the flexural capacity of the cross section due to premature diagonal tension failure in

the shear span zone. In addition, the level of load at failure for all of the beams exceeds the theoretical shear capacity of concrete calculated using Eq. (4). In addition flexural capacity of cross section increases as the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement increases. Additionally, these figures also illustrate clearly the quantity of shear force needed to achieve the flexural capacity for each increment of longitudinal reinforcement ratio. The higher the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement, the higher the shear strength required for failure.

Commented [U13]: the higher: corrected




Fig. 6. Experimental shear capacity and flexural capacity of beams with rectangular cross section.




Fig. 7. Experimental shear capacity and flexural capacity of beams with T cross section.




Fig. 8. Effect of reinforcement ratio on experimental shear capacity and angle of diagonal crack.

Commented [U14]: explain the wide variation: explained

The effect of longitudinal reinforcement ratio on shear capacity and angle of diagonal cracks are plotted in Fig. 8. It is shown that most of the beams failed with the angle of diagonal crack around 45°. On the other hand, as concrete is a non-homogeneous material, a wide variation of angle of diagonal crack is shown in beams R-03E and T-02E. However, generally speaking the angle of diagonal crack decreases as the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement increases. It is also demonstrated that the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement significantly affects the shear capacity and angle of diagonal crack.

The test results from this study and selected additional data from literature [7, 17, 18] are summarized in Table 2. All cited data listed in Table 2 are from beams without stirrups and collapsed in diagonal tension failure mode as also attained in this study. For all T-beams listed in Table 2, the concrete compressive strength varies between 13 and 40 MPa. The wide variation of concrete compression strength is an advantage in this study in order to examine the effect of concrete strength on the shear capacity of concrete. The ratio of longitudinal reinforcement ranges between 0.49 to 5.2. The maximum flange width and flange height are 610 mm and 102 mm respectively. While the effective depth ranges between 200 and 399 mm.

Table 2. Test results and theoretical values of Vc.

Specimens	$f_c'$ (MPa)	$b_w$ (mm)	$h_f$ (mm)	$b_f$ (mm)	$d$ (mm)	$a/d$	$\rho_w$ (%)	Zsutty $V_c$ (kN)	Nwva $V_c$ (kN)	EC2 $V_c$ (kN)	SNI $V_c$ (kN)	Exp. $V_{max}$ (kN)	Proposed Model $V_c$ (kN)
Data from this study													
R-01E	32	125			219	3.7	1.0	26.05	28.45	2017	23.31	32.6	23.31
R-02E	32	125			219	3.7	1.5	29.82	32.57	23.09	23.94	37.0	23.94
R-03E	32	125			212	3.8	2.5	34.31	37.75	27.03	24.43	37.6	24.43
T-01E	32	125	70	250	219	3.7	1.0	26.05	28.45	2017	23.31	36.6	25.34
T-02E	32	125	70	250	219	3.7	1.5	29.82	32.57	23.09	23.94	38.5	25.96
T-03E	32	125	70	250	212	3.8	2.5	34.31	37.75	27.03	24.43	47.5	26.51
Thamrin et al. [7]													
BSL-02	13.0	130			200	2.3	0.6	19.85	20.95	12.38	14.55	42.5	14.55
BSL-03	13.0	130			200	2.3	0.9	22.81	24.07	14.22	15.16	44.9	15.16
BSN-05	33.5	130			200	2.3	0.6	27.21	28.73	16.97	22.66	48.9	22.66
BSN-06	33.5	130			200	2.3	0.9	31.27	33.00	19.49	23.26	53.9	23.26
BSL-08	13.0	130			200	3.0	0.6	16.71	18.76	12.38	14.28	27.4	14.28
BSL-09	13.0	130			200	3.0	0.9	19.20	21.56	14.22	14.74	29.2	14.74
BSN-11	33.5	130			200	3.0	0.6	22.92	25.72	16.97	22.39	35.7	22.39
BSN-12	33.5	130			200	3.0	0.9	26.33	29.55	19.49	22.85	43.9	22.85
Kotsopoulos et al. [17]													
I	40	50	65	200	240	10.4	5.2	15.26	18.01	16.35	11.88	19.0	12.49
II	40	50	65	200	240	10.4	5.2	15.26	18.01	16.35	11.88	22.0	12.49
III	40	50	65	200	240	3.3	5.2	22.30	23.82	16.35	14.07	37.0	14.68
Palaskas et al. [18]													
N02	32.8	190	102	610	374	4.14	0.69	58.52	55.94	41.76	60.17	72.0	66.6
A00	32.7	190	102	610	394	3.92	0.66	61.80	58.25	42.83	63.31	64.7	69.4
B00	32.0	190	102	610	399	3.88	0.49	56.45	53.04	38.89	62.90	70.5	68.9

The equations listed in Table 1 were used to calculate the shear strength of the beams and the results are shown in Table 2. It is noted that all of theoretical equations listed in Table 1 ignore the contribution of flanges in T-beams. The

Commented [U15]: angle: corrected

Commented [U16]: organise the format: done

Commented [U17]: may affect your shear capacity? Intended grade is 30 MPa: explained

comparisons between theoretical values of shear capacity and experimental are presented in Fig. 9. It is shown from Fig. 9 that Eq. (1) and (2) conservatively predict the test results while Eqs. (3) and (4) extremely conservatively predict the shear capacity for both beams with rectangular and T sections. In addition, theoretical predictions for beams with T sections show lower values compared to that obtained from the test especially from the experimental study carried out by Kotsovos et al. [17] and Palaskas et al [18].

These results demonstrate that shear capacity of concrete is significantly influenced by concrete compressive strength, longitudinal reinforcements ratio, shear span to effective depth ratio and effect of member size. The presence of flange in case of T-beams also affects the shear capacity of the beams significantly.




Fig. 9. Comparison of theoretical values of shear capacity with experimental.

### 5. Modified Shear Strength Equation for T-Beam

Figure 10 illustrates three models of T section with ignored and effective shear areas. As already described in the previous section, existing theoretical equations listed in Table 1 ignore the effect of flange in T-beams as illustrated by the shaded area in Fig. 10(a) and only include the white area (b,c,d). While Fig. 10(b) shows

the effective shear area (shaded area) of concrete in the flange zone according to Zararis et al. [8] and Tureyen et al. [9]. In their report, Zararis et al. [8] suggested a design procedure to calculate the effect of flange, however the procedure proposed is difficult to use in practice. Hence, it is necessary to estimate the effect of flange on the shear capacity using a more simple procedure.




Fig. 10. Ignored and effective shear area of T section.

