

Flexure of Simply Supported Thick Beams Using Refined Shear Deformation Theory

Yuwaraj M. Ghugal, Ajay G. Dahake

Abstract—A trigonometric shear deformation theory for flexure of thick beams, taking into account transverse shear deformation effects, is developed. The number of variables in the present theory is same as that in the first order shear deformation theory. The sinusoidal function is used in displacement field in terms of thickness coordinate to represent the shear deformation effects. The noteworthy feature of this theory is that the transverse shear stresses can be obtained directly from the use of constitutive relations with excellent accuracy, satisfying the shear stress free conditions on the top and bottom surfaces of the beam. Hence, the theory obviates the need of shear correction factor. Governing differential equations and boundary conditions are obtained by using the principle of virtual work. The thick simply supported isotropic beams are considered for the numerical studies to demonstrate the efficiency of the results obtained is discussed critically with those of other theories.

Keywords—Trigonometric shear deformation, thick beam, flexure, principle of virtual work, equilibrium equations, stress.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is well-known that elementary theory of bending of beam based on Euler-Bernoulli hypothesis disregards the effects of the shear deformation and stress concentration. The theory is suitable for slender beams and is not suitable for thick or deep beams since it is based on the assumption that the transverse normal to neutral axis remains so during bending and after bending, implying that the transverse shear strain is zero. Since theory neglects the transverse shear deformation, it underestimates deflections in case of thick beams where shear deformation effects are significant.

Bresse [1], Rayleigh [2], and Timoshenko [3] were the pioneer investigators to include refined effects such as rotatory inertia and shear deformation in the beam theory. Timoshenko showed that the effect of transverse vibration of prismatic bars. This theory is now widely referred to as Timoshenko beam theory or first order shear deformation theory (FSDT) in the literature. In this theory transverse shear strain distribution is assumed to be constant through the beam thickness and thus requires shear correction factor to appropriately represent the strain energy of deformation. Cowper [4] has given refined expression for the shear correction factor for different cross-sections of beam. The accuracy of Timoshenko beam theory for transverse vibrations of simply supported beam in respect of the fundamental frequency is verified by Cowper [5] with a

plane stress exact elasticity solution. To remove the discrepancies in classical and first order shear deformation theories, higher order or refined shear deformation theories were developed and are available in the open literature for static and vibration analysis of beam.

Levinson [6], Bickford [7], Rehfield and Murty [8], Krishna Murty [9], Baluch, Azad and Khidir [10], Bhimaraddi and Chandrashekhara [11] presented parabolic shear deformation theories assuming a higher variation of axial displacement in terms of thickness coordinate. These theories satisfy shear stress free boundary conditions on top and bottom surfaces of beam and thus obviate the need of shear correction factor. Irretier [12] studied the refined dynamical effects in linear, homogenous beam according to theories, which exceed the limits of the Euler-Bernoulli beam theory. These effects are rotary inertia, shear deformation, rotary inertia and shear deformation, axial pre-stress, twist and coupling between bending and torsion.

Kant and Gupta [13], Heyliger and Reddy [14] presented finite element models based on higher order shear deformation uniform rectangular beams. However, these displacement based finite element models are not free from phenomenon of shear locking (Averill and Reddy [15], Reddy [16]).

There is another class of refined theories, which includes trigonometric functions to represent the shear deformation effects through the thickness. Vlasov and Leont'ev [17], Stein [18] developed refined shear deformation theories for thick beams including sinusoidal function in terms of thickness coordinate in displacement field. However, with these theories shear stress free boundary conditions are not satisfied at top and bottom surfaces of the beam. A study of literature by Ghugal and Shimpi [19] indicates that the research work dealing with flexural analysis of thick beams using refined trigonometric and hyperbolic shear deformation theories is very scarce and is still in infancy.