The process to determine the basic parameters affecting the shear capacity of T-beams can be described using Fig. 10(b) and the following assumptions. As shown in Fig. 10(b), the total shaded area,  $A_{ct}$ , can be calculated as:

$$A_{ct} = cb_w + \left( \frac{b_f - b_w}{2} h_f \right) \quad (5)$$

If only the shaded area in flange zone,  $A_{cf}$ , as shown in Fig. 10(c) is considered, the total shaded area in Eq. (5) can be reduced to:

$$A_{cf} = \left( \frac{b_f - b_w}{2} h_f \right) \quad (6)$$




Fig. 11. Effect of  $b_f$  and  $b_w$  on the shear capacities.

Figure 11 is plotted in order to examine the effect of  $b_f$  and  $b_w$  on the shear capacities of the beams with T section. In addition, the square of the effective depth,  $d$ , of the cross section is used as a normalized variable. It is shown in Fig. 11(a) that R-square value of the trend line obtained from this simple statistical analysis is higher than that value in Fig. 11(b). These results demonstrate that  $b_f$  affects the shear capacity of the beams considerably more than  $b_w$ . Moreover,



since the effect of  $b_w$  on the shear capacity is not significant it can be ignored. For that reason the shear area of T section in the flange can be proposed as illustrated in Fig. 10(c) and the basic equation to estimate the effect of flange on the shear capacity can be simplify as:

$$\alpha = \left( \frac{b_f h_f}{2d^2} \right) \tag{7}$$


Therefore the width and thickness of the flange become the main variables predicting the additional shear strength contributed by the flange. Eq. (7) was then modified to fit the test results and data from the literature using simple statistical procedure to produce Eq. (8).

$$\alpha = 1.0 + \left( \frac{b_f h_f}{4d^2} \right) \tag{8}$$

Eq. (8) gives a value of 1 in the case of beams with rectangular cross section ( $h_f = 0$ ). Furthermore, Eq. (4) which is adopted from SNI 03-2847-2002 was modified in order to add the effect of the flange in beams with T section. This is done by substituting Eq. (8) in to Eq. (4) as a multiplication factor for the square root of concrete compressive strength and the modified equation can then be proposed as follows:

$$V_c = \frac{1}{7} \left( \alpha \sqrt{f_c} + 120 \rho_w \frac{d}{a} \right) b_w d \tag{9}$$

Figure 12 compares shear capacity predicted by the proposed model with experimental results obtained from this study and literature. It can be shown from Fig. 12(a) that the shear capacity of the proposed model is slightly higher than that obtained using Eq. (4). While Fig. 12(b) shows that the shear capacity of the proposed model still conservatively compares to values obtained from the test.



(a) (b)  
**Fig. 12. Comparison of shear capacity,  $V_c$ , between proposed model and experimental results for beams with T section.**

## 6. Conclusions

Six reinforced concrete beams, consisting of three beams with rectangular cross sections and three beams with T sections, were tested to study the effect of flange and longitudinal reinforcement on the shear capacity. The following conclusions are noted from this study:

- Shear capacity of the tested T-beams is significantly influenced by the flange and the amount of longitudinal reinforcement ratio. The shear capacity of T-beams is 5 to 20% higher than that of beams with rectangular cross section.
- The angle of diagonal crack in the shear span zone was also significantly influenced by the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. Commonly, for both rectangular and T sections, the angle of diagonal crack decreases as the longitudinal reinforcement ratio increases.
- All of theoretical equations used to calculate shear strength of concrete conservatively predict the shear capacity of the beams especially for equations suggested by the codes. Values of the test results are 10 to 90% higher than the theoretical values.
- A new model is proposed to predict the shear strength of reinforced concrete beams with T sections. Shear strength calculated using the proposed model still compares conservatively to experimental values.

## References

1. Kani, G. N. J., (1964). The Riddle of Shear Failure and Its Solution. Proceedings, American Concrete Institute, Vol. 61, No. 4, pp. 441-467.
2. Bresler, B. and MacGregor, J. G., (1967). "Review of concrete beams failing in shear." J. Struct. Division, Proc. American Society Civil Eng., V. 93, ST1, pp. 343-371.
3. Zsutty, T. C., (1968), Beam Shear Strength Prediction by Analysis of Existing Data. ACI Journal, 65(11), 942-951.
4. Placas, A. and Regan, P. E., (1971). Shear Failure of Reinforced Concrete Beams. American Concrete Institute, Vol. 68, No. 10, pp. 763-773.
5. Swamy, R. N. and Qureshi, S. A., (1974). An ultimate shear strength theory for reinforced concrete T-beams without web reinforcement. Matériaux et Construction, Volume 7, Issue 3, pp 181-189.
6. Zararis, P. D., (2003). Shear Strength and Minimum Shear Reinforcement of Reinforced Concrete Slender Beams, ACI Structural Journal, Vol. 100(2), pp. 203-214.
7. Thamrin, R., Aziz, A., Yeoh, D., Azlina, N. and Ali, M., (2011). Experimental Study on Diagonal Shear Cracks of Concrete Beams Without Stirrups Longitudinally Reinforced with GFRP Bars. Proc. of FIB Symposium 'Concrete Engineering for Excellence and Efficiency', Prague, Czech Republic, Edited by Sruma, V., pp. 1177 - 1180.
8. Zararis, P. D. (2006). Shear Strength of Reinforced Concrete T-Beams. ACI Structural Journal, V. 103, No. 5, pp. 693-700.

Commented [U18]: include in terms of magnitude: done

Commented [U19]: recheck citation sequence: corrected

9. Tureyen, A. K., Wolf, T. S. and Frosch, R. J. (2006). Shear Strength of Reinforced Concrete T-Beams without Transverse Reinforcement. *ACI Structural Journal*, V. 103, No. 5, pp. 656-663.
10. Niwa, J., Yamada, K., Yokozawa, K. and Okamura, H., (1987). Reevaluation of The Equation for Shear Strength of Reinforced Concrete Beams without Web Reinforcement. *Concrete Library International of JSCE*, No.9, pp.65-84.
11. Eurocode 2, (2004), *Design of Concrete Structures - Part 1-1: General Rules and rules for Buildings*.
12. SNI 03-2847-2002, (2002). *Tata Cara Perhitungan Struktur Beton untuk Bangunan Gedung*.
13. Thamrin, R. and Kaku, T., (2007). Bond Behavior of CFRP Bars in Simply Supported Reinforced Concrete Beam with Hanging Region. *J. Compos. Construct., ASCE*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 129-137.
14. ACI 318M-08, (2008). *Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete (ACI 318M-08) and Commentary*. American Concrete Institute.
15. Park, R., and Paulay T., (1975). *Reinforced Concrete Structures*. John Wiley, New York.
16. Thamrin, R., (2014). *User manual of Reinforced Concrete Cross Section Analysis (RCCSA)*. Jurusan Teknik Sipil, Fakultas Teknik, Universitas Andalas.
17. Kotsovos, M. D.; Bobrowski, J. and Eibl, J., (1987). Behaviour of Reinforced Concrete T-Beams in Shear. *The Structural Engineer*, V. 65B, No. 1, pp. 1-10.
18. Palaskas, M. N.; Attiogbe, E. K. and Darwin, D., (1981). Shear Strength of Lightly Reinforced T-Beams. *ACI Journal, Proceedings* V. 78, No. 6, pp. 447-455.

**JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
(JESTEC)  
MISC14\_082**

**REVIEWER 3 COMMENTS**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Revision</b>
1.	The manuscript is written well, easy to read and understand. However, English can be improved further in order to meet the journal's required standard. Revise the whole manuscript carefully and try to avoid any grammatical or syntax error.	Correction has been made as suggested.
2.	Reference should be arranged and cited in order. For example, in Introduction, "A series of test designed to study shear failure in reinforced concrete beams without stirrup was carried out in the past [7]". This should be cited as [6].	Correction has been made as suggested.
3.	Reference [4] could not be found in the text. In the reference list, reference [10] should be properly cited as Eurocode 2, not the book that contains the equation.	Correction has been made as suggested.
4.	In comparison with the experimental values, it seems that Equations (1), (2), (3) and (4) underestimate the shear capacity in all cases, no conservative predictions can be found in Table 2. Please clarify this.	The authors thanks the reviewer for the valuable comments. It is agreed that all of the theoretical equations (Equations (1), (2), (3) and (4)) underestimate the shear capacity in all cases. Due to this fact we normally said that the prediction is conservative because the values obtained from the test higher than predicted values. On the other hand, in case of the values obtained from the test lower than theoretical values, we said this unsafe or un conservative.
5.	Authors should include shear strength values predicted by using the proposed model (Equation 6) in Table 2 so that comparison can be made clearly and the accuracy of the proposed model can be evaluated. How accurate is this equation in correspondence with the test results?	Revision has been made as suggested (See Table 2).
6.	Please complete the references by referring to at least one (1) relevant paper from JESTEC (if any).	The authors have tried to search the relevant paper from JESTEC, unfortunately we cannot find the related paper and fulfil the request from reviewer.

**REVIEWER 4 COMMENTS**

No.	Comments	Revision
1.	The author should adjusted all joining words inside the paper, for example ( in introduction paragraph: ( line 15) <b>isreported</b> »» is reported , and in (line 24) <b>thestudy</b> »» the study, etc. ....in all paragraphs of paper).	Correction has been made as suggested.
2.	The review of literatures is very few which are deal with the paper's subject. The reviewer hopes to re-read below references to use in build the new proposed shear model: <b>Additional references are:</b> A. Swamy R.N. , and Qureshi S.A., (1974). <i>An ultimate shear strength theory for reinforced concrete T-beams without web reinforcement</i> . <u>Matériaux et Construction</u> , Volume 7, Issue 3 , pp 181-189  B. Munther J. Haddadin, Sheu-Tien Hong, and Alan H. Mattock. Stirrup Effectiveness in Reinforced Concrete Beams with Axial Force . Journal of the Structural Division, Vol. 97, No. 9, pp. 2277-2297.  C. Mahmoud K.S (2012). Experimental Study of the Shear Behavior of Self Compacted Concrete T-Beams. Journal of Engineering and Development, Vol. 16, No.1, pp.120-137. [http://www.iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=28697]	Literatures has been added as suggested. However suggested additional references (B and C) by reviewer has been replaced with:  - Bresler, B. and MacGregor, J. G., (1967), "Review of concrete beams failing in shear." J. Struct. Division, Proc. American Society Civil Eng., V. 93, ST1, pp. 343–371.  which is more relevant to the study carried out by authors.
3.	Transfer the ( <b>nomenclatures</b> ) list to second page, as journal's instructions.	Correction has been made as suggested.
4.	Explain how to fixed the longitudinal reinforcements without stirrups. Are used stirrups at supports, illustrated it in <b>Fig.1</b>	Explanation has been added as requested.
5.	Explain how much side concrete cover of cross sections in <b>Fig.1</b> .	Explanation has been added as requested.
6.	Are the ( <b>32MPa</b> ) as average compressive concrete strength?, should be mentioned that.	Explanation has been added as requested.

7.	Add this sentence (one of ) on line 11 of paragraph as:  " For all beams the deflections at midspan and at <u>one of</u> loading points were measured using two displacement transducers connected to data acquisition system as illustrated in Fig. 1"	Correction has been done as suggested.
8.	In page (4), line(2); write that " Equation (1) was used in this study because its simplicity" , but in Fig.5 &6, Eq. 4 was used.	The authors thanks the reviewer for the valuable comments. Eq. (4) was used because the authors would like to evaluate shear design equation suggested in their country code. However the parameter taking into account the effect of flange in T section proposed by authors also can be applied to the other design codes.
9.	should be mentioned in (line 14; page4), equation (4) in (ACI) has condition ( $a/d > 2.5$ ).	Correction has been done as suggested.
10.	Why the cracks in most beams crossing the support line (see Fig.2), are this weak support area ?	Explanation has been added as requested.
11.	The reviewer suggests that: beams (R-03E, and T-02E) failed as shear tension. Also beam (R-02E) failed as shear compression failure.	The authors appreciate the suggestion and helpful reminder for the shear failures mode. The authors decided to use the term "shear-tension failure" as suggested by reviewer. Additional explanation has been added in the first paragraph of Sect. 4.
12.	( Fig.7a. and Table2 ) are very important to notice the shear capacity contribution of flange. Should be written that as percentage.	Correction has been done as suggested.
13.	Fig.7b. show most of beams are failed approximately at 45°. Need to explain that two specimens are not on this range.	Explanation has been added as requested.
14.	Should be explain the (Conclusion No.3 )	Explanation has been added as requested.
15.	Reference (9) need to correct title " <b>Reevaluation</b> " »» Reevaluation.	Revision has been made as suggested.

**Tanggal Accepted: 25 April 2015**

Dear Author(s)

Thank you for your email and sending your modified paper.

There are some formatting mistakes (for example the format of the tables, and the formatting of the references (style)) and the paper in its current format needs further revision before it can be accepted as camera-ready paper and published online or hardcopy publication (please refer to our website for instructions and template).

We would like to inform you that your paper has been scheduled to be published in

**August 2016, Volume 11 Issue 8**

*Attached please find the acceptance letter.*

*Please take note that we are currently working to upload all accepted and ready camera papers under the category "Articles in Press" which means your paper will be uploaded online and fully cited but as a hardcopy will appear in Volume 11(8), August 2016.*

We also like to inform you that the sooner you submit the final version of your paper the earlier will appear online in the Journal website as an "Article in Press".

Kindly use this link <http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/Articles%20in%20Press.htm> to read more about "**Articles in Press**".

We thank you very much for your interest in JESTEC and looking forward for new contribution.