In this paper development of theory and its application to thick fixed beams is presented.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF THEORY

The beam under consideration as shown in Fig. 1 occupies in $0-x-y-z$ Cartesian coordinate system the region:

$$0 \leq x \leq L ; \quad 0 \leq y \leq b ; \quad -\frac{h}{2} \leq z \leq \frac{h}{2}$$

where x, y, z are Cartesian coordinates, L and b are the length and width of beam in the x and y directions respectively, and h

is the thickness of the beam in the z -direction. The beam is made up of homogeneous, linearly elastic isotropic material.




Fig. 1 Beam under bending in x - z plane

A. The Displacement Field

The displacement field of the present beam theory is of the form:

$$u(x, z) = -z \frac{dw}{dx} + \frac{h}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi z}{h} \phi(x) \quad (1)$$

$$w(x, z) = w(x)$$

where u is the axial displacement in x direction and w is the transverse displacement in z direction of the beam. The sinusoidal function is assigned according to the shear stress distribution through the thickness of the beam. The function ϕ represents rotation of the beam at neutral axis, which is an unknown function to be determined. The normal and shear strains obtained within the framework of linear theory of elasticity using displacement field given by (1) are as follows;

$$\text{Normal strain: } \varepsilon_x = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = -z \frac{d^2 w}{dx^2} + \frac{h}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi z}{h} \frac{d\phi}{dx} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Shear strain: } \gamma_{zx} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial z} + \frac{dw}{dx} = \cos \frac{\pi z}{h} \phi \quad (3)$$

The stress-strain relationships used are as follows:

$$\sigma_x = E\varepsilon_x, \quad \tau_{zx} = G\gamma_{zx} \quad (4)$$

B. Governing Equations and Boundary Conditions

Using (2) through (4) and using the principle of virtual work, variationally consistent governing differential equations and boundary conditions for the beam under consideration can be obtained. The principle of virtual work when applied to the beam leads to:

$$b \int_{x=0}^{x=L} \int_{z=-h/2}^{z=h/2} (\sigma_x \delta\varepsilon_x + \tau_{zx} \delta\gamma_{zx}) dx dz - \int_{x=0}^{x=L} q(x) \delta w dx = 0 \quad (5)$$

where the symbol δ denotes the variational operator. Employing Green's theorem to (4) successively, we obtain the

coupled Euler-Lagrange equations which are the governing differential equations and associated boundary conditions of the beam. The governing differential equations obtained are as follows:

$$EI \frac{d^4 w}{dx^4} - \frac{24}{\pi^3} EI \frac{d^3 \phi}{dx^3} = q(x) \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{24}{\pi^3} EI \frac{d^3 w}{dx^3} - \frac{6}{\pi^2} EI \frac{d^2 \phi}{dx^2} + \frac{GA}{2} \phi = 0 \quad (7)$$

The associated consistent natural boundary conditions obtained are of following form:

At the ends $x = 0$ and $x = L$

$$V_x = EI \frac{d^3 w}{dx^3} - \frac{24}{\pi^3} EI \frac{d^2 \phi}{dx^2} = 0 \text{ or } w \text{ is prescribed} \quad (8)$$

$$M_x = EI \frac{d^2 w}{dx^2} - \frac{24}{\pi^3} EI \frac{d\phi}{dx} = 0 \text{ or } \frac{dw}{dx} \text{ is prescribed} \quad (9)$$

$$M_a = EI \frac{24}{\pi^3} \frac{d^2 w}{dx^2} - \frac{6}{\pi^2} EI \frac{d\phi}{dx} = 0 \text{ or } \phi \text{ is prescribed} \quad (10)$$

Thus the boundary value problem of the beam bending is given by the above variationally consistent governing differential equations and boundary conditions.