Best regards

**Dr. Abdulkareem Sh. Mahdi Al-Obaidi, CEng MIMechE**  
Senior Lecturer, School of Engineering  
Head of Engineering Education Lab Research Group  
Executive Editor, Journal of Engineering Science & Technology  
<http://jestec.taylors.edu.my>  
Taylor's University  
Taylor's Lakeside Campus  
No. 1 Jalan Taylor's, 47500 Subang Jaya  
Selangor DE  
MALAYSIA  
Tel: [+603-56295263](tel:+603-56295263)  
Fax: [+603-56295477](tel:+603-56295477)  
[abdulkareem.mahdi@taylors.edu.my](mailto:abdulkareem.mahdi@taylors.edu.my)

Saturday, April 25, 2015

**Letter of Acceptance**

**To Whom It May Concern:**

This is to certify that **RENDY THAMRIN, JAFRIL TANJUNG, RIZA ARYANTI, OSCAR FITRAH NUR, and AZMU DEVINUS** have submitted the article entitled

***“SHEAR STRENGTH OF REINFORCED CONCRETE T-BEAMS WITHOUT STIRRUPS”***

to our journal, **Journal of Engineering Science & Technology (JESTEC)**.

The paper has been reviewed and accepted for publication in

**Volume 11, Issue 8 (August 2016).**

Best regards




**Dr. Abdulkareem Sh. Mahdi Al-Obaidi, CEng MIMechE**  
Senior Lecturer, School of Engineering  
Head of Engineering Education Lab Research Group  
Executive Editor, Journal of Engineering Science & Technology  
<http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/>  
Taylor's University  
Taylor's Lakeside Campus  
No. 1 Jalan Taylor's, 47500 Subang Jaya  
Selangor DE  
MALAYSIA  
Tel: ++603-56295263  
Fax: ++603-56295477  
[abdulkareem.mahdi@taylors.edu.my](mailto:abdulkareem.mahdi@taylors.edu.my)




## Alamat dari Website Paper yang Sudah Diterbitkan pada Publikasi Online:

<http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/V11Issue4.htm>



The screenshot shows a web browser window with the URL [jestec.taylors.edu.my/V11Issue4.htm](http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/V11Issue4.htm). The page title is "Journal of Engineering Science and Technology (JESTEC)". The main content area displays the journal cover for Volume 11, Issue 4, April 2016, with page numbers 458-654. A list of articles is provided below the cover:

- [Hygro-thermal behaviour of porous building material subjected to different external temperature and humidity conditions](#)  
A. Chikhi, A. Belhamri, P. Glouannec, A. Magueresse  
458 - 475
- [An improved bit loading technique for enhanced energy efficiency in next generation voice/video applications](#)  
Vinoth Babu K., Ramachandra Reddy G., Arthi M.  
476 - 495
- [Liquid air as an energy storage: A review](#)  
Y. Lim, M. Al-Atabi, Richard A. Williams  
496 - 515



The screenshot shows the same web browser window, but with the list of articles expanded. The article "Shear strength of reinforced concrete T-beams without stirrups" is highlighted with a red rectangular box. The list of articles includes:

- [Liquid air as an energy storage: A review](#)  
Y. Lim, M. Al-Atabi, Richard A. Williams  
496 - 515
- [Improved variable step size incremental conductance MPPT method with high convergence speed for PV systems](#)  
Behzad A. Isaloo, P. Amiri  
516 - 528
- [Infusing industry practices into an engineering capstone project: A learning outcome attainment case study](#)  
S. Namasivayam, M. Al-Atabi, R. Gamboa, R. Singh  
529 - 547
- [Shear strength of reinforced concrete T-beams without stirrups](#)  
R. Thamrin, J. Tanjung, R. Aryaniti, Oscar F. Nur, A. Devinus  
548 - 562
- [Analysis of Monte Carlo simulation sampling techniques on small signal stability of wind generator- connected power system](#)  
T. R. Ayodele  
563 - 583
- [Experimental investigation on the effect of natural tropical weather on interfacial bonding performance of CFRP-concrete bonding system](#)  
M. H. Mohd Hashim, A. R. Mohd Sam, M. W. Hussin  
584 - 604
- [Design and develop a computer aided design for automatic exudates detection for diabetic retinopathy screening](#)  
C. A. Sathiyamoorthy, G. Kulanthavel  
605 - 618
- [Comparing the geodetical and geotechnical methods in investigating the deformation of Earthfill dams; A case study of Mahabad earthfill dam, Iran](#)  
M. H. Aminfar, A. Rasibud, H. Ahmadi, A. Naseri  
619 - 637
- [Effects of styrene-butadiene-styrene on stiffness of asphalt concrete at different traffic conditions](#)  
G. Shafabakhsh, A. Tanakzadeh  
638 - 654

# Journal of Engineering Science and Technology (JESTEC)

## Archive

[Home](#)

[Instructions](#)

[Editors](#)

[Reviewers](#)

[Authors Index](#)

[Downloads](#)

[Contacts](#)



**Volume 11, Issue 4, April 2016**

**Page 458 – 654**

[Hygro-thermal behaviour of porous building material subjected to different external temperature and humidity conditions](#)

A. Chikhi, A. Belhamri, P. Glouanec, A. Magueresse  
458 - 475

[An Improved bit loading technique for enhanced energy efficiency in next generation voice/video applications](#)

Vinoth Babu K., Ramachandra Reddy G., Arthi M.  
476 - 495

[Liquid air as an energy storage: A review](#)

Y. Lim, M. Al-Atabi, Richard A. Williams  
496 - 515

[Improved variable step size incremental conductance MPPT method with high convergence speed for PV systems](#)

Behzad A. Isaloo, P. Amiri  
516 - 528

[Infusing industry practices into an engineering capstone project: A learning outcome attainment case study](#)

S. Namasivayam, M. Al-Atabi, R. Gamboa, R. Singh  
529 - 547

[Shear strength of reinforced concrete T-beams without stirrups](#)

R. Thamrin, J. Tanjung, R. Aryanti, Oscar F. Nur, A. Devinus  
548 - 562

[Analysis of Monte Carlo simulation sampling techniques on small signal stability of wind generator- connected power system](#)

T. R. Ayodele  
563 - 583

[Experimental investigation on the effect of natural tropical weather on interfacial bonding performance of CFRP-concrete bonding system](#)

M. H. Mohd Hashim, A. R. Mohd Sam, M. W. Hussin  
584 - 604

[Design and develop a computer aided design for automatic exudates detection for diabetic retinopathy screening](#)

C. A. Sathiyamoorthy, G. Kulanthaivel  
605 - 618

[Comparing the geodetical and geotechnical methods in investigating the deformation of Earthfill dams; A case study of Mahabad earthfill dam, Iran](#)

M. H. Aminfar, A. Rastbud, H. Ahmadi, A. Naseri  
619 - 637

[Effects of styrene-butadiene-styrene on stiffness of asphalt concrete at different traffic conditions](#)