C. The General Solution of Governing Equilibrium Equations of the Beam

The general solution for transverse displacement $w(x)$ and warping function $\phi(x)$ is obtained using (6) and (7) using method of solution of linear differential equations with constant coefficients. Integrating and rearranging (6), we obtain the following expression

$$\frac{d^3 w}{dx^3} = \frac{24}{\pi^3} \frac{d^2 \phi}{dx^2} + \frac{Q(x)}{EI} \quad (11)$$

where $Q(x)$ is the generalized shear force for beam and it is given by $Q(x) = \int_0^x q dx + C_1$.

Now (7) is rearranged in the following form:

$$\frac{d^3 w}{dx^3} = \frac{\pi}{4} \frac{d^2 \phi}{dx^2} - \beta \phi \quad (12)$$

A single equation in terms of ϕ is now obtained using (11) and (12) as:

$$\frac{d^2 \phi}{dx^2} - \lambda^2 \phi = \frac{Q(x)}{\alpha EI} \quad (13)$$

where constants α , β and λ in (12) and (13) are as follows

$$\alpha = \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{24}{\pi^3} \right), \quad \beta = \left(\frac{\pi^3 GA}{48 EI} \right) \text{ and } \lambda^2 = \frac{\beta}{\alpha}$$

The general solution of (13) is as follows:

$$\phi(x) = C_2 \cosh \lambda x + C_3 \sinh \lambda x - \frac{Q(x)}{\beta EI} \quad (14)$$

The equation of transverse displacement $w(x)$ is obtained by substituting the expression of $\phi(x)$ in (12) and then integrating it thrice with respect to x . The general solution for $w(x)$ is obtained as follows:

$$EI w(x) = \iiint q dx dx dx + \frac{C_1 x^3}{6} + \left(\frac{\pi}{4} \lambda^2 - \beta \right) \frac{EI}{\lambda^3} (C_2 \sinh \lambda x + C_3 \cosh \lambda x) + C_4 \frac{x^2}{2} + C_5 x + C_6 \quad (15)$$

where C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_5 and C_6 are arbitrary constants and can be obtained by imposing boundary conditions of beam.

III. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

In order to prove the efficacy of the present theory, the following numerical examples are considered. The following material properties for beam are used

$$E = 210 \text{ GPa}, \mu = 0.3 \text{ and } \rho = 7800 \text{ kg/m}^3$$

where E is the Young's modulus, ρ is the density, and μ is the Poisson's Units

A. Example 1: Simply Supported Beam with Cosine Load

The simply supported beam is having its origin at left support and is simply supported at $x = 0$ and $x = L$. The beam is subjected to cosine load on surface $z = +h/2$ acting in the downward z direction with maximum intensity of load q_0




Fig. 2 Simply supported beam with cosine load

General expressions obtained for $w(x)$ and $\phi(x)$ are as follows:

$$w(x) = \frac{q_0 L^4}{120 EI} \left\{ \frac{480}{\pi^2} \left[\frac{4}{\pi^2} \left(\cos \frac{\pi x}{2L} - 1 + \frac{x}{L} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{x^2}{L^2} - \frac{1}{6} \frac{x^3}{L^3} - \frac{1}{3} \frac{x}{L} \right] + \frac{11520 E h^2}{\pi^6 G L^2} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{x^2}{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{x}{L} \right) + \frac{120 E h^2}{\pi^2 G L^2} \left(\frac{4}{\pi^2} \left(\cos \frac{\pi x}{2L} - 1 + \frac{x}{L} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{x^2}{L^2} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{x}{L} \right) \right\} \quad (16)$$

$$\phi(x) = \frac{q_0 L}{\beta EI} \left(\frac{4}{\pi^2} - \frac{2}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi x}{2L} + \frac{\sinh \lambda x - \cosh \lambda x}{\lambda L} \right) \quad (17)$$

$$u = \frac{q_0 h}{Eb} \left\{ -\frac{1}{10} \frac{z L^3}{h^3} + \frac{11520 E h^2}{\pi^6 G L^2} \left(-\frac{x^2}{L^2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{120 E h^2}{\pi^2 G L^2} \left(\frac{4}{\pi^2} \left(-\frac{\pi}{2} \sin \frac{\pi x}{2L} + 1 \right) + \frac{x}{L} - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{48}{\pi^4} \sin \frac{\pi z}{h} \frac{E L}{G h} \left(\frac{4}{\pi^2} - \frac{2}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi x}{2L} + \frac{\sinh \lambda x - \cosh \lambda x}{\lambda L} \right) \right\} \quad (18)$$

$$\sigma_x = \frac{q_0}{b} \left\{ -\frac{1}{10} \frac{z L^2}{h^2} \left[\frac{480}{\pi^2} \left[-\cos \frac{\pi x}{2L} + 1 - \frac{x}{L} \right] - \frac{11520 E h^2}{\pi^6 G L^2} + \frac{120 E h^2}{\pi^2 G L^2} \left(-\cos \frac{\pi x}{2L} + 1 \right) \right] + \frac{48}{\pi^4} \sin \frac{\pi z}{h} \frac{E}{G} \left(-\cos \frac{\pi x}{2L} + \cosh \lambda x - \sinh \lambda x \right) \right\} \quad (19)$$

$$\tau_{xz}^{CR} = \frac{48 q_0 L}{\pi^3 b h} \cos \frac{\pi z}{h} \left(\frac{4}{\pi^2} - \frac{2}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi x}{2L} + \frac{\sinh \lambda x - \cosh \lambda x}{\lambda L} \right) \quad (20)$$

$$\tau_{xz}^{EE} = \frac{q_0 L}{80 bh} \left(4 \frac{z^2}{h^2} - 1 \right) \left[\frac{480}{\pi^2} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \sin \frac{\pi x}{2L} - 1 \right) + \frac{120 E h^2}{\pi^2 G L^2} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \sin \frac{\pi x}{2L} \right) \right] + \frac{48}{\pi^5} \cos \frac{\pi z}{h} \frac{E q_0 h}{G b L} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} \sin \frac{\pi x}{2L} + \lambda L (\sin \lambda x - \cosh \lambda x) \right) \quad (21)$$

B. Example 2: Simply Supported Beam with Cosine Load

The simply supported beam is having its origin at left support and is simply supported at $x = 0$ and $x = L$. The beam is subjected to cosine load, on surface $z = +h/2$ in the region $(0 \leq x \leq L/2)$ acting in the downward z direction and in the region $(L/2 \leq x \leq L)$ it acts in upward direction on surface $z = -h/2$ with maximum intensity of load q_0 .




Fig. 3 Simply supported beam with cosine load

$$\tau_{zx}^{EE} = q_0 L \left(4 \frac{z^2}{h^2} - 1 \right) \left[\frac{120}{\pi^2} \left(\pi \sin \frac{\pi x}{L} - 2 \right) + \frac{120 E h^2}{\pi^2 G L^2} \left(\pi \sin \frac{\pi x}{2L} \right) \right] + \frac{48}{\pi^5} \cos \frac{\pi z}{h} \frac{E q_0 h}{G b L} \left(\pi \sin \frac{\pi x}{L} + \lambda L (\sin \lambda x - \cosh \lambda x) \right) \quad (27)$$

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this paper, the results for inplane displacement, transverse displacement, inplane and transverse stresses are presented in the following non dimensional form for the purpose of presenting the results in this work.

For beams subjected to cosine load, $q(x)$

General expressions obtained for $w(x)$ and $\phi(x)$ are as follows:

$$w(x) = \frac{q_0 L^4}{120EI} \left\{ \frac{120}{\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{\pi^2} \left(\cos \frac{\pi x}{L} - 1 + 2 \frac{x}{L} \right) + \frac{1 x^2}{2 L^2} - \frac{1 x^3}{3 L^3} - \frac{1 x}{6 L} \right] + \frac{11520 E h^2}{\pi^6 G L^2} \left(-\frac{1 x^2}{2 L^2} + \frac{1 x}{2 L} \right) + \frac{120 E h^2}{\pi^2 G L^2} \left[\frac{1}{\pi^2} \left(\cos \frac{\pi x}{L} - 1 + \frac{x}{L} \right) + \frac{1 x^2}{2 L^2} - \frac{1 x}{2 L} \right] \right\} \quad (22)$$

$$\phi(x) = \frac{q_0 L}{\beta EI} \left(\frac{2}{\pi^2} - \frac{1}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi x}{L} + \frac{\sinh \lambda x - \cosh \lambda x}{\lambda L} \right) \quad (23)$$