G. Shafabakhsh, A. Tanakizadeh

638 - 654 A. Mojtahedi

296 - 310

[Home](#)

[Instructions](#)

[Editors](#)

[Reviewers](#)

[Authors  
Index](#)

[Downloads](#)

[Contacts](#)



Copyright ©2006-2016 by: School of Engineering. Taylor's University

## **SHEAR STRENGTH OF REINFORCED CONCRETE T-BEAMS WITHOUT STIRRUPS**

RENDY THAMRIN\*, JAFRIL TANJUNG, RIZA ARYANTI,  
OSCAR FITRAH NUR, AZMU DEVINUS

Department of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Andalas University,  
Padang, 25163, West Sumatera, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: rendy@ft.unand.ac.id

### **Abstract**

This paper presents the test results of experimental study on shear strength of reinforced concrete beams without stirrups. The test variables in this study were type of beam cross section and ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. Six simple supported beams, consisting of three beams with rectangular cross section and three beams with T section, subjected to two point load were tested until failure. During the test, the values of the diagonal crack load and the maximum load were observed as well as the deformation of the beams. Existing empirical equations for shear strength of concrete presented in the literature and design codes were used and then compared to that value obtained from the test. Comparison between test results and theoretical shear capacity show that all of equations conservatively estimate the occurrence of shear failure with the values of the test results 10 to 90% higher than the theoretical values. It was confirmed from the test that the shear capacity of T-beams were higher than for rectangular beams, with the values ranging from 5 to 25%, depending on the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. Also, it was observed that ratio of longitudinal reinforcement influences the shear capacity of the beam as well as the angle of diagonal shear crack. In addition, based on the test results, a simple model for predicting the contribution of flange to shear capacity in T-beam was presented.

Keywords: Reinforced concrete, T-beam, shear crack, Longitudinal reinforcements ratio, Angle of diagonal crack.

### **1. Introduction**

Study on shear performance of reinforced concrete structures has been carried out by other researchers over the last 60 years [1-6]. The test variables used to investigate shear behavior of reinforced concrete structures frequently found in literature refer

<b>Nomenclatures</b>	
$a$	shear span length
$b_f$	width of flange
$b_w$	width of web
$c$	neutral axis depth
$d$	effective depth
$f'_c$	concrete compressive strength
$h_f$	height of flange
$k$	$1.0 + \sqrt{(200/d)} \leq 2.0$
$V_c$	shear capacity of concrete
<b>Greek Symbols</b>	
$\alpha$	parameter taking into account the effect of flange in T section
$\rho_w$	ratio of longitudinal reinforcement (%)
<b>Abbreviations</b>	
ACI	American Concrete Institute
SNI	Standar Nasional Indonesia
LVDT	Linear Variable Differential Transformer
RCCSA	Reinforced Concrete Cross Section Analysis

to the main parameters affecting the occurrence of shear failure e.g. concrete compressive strength, longitudinal reinforcement ratio, shear span to effective depth ratio and effect of member size. Most studies in this area focused only on reinforced concrete beams with rectangular cross section.

Bresler and McGregor [2] reported that shear failure is commonly initiated by the occurrence of diagonal cracks developing in the shear span. It is also stated in their paper that the flexural cracks always come before the occurrence of diagonal cracks in rectangular, I or T sections. Bresler and McGregor noted that the shape of the beam (I and T sections) influences the shear capacity and the behaviour of propagation of diagonal cracking due to the different magnitude of shearing stress developed in the web. However, not much attention has been given to the behavior of reinforced concrete beams with T sections.

In another report, Swamy and Qureshi [5] proposed an analytical procedure to calculate the ultimate shear strength of the compression zone of T-beams with long shear span. The theory of this procedure was derived using the concept of biaxial stress criterion and was based on Mohr's theory of failure. In this method the variables affecting the ultimate shear strength of the compression zone of T-beams are concrete compression strength, longitudinal reinforcement ratio, shear span length and effective depth of the section. Even though Swamy and Qureshi stated that their theory showed good agreement with test results their computation procedure is not simple, it needs several steps of calculation and difficult to apply in practice.

A series of tests designed to study shear failure in reinforced concrete beams without stirrups has been carried out previously [7]. In this earlier study, the type of cross section was rectangular and the test variables were ratio of longitudinal reinforcement and shear span to effective depth ratio. It is reported from this study that most of the beams tested collapsed suddenly after the formation of

diagonal shear cracks. On the other hand, diagonal shear cracks were not noticeable if the flexural capacity of the beams was lower than the shear capacity of the concrete and in this case the beams failed in flexural mode. It is also reported that the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement influences not only the shear capacity but also the angle of diagonal shear cracks.

So far, the codes have not covered the behavior of shear capacity of reinforced concrete beams with T sections. In addition, existing equations for shear capacity of concrete available in international design codes do not take into account the influence of the flange in T sections [8, 9]. Due to this fact, the main objective of this experimental work is to add to the data on this topic by focusing on the contribution of the flange to the shear capacity of reinforced concrete T-beams.

In order to achieve the aim of this research, three beams with rectangular sections and three beams with T sections were tested. The effect of longitudinal reinforcement ratio to the shear capacity and the growth of diagonal shear cracks were examined during the test. In addition the angle of diagonal cracks was also measured in order to observe the influence of longitudinal reinforcement ratio on the distribution of stresses in the shear span zone. Empirical equations for shear capacity of concrete available in literature and design code were also used in this study and then compared with shear strength obtained from the test. Finally, available experimental data from literature was added to the data obtained from this study and by using a simple statistical procedure a model for predicting the contribution of flange to the shear capacity of concrete in reinforced concrete beams with T sections was proposed.

## 2. Experimental Study

Six simply supported reinforced concrete beams without stirrups, consisting of three beams with rectangular cross sections and three beams with T cross sections, were tested in this study. The beams were monotonically loaded until failure with two point load using a 500 kN capacity hydraulic jack. Loading position and dimension of the beam are shown in Fig. 1. For all of the beams, the clear span was 2000 mm, the shear span length ( $L_s$ ) was 800 mm and the end anchorage length beyond the support ( $L_a$ ) was 150 mm. For all of the beams the shear span - effective depth ratio was about 3.7 ( $a/d > 2.5$ ).

Two types of cross section as shown in Fig. 1 were used. The rectangular section had dimensions of 125 mm width and 250 mm height, while T section had 250 mm flange width, 70 mm flange thickness, 125 web width and 250 height. Deformed steel bars with 13 mm diameter, 550 MPa yield strength, and 204 GPa modulus of elasticity were used as longitudinal reinforcement. Three ratios of longitudinal reinforcement (1, 1.5 and 2.5%) were used for both type of cross section as shown in Fig. 1. The bottom and side concrete covers were 30 mm and 20 mm, respectively. Two wooden plates placed at each end side of the beam's formwork and drilled at the position of longitudinal reinforcements were used to keep the bars in position during concrete casting. The longitudinal reinforcements were suspended using steel wire at the middle position of the beam.