The axial displacement and stresses obtained based on above solutions are as follows

$$u(x) = \frac{q_0 h}{Eb} \left\{ -\frac{1 z L^3}{10 h h^3} + \frac{11520 E h^2}{\pi^6 G L^2} \left(-\frac{x}{L} + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{120 E h^2}{\pi^2 G L^2} \left[\frac{1}{\pi^2} \left(-\pi \sin \frac{\pi x}{L} + 2 \right) + \frac{x}{L} - \frac{x^2}{L^2} - \frac{1}{6} \right] + \frac{48}{\pi^4} \sin \frac{\pi z}{h} \frac{E L}{G h} \left(\frac{2}{\pi^2} - \frac{1}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi x}{L} + \frac{\sinh \lambda x - \cosh \lambda x}{\lambda L} \right) \right\} \quad (24)$$

$$\sigma_x = \frac{q_0}{b} \left\{ -\frac{1 z L^2}{10 h h^2} + \frac{120}{\pi^2} \left(1 - 2 \frac{x}{L} - \cos \frac{\pi x}{L} \right) - \frac{11520 E h^2}{\pi^6 G L^2} + \frac{120 E h^2}{\pi^2 G L^2} \left(1 - \cos \frac{\pi x}{2L} \right) + \frac{48}{\pi^4} \sin \frac{\pi z}{h} \frac{E}{G} \left(-\cos \frac{\pi x}{L} + \cosh \lambda x - \sinh \lambda x \right) \right\} \quad (25)$$

$$\tau_{zx}^{CR} = \frac{48 q_0 L}{\pi^3 b h} \cos \frac{\pi z}{h} \left(\frac{2}{\pi^2} - \frac{1}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi x}{L} + \frac{\sinh \lambda x - \cosh \lambda x}{\lambda L} \right) \quad (26)$$

$$\bar{u} = \frac{E b u}{q_0 h}, \quad \bar{w} = \frac{10 E b h^3 w}{q_0 L^4},$$

$$\bar{\sigma}_x = \frac{b \sigma_x}{q_0}, \quad \bar{\tau}_{zx} = \frac{b \tau_{zx}}{q_0}$$

TABLE I

NON-DIMENSIONAL AXIAL DISPLACEMENT (\bar{u}) AT ($x=0.25L, z=H/2$), TRANSVERSE DEFLECTION (\bar{w}) AT ($x=0.25L, z=0.0$) AXIAL STRESS ($\bar{\sigma}_x$) AT ($x=0.25L, z=H/2$) MAXIMUM TRANSVERSE SHEAR STRESSES $\bar{\tau}_{zx}^{CR}$ AND $\bar{\tau}_{zx}^{EE}$ AT ($x=0, z=0$) OF THE BEAM SUBJECTED TO COSINE LOAD FOR ASPECT RATIO $S=4$ AND 10 (EXAMPLE 1)

Model	S	\bar{u}	\bar{w}	$\bar{\sigma}_x$	$\bar{\tau}_{zx}^{CR}$	$\bar{\tau}_{zx}^{EE}$
TSDT	4	2.6052	0.2739	13.7935	1.1872	-1.6723
HPSDT		2.5965	0.2775	15.8019	1.4157	-2.8196
HSDT		2.5957	0.2754	14.1509	1.2426	-1.7332
FSDT		2.0818	0.1882	6.1653	0.1971	2.5979
ETB		2.0821	0.1281	6.1658	—	2.5980
TSDT	10	33.8367	0.1526	57.5339	5.0975	2.4560
HPSDT		33.8196	0.1529	62.5214	5.4663	2.8494
HSDT		33.8175	0.1527	58.3994	5.1462	2.8156
FSDT		32.5281	0.1377	38.5335	3.0797	6.4948
ETB		32.5337	0.1281	38.5365	—	6.4950

TABLE II

NON-DIMENSIONAL AXIAL DISPLACEMENT (\bar{u}) AT ($x=0.25L, z=H/2$), TRANSVERSE DEFLECTION (\bar{w}) AT ($x=0.25L, z=0.0$) AXIAL STRESS ($\bar{\sigma}_x$) AT ($x=0.25L, z=H/2$) MAXIMUM TRANSVERSE SHEAR STRESSES $\bar{\tau}_{zx}^{CR}$ AND $\bar{\tau}_{zx}^{EE}$ AT ($x=0, z=0$) OF THE BEAM SUBJECTED TO COSINE LOAD FOR ASPECT RATIO $S=4$ AND 10 (EXAMPLE 2)

Model	S	\bar{u}	\bar{w}	$\bar{\sigma}_x$	$\bar{\tau}_{zx}^{CR}$	$\bar{\tau}_{zx}^{EE}$
TSDT	4	-0.1121	0.1039	-2.2033	1.1593	-5.3908
HPSDT		-0.0992	0.1049	-2.1935	1.1437	-7.6669
HSDT		-0.1059	0.1044	-2.1929	1.1325	-6.0966
FSDT		-0.0623	0.1060	-2.0145	0.5111	1.2159
ETB		-0.0623	0.0652	-2.0145	—	1.2159
TSDT	10	-1.0991	0.1039	-12.7794	3.0145	-3.5669
HPSDT		-1.0668	0.1049	-12.7696	2.9617	-5.8432
HSDT		-1.0836	0.1044	-12.7689	2.9563	-4.2728
FSDT		-0.9747	0.1060	-12.5906	3.1944	3.0396
ETB		-0.9747	0.0652	-12.5906	—	3.0396




Fig. 4 Variation of axial displacement (\bar{u}) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0.25L, z$) when subjected to cosine load for aspect ratio 4 (Example 1)




Fig. 6 Variation of axial stress ($\bar{\sigma}_x$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0.25L, z$) when subjected to cosine load for aspect ratio 4 (Example 1)




Fig. 5 Variation of axial displacement (\bar{u}) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0.25L, z$) when subjected to cosine load for aspect ratio 10 (Example 1)




Fig. 7 Variation of axial stress ($\bar{\sigma}_x$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0.25L, z$) when subjected to cosine load for aspect ratio 10 (Example 1)




Fig. 8 Variation of transverse shear stress ($\bar{\tau}_{zx}$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0, z$) when subjected to cosine load and obtain using constitutive relation for aspect ratio 4 (Example 1)




Fig. 10 Variation of transverse shear stress ($\bar{\tau}_{zx}$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0, z$) when subjected to cosine load and obtain using equilibrium equation for aspect ratio 4 (Example 1)




Fig. 9 Variation of transverse shear stress ($\bar{\tau}_{zx}$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0, z$) when subjected to cosine load and obtain using constitutive relation for aspect ratio 10 (Example 1)




Fig. 11 Variation of transverse shear stress ($\bar{\tau}_{zx}$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0, z$) when subjected to cosine load and obtain using equilibrium equation for aspect ratio 10 (Example 1)




Fig. 12 Variation of maximum transverse displacement (\bar{w}) of simply supported beam at ($x = 0.25L, z = 0$) when subjected to cosine load with aspect ratio S (Example 1)




Fig. 13 Variation of maximum transverse displacement (\bar{w}) of simply supported beam at ($x = 0.25L, z = 0$) when subjected to cosine load with aspect ratio S (Example 2)