Fresh concrete was produced in the laboratory with a concrete mixer using maximum aggregate size of 20 mm and target compressive strength of 30 MPa. Afterwards, the average concrete cylinder strength obtained from compression

tests was 32 MPa at age 28 days. For all beams the deflections at midspan and at one of the loading points were measured using two displacement transducers connected to a data acquisition system as illustrated in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. Test setup and beam dimensions.

### 3. Theoretical Concrete Shear Strength

Although many empirical equations for concrete shear strength have been suggested in the literature and design codes, only some of them are applied in this study. Four empirical equations listed in Table 1 were used to estimate shear capacity of the concrete. Equation (1) was selected from the literature because of its simplicity, ease of application, and because it takes into account the size effect and ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. This empirical equation is also well-known and frequently used by researchers. Zsutty's equation predicts the shear strength of reinforced concrete beams without stirrups with a high degree of accuracy.

Table 1. Empirical equations for shear capacity of concrete from literature.

Literature	Empirical equations for shear capacity of concrete
Zsutty [3]	$V_c = 2.17 \left( \rho_w f_c' \frac{d}{a} \right)^{1/3} b_w d$ (1)
Niwa [10]	$V_c = 0.2 \left( \rho_w f_c' \right)^{1/3} \left( d^{-1/4} \right) \left( 0.75 + 1.4 \frac{d}{a} \right) b_w d$ (2)
Eurocode 2 [11]	$V_c = \left( 0.12 k (100 \rho_w f_c')^{1/3} \right) b_w d$ (3)
SNI [12]	$V_c = \frac{1}{7} \left( \sqrt{f_c'} + 120 \rho_w \frac{d}{a} \right) b_w d$ (4)

Equation (2) was selected as representative of empirical equations developed in response to the needs of a high seismic intensity environment. It also has good agreement with the experimental results [13]. Although apparently complex, parameters used in Niwa's equation are not so different to those used in Eq. (1).

Furthermore, Eq. (3) is an equation adopted from Eurocode2 [11] as representative of the international codes and Eq. (4) is an equation adopted from SNI 03-2847-2002 as representative of the local code [12]. SNI 03-2847-2002 has adopted a similar expression with the equation for concrete shear strength suggested in ACI 318M-08 code [14]. It is shown in Table 1 that all listed equations take into account the concrete compressive strength, longitudinal reinforcements ratio, shear span to effective depth ratio, and size effect. The constant values in each of equation are different due to the choice of mathematical function used to model the observed data and statistical approaches used to analyse it.


#### 4. Results and Discussion

It was observed from the test that the earliest flexural cracks, for both types of beam cross section, developed in the pure moment zone when concrete reached its tensile strength at an average load value of 26 kN. Then, as the load increased, the flexural cracks extended to the shear span zone which then turned to become diagonal shear cracks at an average load value of 36 kN. Soon after that, all of the tested beams failed in shear (shear-tension failure) as expected. This type of shear failure is indicated by rapid propagation of diagonal shear cracks in the shear span zone shortly followed by sudden collapse of the beams. In addition, at failure stage the diagonal cracks continued to develop rapidly towards the support and compression surface of the shear span zone near the point load. The maximum shear load for each tested beam is listed in Table 2. It is shown that the maximum load for beams with T sections is higher than that for rectangular section with the values ranging from 5 to 25%, depending on the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. This fact confirms that the flange in T beams affects the shear stress distribution and propagation of the diagonal cracks in the web.

Failure modes and cracking patterns of the beams are shown in Fig. 2. The diagonal shear cracks developed in the shear span zone for all beams tested. As shown in Fig. 2, in case of beams with rectangular sections, the height of flexural cracks along the beam length are relatively small especially for beams R-02E and R-03E. On the other hand, in case of beam T-01E, the flexural cracks were developed up to the flange. While for the other two beams with higher reinforcement ratio (T-02E and T-03E) the height of flexural cracks are relatively small. This indicates that the flange and ratio of longitudinal reinforcement not only affects the shear capacity of the beams but also influences the crack formation of the beams significantly.

This can be explained using calculated strain distributions of rectangular (R-01A, R-02A and R-03A) and T sections (T-01A, T-02A and T-03A) as shown in Fig. 3. These strain distributions were obtained numerically based on layered element method described in literature [15]. In this method, the reinforced concrete cross section is divided into finite layer elements. A nonlinear stress-strain relationships of concrete and steel should be used in the calculation process. The strains and the corresponding stresses in both steel and concrete elements are then predicted through an iterative procedure by estimating neutral axis depth for a given curvature which satisfies the equilibrium conditions. A numerical procedure was applied to determine the full response of a reinforced concrete cross section until the failure load. This procedure was implemented using a computer program named Reinforced Concrete Cross Section Analysis (RCCSA) developed by Thamrin [16].





**Fig. 2. Failure modes and cracking patterns of the beams.**

Figure 3 shows that at the level of failure load, the maximum compression strain of T sections is smaller than rectangular sections except for T-01A. This confirms that the flange of T sections significantly decreases the strain quantity in the compression zone. Consequently, the tensile strain of reinforcement in T sections are higher than tensile strain in rectangular sections. In addition, the strain in the compression surface of the section for both types of cross sections do not reach the maximum value of concrete compression strain (0.003). These results indicate that no concrete crushing occurs in the compression surface of the pure bending zone (between two load points) as also shown in Fig. 2. While sections R-01A and T-01A reach the yield strain value (0.0027) of the bar due to

a smaller ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. This means that, for these two beams, the shear failure occurs after the tensile reinforcement yield.




Fig. 3. Analytical strain distributions of rectangular and T sections.

Figures 4(a) and (b) show load-deflection curves of the tested beams. It is shown from these figures that beam capacity increases as the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement increases. In addition, it is confirmed from Fig. 4 that beam R-01E and T-01E failed in shear after longitudinal reinforcement yielded. This is indicated by the flat region in the end part of load-deflection curve. However, the reinforcement in beams R-02E, R-03E, T-02E and T-03E did not reach the yield strength up to the occurrence of shear failure. Comparison between load-deflection curves for individual beams with rectangular and T sections are shown in Fig. 5. Due to the contribution of flange in the compression zone of the section, it is revealed that the capacity and stiffness of beams with T sections are higher than that of beams with rectangular sections.




Fig. 4. Load-deflection curves obtained from test.




Fig. 5. Comparison between load-deflection curves for beams with rectangular and T sections.

Figures 6 and 7 are plotted in order to compare the shear capacity of the beams from both theoretical (red line) and experimental results (dash line) with flexural capacity (black thick line) of the cross sections. Equation (4) is used as a representative value of theoretical shear capacity. Flexural capacities of the beams plotted in this figures were obtained numerically using the RCCSA program and in this calculation the maximum strain of concrete in compression is 0.003.