Fig. 14 Variation of axial displacement (\bar{u}) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0.25L, z$) when subjected to cosine load for aspect ratio 4 (Example 2)




Fig. 15 Variation of axial displacement (\bar{u}) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0.25L, z$) when subjected to cosine load for aspect ratio 10 (Example 2)




Fig. 16 Variation of axial stress ($\bar{\sigma}_x$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0.25L, z$) when subjected to cosine load for aspect ratio 4 (Example 2)




Fig. 17 Variation of axial stress ($\bar{\sigma}_x$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0.25L, z$) when subjected to cosine load for aspect ratio 10 (Example 2)




Fig. 18 Variation of transverse shear stress ($\bar{\tau}_{zx}$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0, z$) when subjected to cosine load and obtain using constitutive relation for aspect ratio 4 (Example 2)




Fig. 19 Variation of transverse shear stress ($\bar{\tau}_{zx}$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0, z$) when subjected to cosine load and obtain using constitutive relation for aspect ratio 10 (Example 2)




Fig. 20 Variation of transverse shear stress ($\bar{\tau}_{zx}$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0, z$) when subjected to cosine load and obtain using equilibrium equation for aspect ratio 4 (Example 2)




Fig. 21 Variation of transverse shear stress ($\bar{\tau}_{zx}$) through the thickness of simply supported beam at ($x = 0, z$) when subjected to cosine load and obtain using equilibrium equation for aspect ratio 10 (Example 2)

V. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The comparison of results of maximum non-dimensional axial displacement (\bar{u}) for the aspect ratios of 4 and 10 is presented in Tables I and II for simple beams subjected to cosine load (see Figs 2 and 3). The values of axial displacement given by present theory are in close agreement with the values of other refined theories for aspect ratio 4 and 10 for example 1. In case of example 2, higher order theories give curvilinear distribution of this displacement at quarter span and ETB and FSDT give straight line variation across the thickness. The through thickness distribution of this

displacement obtained by present theory is in close agreement with all the theories in case of Example 1. However, for Example 2, shows nonlinear behavior in case of this displacement as compared to the one given by classical and first order shear deformation theory (FSDT). Variations of these distributions are shown in Figs. 4, 5, 14 and 15 for aspect ratio 4 and 10.

The comparison of results of maximum non-dimensional transverse displacement (\bar{w}) for the aspect ratios of 4 and 10 is presented in Tables I and II for beams subjected to cosine load. The values of present theory are in excellent agreement with the values of other refined theories for aspect ratio 4 and 10 except those of classical beam theory (ETB) and FSDT of Timoshenko. The variation of \bar{w} with aspect ratio (S) is shown in Figs 12 and 13.

The results of axial stress ($\bar{\sigma}_x$) are shown in Tables I and II for aspect ratios 4 and 10. The axial stresses given by present theory are compared with other higher order shear deformation theories. It is observed that the results by present theory are in excellent agreement with other refined theories. However, ETB and FSDT yield lower values of this stress as compared to the values given by other refined theories. The variations of this stress are shown in Figs. 6, 7, 16, and 17.

The comparison of maximum non-dimensional transverse shear stress for a simple beams with cosine load are obtained by the present theory and other refined theories is presented in Tables I and II for aspect ratio of 4 and 10. The maximum transverse shear stress obtained by present theory using constitutive relation is in good agreement with that of higher order theories. The through thickness variation of this stress obtained via constitutive relation are presented graphically in Figs. 8, 9, 18, and 19 and those obtained via equilibrium equation are presented in Figs. 10, 11, 20, and 21. It can be seen from these figures that the nature of variation obtained by equilibrium equation in accordance with higher order and equivalent shear deformation theories is different than the one given by ETB and FSDT due to the maximum intensity of load at the simple support. This feature cannot be captured by the lower order theories (ETB and FSDT).

VI. CONCLUSION

The variationally consistent theoretical formulation of the theory with general solution technique of governing differential equations is presented. The general solutions for beams with cosine loads are obtained in case of thick simply supported beams. The displacements and stresses obtained by present theory are in excellent agreement with those of other equivalent refined and higher order theories. The present theory yields the realistic variation of axial displacement and stresses through the thickness of beam. Thus the validity of the present theory is established.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. A. C. Bresse, "Cours de Mechanique Applique", Mallet-Bachelier, Paris, 1859.
- [2] J. W. S. Lord Rayleigh, "The Theory of Sound", Macmillan Publishers, London, 1877.

- [3] S. P. Timoshenko, J. N. Goodier, "Theory of Elasticity", Third Int. Ed., McGraw-Hill, Singapore. 1970.
- [4] G. R. Cowper, "The shear coefficients in Timoshenko beam theory", *ASME J. of Applied Mechanics*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 335-340, 1966.
- [5] G. R. Cowper, "On the accuracy of Timoshenko beam theory", *ASCE J. of Engineering Mechanics Division*. Vol. 94, no. EM6, pp. 1447-1453, 1968.
- [6] M. Levinson, "A new rectangular beam theory", *J. of Sound and Vibration*, vol. 74, no.1, pp. 81-87, 1981.
- [7] W. B. Bickford, "A consistent higher order beam theory", *Int. Proceeding of Dev. in Theoretical and Applied Mechanics (SECTAM)*, vol. 11, pp. 137-150, 1982.
- [8] L. W. Rehfield, P. L. N. Murthy, "Toward a new engineering theory of bending: fundamentals", *AIAA J.* vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 693-699, 1982.
- [9] A. V. Krishna Murty, "Towards a consistent beam theory", *AIAA J.*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 811-816, 1984.
- [10] M. H. Baluch, A. K. Azad, M. A. Khidir, "Technical theory of beams with normal strain", *ASCE J. of Engineering Mechanics*, vol. 110, no. 8, pp. 1233-1237, 1984.
- [11] A. Bhimaraddi, K. Chandrashekhara, "Observations on higher order beam Theory", *ASCE J. of Aerospace Engineering*, vol. 6, no.4, pp. 408-413, 1993.
- [12] H. Irretier, "Refined effects in beam theories and their influence on natural frequencies of beam", *Int. Proceeding of Euromech Colloquium*, 219, on Refined Dynamical Theories of Beam, Plates and Shells and Their Applications, Edited by I. Elishakoff and H. Irretier, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, pp. 163-179, 1986.
- [13] T. Kant, A. Gupta, "A finite element model for higher order shears deformable beam theory", *J. of Sound and Vibration*, vol. 125, no. 2, pp. 193-202, 1988.
- [14] P. R. Heyliger, J. N. Reddy, "A higher order beam finite element for bending and vibration problems", *J. of Sound and Vibration*, vol. 126, no. 2, pp. 309-326, 1988.
- [15] R. C. Averill, J. N. Reddy, "An assessment of four-noded plate finite elements based on a generalized third order theory", *Int. J. of Numerical Methods in Engineering*, vol. 33, pp. 1553-1572, 1992.
- [16] J. N. Reddy, "An Introduction to Finite Element Method". 2nd Ed., McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1993.
- [17] V. Z. Vlasov, U. N. Leont'ev, "Beams, Plates and Shells on Elastic Foundations" Moskva, Chapter 1, 1-8. Translated from the Russian by A. Barouch and T. Plez Israel Program for Scientific Translation Ltd., Jerusalem, 1966.
- [18] M. Stein, "Vibration of beams and plate strips with three dimensional flexibility", *ASME J. of Applied Mechanics*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 228-231, 1989.
- [19] Y. M. Ghugal, R. P. Shmipi, "A review of refined shear deformation theories for isotropic and anisotropic laminated beams", *J. of Reinforced Plastics and Composites*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 255-272, 2001.