It is shown from Figs. 6 and 7 that none of the beams tested reached the flexural capacity of the cross section due to premature shear-tension failure. Additionally, the level of load at failure for of all of the beams exceeds the

theoretical shear capacity of concrete calculated using Eq. (4). As well, flexural capacity of cross section increases as the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement increases. These figures also illustrate clearly the quantity of shear force needed to achieve the flexural capacity for each increment of longitudinal reinforcement ratio. The higher the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement, the higher the shear strength required for failure.




Fig. 6. Experimental shear and flexural capacities of rectangular beams.




Fig. 7. Experimental shear and flexural capacities of T-beams.




Fig. 8. Effect of reinforcement ratio on shear capacity and angle of diagonal crack.

The effect of longitudinal reinforcement ratio on shear capacity and angle of diagonal cracks are plotted in Fig. 8. It is shown that most of the beams failed with the angle of diagonal crack around 45°. However, as concrete is a non-homogeneous material, a wide variation of angle of diagonal crack is shown in beams R-03E and T-02E. Generally speaking the angle of diagonal crack decreases as the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement increases. It is also demonstrated that the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement significantly affects the shear capacity and angle of diagonal crack.

The test results from this study and selected additional data from literature [7, 17, 18] are summarized in Table 2. All cited data listed in Table 2 are from beams without stirrups and collapsed in diagonal tension failure mode as also attained in this study. For all T-beams listed in Table 2, the concrete compressive strength varies between 13 and 40 MPa. The wide variation of concrete compression strength is an advantage in this study in order to examine the effect of concrete strength on the shear capacity of concrete. The ratio of longitudinal reinforcement ranges between 0.49 to 5.2. The maximum flange width and flange height are 610 mm and 102 mm respectively. While the effective depth ranges between 200 and 399 mm.

**Table 2. Test results and theoretical values of  $V_c$ .**

Specimens	$f_c'$ (MPa)	$b_w$ (mm)	$h_f$ (mm)	$b_f$ (mm)	$d$ (mm)	$a/d$	$\rho_w$ (%)	$Z_{sutty}[3]$ (kN)	Niwa[10]	EC2 [11]	SNI [12]	Exp.	Proposed
												$V_{max}$ (kN)	Model (kN)
Data from this study													
R-01E	32	125			219	3.7	1.0	26.05	28.45	20.17	23.31	32.6	23.31
R-02E	32	125			219	3.7	1.5	29.82	32.57	23.09	23.94	37.0	23.94
R-03E	32	125			212	3.8	2.5	34.31	37.75	27.03	24.43	37.6	24.43
T-01E	32	125	70	250	219	3.7	1.0	26.05	28.45	20.17	23.31	36.6	25.34
T-02E	32	125	70	250	219	3.7	1.5	29.82	32.57	23.09	23.94	38.5	25.96
T-03E	32	125	70	250	212	3.8	2.5	34.31	37.75	27.03	24.43	47.5	26.51
Thamrin et al. [7]													
BSL-02	13.0	130			200	2.3	0.6	19.85	20.95	12.38	14.55	42.5	14.55
BSL-03	13.0	130			200	2.3	0.9	22.81	24.07	14.22	15.16	44.9	15.16
BSN-05	33.5	130			200	2.3	0.6	27.21	28.73	16.97	22.66	48.9	22.66
BSN-06	33.5	130			200	2.3	0.9	31.27	33.00	19.49	23.26	53.9	23.26
BSL-08	13.0	130			200	3.0	0.6	16.71	18.76	12.38	14.28	27.4	14.28
BSL-09	13.0	130			200	3.0	0.9	19.20	21.56	14.22	14.74	29.2	14.74
BSN-11	33.5	130			200	3.0	0.6	22.92	25.72	16.97	22.39	35.7	22.39
BSN-12	33.5	130			200	3.0	0.9	26.33	29.55	19.49	22.85	43.9	22.85
Kotsovos et al. [17]													
I	40	50	65	200	240	10.4	5.2	15.26	18.01	16.35	11.88	19.0	12.49
II	40	50	65	200	240	10.4	5.2	15.26	18.01	16.35	11.88	22.0	12.49
III	40	50	65	200	240	3.3	5.2	22.30	23.82	16.35	14.07	37.0	14.68
Palaskas et al. [18]													
N0.2	32.8	190	102	610	374	4.14	0.69	58.52	55.94	41.76	60.17	72.0	66.6
A00	32.7	190	102	610	394	3.92	0.66	61.80	58.25	42.83	63.31	64.7	69.4
B00	32.0	190	102	610	399	3.88	0.49	56.45	53.04	38.89	62.90	70.5	68.9

The equations listed in Table 1 were used to calculate the shear strength of the beams and the results are shown in Table 2. It is noted that all of empirical equations listed in Table 1 ignore the contribution of flanges in T-beams. The

comparisons between theoretical values of shear capacity and experimental are presented in Fig. 9. It is shown from Fig. 9 that Eq. (1) and (2) conservatively predict the test results while Eqs. (3) and (4) extremely conservatively predict the shear capacity for both beams with rectangular and T sections. In addition, theoretical predictions for beams with T sections show lower values compared to that obtained from the test especially from the experimental study carried out by Kotsovos et al. [17] and Palaskas et al. [18].

These results demonstrate that shear capacity of concrete is significantly influenced by concrete compressive strength, longitudinal reinforcements ratio, shear span to effective depth ratio and effect of member size. Additionally, the presence of flange in case of T-beams also affects the shear capacity of the beams significantly.




Fig. 9. Comparison of theoretical values of shear capacity with experimental data.

### 5. Modified Shear Strength Equation for T-Beam

Figure 10 illustrates three models of T section with ignored and effective shear areas. As already described in the previous section, existing empirical equations listed in Table 1 ignore the effect of flange in T-beams as illustrated by the shaded area in Fig. 10(a) and only include the white area ( $b_w d$ ). While Fig. 10(b) shows

the effective shear area (shaded area) of concrete in the flange zone according to Zararis et al. [8] and Tureyen et al. [9]. In their report, Zararis et al. [8] suggested a design procedure to calculate the effect of flange, however the procedure proposed is difficult to use in practice. Hence, it is necessary to estimate the effect of flange on the shear capacity using a more simple procedure.




Fig. 10. Ignored and effective shear area of T section.

The process to determine the basic parameters affecting the shear capacity of T-beams can be described using Fig. 10(b) and the following assumptions. As shown in Fig. 10(b), the total shaded area,  $A_{ct}$ , can be calculated as:

$$A_{ct} = cb_w + \left( \frac{b_f - b_w}{2} h_f \right) \tag{5}$$

If only the shaded area in flange zone,  $A_{cf}$ , as shown in Fig. 10(c) is considered, the total shaded area in Eq. (5) can be reduced to:

$$A_{cf} = \left( \frac{b_f - b_w}{2} h_f \right) \tag{6}$$




Fig. 11. Effect of  $b_f$  and  $b_w$  on the shear capacities.

Figure 11 is plotted in order to examine the effect of  $b_f$  and  $b_w$  on the shear capacities of the beams with T section. In addition, the square of the effective depth,  $d$ , of the cross section is used as a normalized variable. It is shown in Fig. 11(a) that R-square value of the trend line obtained from this simple statistical analysis is higher than that value in Fig. 11(b). These results demonstrate that  $b_f$

affects the shear capacity of the beams considerably more than  $b_w$ . Moreover, since the effect of  $b_w$  on the shear capacity is not significant it can be ignored. For that reason the shear area of T section in the flange can be proposed as illustrated in Fig. 10(c) and the basic equation to estimate the effect of flange on the shear capacity can be simplified as:

$$\alpha = \left( \frac{b_f h_f}{2d^2} \right) \quad (7)$$


Therefore the width and thickness of the flange become the main variables predicting the additional shear strength contributed by the flange. Eq. (7) was then modified to fit the test results and data from the literature using simple statistical procedure to produce Eq. (8).

$$\alpha = 1.0 + \left( \frac{b_f h_f}{4d^2} \right) \quad (8)$$

Eq. (8) gives a value of 1 in the case of beams with rectangular cross section ( $h_f = 0$ ). Furthermore, Eq. (4) which is adopted from SNI 03-2847-2002 was modified in order to add the effect of the flange in beams with T section. This is done by substituting Eq. (8) in to Eq. (4) as a multiplication factor for the square root of concrete compressive strength and the modified equation can then be proposed as follows:

$$V_c = \frac{1}{7} \left( \alpha \sqrt{f'_c} + 120 \rho_w \frac{d}{a} \right) b_w d \quad (9)$$

Figure 12 compares shear capacity predicted by the proposed model with experimental results obtained from this study and literature. It can be shown from Fig. 12(a) that the shear capacity of the proposed model is slightly higher than that obtained using Eq. (4). While Fig. 12(b) shows that the shear capacity of the proposed model still conservatively compares to values obtained from the test.



**Fig. 12. Comparison of shear capacities between proposed model and experimental data.**



## 6. Conclusions

Six reinforced concrete beams, consisting of three beams with rectangular cross sections and three beams with T sections, were tested to study the effect of flange and longitudinal reinforcement on the shear capacity. The following conclusions are noted from this study:

- Shear capacity of the tested T-beams is significantly influenced by the flange and the amount of longitudinal reinforcement ratio. The shear capacity of T-beams is 5 to 20% higher than that of beams with rectangular cross section.
- The angle of diagonal crack in the shear span zone was also significantly influenced by the ratio of longitudinal reinforcement. Commonly, for both rectangular and T sections, the angle of diagonal crack decreases as the longitudinal reinforcement ratio increases.
- All of empirical equations used to calculate shear strength of concrete conservatively predict the shear capacity of the beams especially for equations suggested by the codes. Values of the test results are 10 to 90% higher than the theoretical values.
- A new model is proposed to predict the shear strength of reinforced concrete beams with T sections. Shear strength calculated using the proposed model still compares conservatively to experimental values.

## Acknowledgement

This experimental study was financially supported by Faculty of Engineering, Andalas University with contract number 030/PL/SPK/PNP/FT-Unand/2014.

## References

1. Kani, G.N.J. (1964). The riddle of shear failure and its solution. *American Concrete Institute Journal*, 61(4), 441-467.
2. Bresler, B.; and MacGregor, J.G. (1967). Review of concrete beams failing in shear. *Journal of Structural Division, ASCE*, 93(ST1), 343-372.
3. Zsutty, T.C. (1968). Beam shear strength prediction by analysis of existing data. *American Concrete Institute Journal*, 65(11), 942-951.
4. Placas, A.; and Regan, P.E. (1971). Shear failure of reinforced concrete beams. *American Concrete Institute Journal*, 68(10), 763-773.
5. Swamy, R.N.; and Qureshi, S.A. (1974). An ultimate shear strength theory for reinforced concrete T-beams without web reinforcement. *Matériaux et Construction*, 7(39), 181-189.
6. Zararis, P.D. (2003). Shear strength and minimum shear reinforcement of reinforced concrete slender beams, *American Concrete Institute Structural Journal*, 100(2), 203-214.
7. Thamrin, R.; Aziz, A.; Yeoh, D.; Azlina, N.; and Ali, M. (2011). Experimental study on diagonal shear cracks of concrete beams without stirrups longitudinally reinforced with GFRP bars. *Proceeding of FIB Symposium 'Concrete Engineering for Excellence and Efficiency'*, Prague, Czech Republic, 1177-1180.

8. Zararis, P.D. (2006). Shear strength of reinforced concrete T-beams. *American Concrete Institute Structural Journal*, 103(5), 693-700.
9. Tureyen, A.K.; Wolf, T.S.; and Frosch, R.J. (2006). Shear strength of reinforced concrete T-beams without transverse reinforcement. *American Concrete Institute Structural Journal*, 103(5), 656-663.
10. Niwa, J.; Yamada, K.; Yokozawa, K.; and Okamura, H. (1987). Reevaluation of the equation for shear strength of reinforced concrete beams without web reinforcement. *Concrete Library International of JSCE*, (9), 65-84.
11. British Standards Institution. (2014). *Eurocode 2: Design of Concrete Structures - Part 1-1: General Rules and Rules for Buildings*. BSI, London, UK.
12. Badan Standardisasi Nasional. (2002). *Tata Cara Perhitungan Struktur Beton untuk Bangunan Gedung SNI 03-2847-2002*. BSN, Jakarta, Indonesia.
13. Thamrin, R.; and Kaku, T. (2007). Bond behavior of CFRP bars in simply supported reinforced concrete beam with hanging region. *Journal of Composites for Construction, ASCE*, 11(2), 129-137.
14. American Concrete Institute. (2008). *Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete (ACI 318M-08) and Commentary*. ACI, Farmington Hills, USA.
15. Park, R.; and Paulay T. (1975). *Reinforced Concrete Structures*. John Wiley, New York.
16. Thamrin, R. (2014). *User Manual of Reinforced Concrete Cross Section Analysis (RCCSA) V4.2*. Jurusan Teknik Sipil, Fakultas Teknik, Universitas Andalas, Padang, Indonesia.
17. Kotsovov, M.D.; Bobrowski, J.; and Eibl, J. (1987). Behaviour of reinforced concrete T-beams in shear. *The Structural Engineer*, 65B(1), 1-10.
18. Palaskas, M.N.; Attiogbe, E.K.; and Darwin, D. (1981). Shear strength of lightly reinforced T-beams. *American Concrete Institute Journal*, 78(6), 447-455.