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This Paper is the first of three on the behaviour of anchorage zones for prestressed concrete. Details of an experimental investigation carried out to determine the behaviour of concrete prisms strip-loaded through rigid steel plates are presented. This loading arrangement represents the transfer of force from tendon to concrete at the anchorage of a prestressed concrete structure. The results of several tests have shown that present design methods of anchorage zones are generally very conservative, which leads to an excessive quantity of steel reinforcement in this highly stressed region, that can lead to poor-quality compacted. It has been found, however, that the spreading of such steel over depths greater than those presently used could perhaps relieve this congestion with little loss in strength of the anchorage. Out-of-plane failures during strip-loading tests were also encountered. Proof must therefore be obtained that such third-direction failure cannot occur in practice if planar failure of the anchorage has been assumed during analysis.

Notation

\( \alpha \) half-breadth of test specimens
\( a_1 \) half-length of loading plate
\( a_1/a \) concentration ratio
\( d \) diameter of steel reinforcing bars
\( f_{ca} \) concrete cube compressive strength
\( f_c \) concrete split-cylinder tensile strength
\( f_y \) yield strength of steel reinforcing bars
\( h \) height of concrete prism
\( k_e \) enhancement factor (= \( P/P_0 \))
\( P \) applied contact pressure under bearing plate
\( P_0 \) notional load capacity of uncracked column
\( T_0 \) total elastic tensile force across central axis of loading
\( \beta \) half-wedge failure angle (to the vertical)
\( \Phi \) steel parameter (defined in equation (1))

Introduction

The problem of a concentrated anchor-load acting on concrete is fundamentally one of a three-dimensional nature. However, the vast majority of the existing analytically-based methods\(^1\) to\(^8\) have been developed for the two-dimensional strip-loaded case for two reasons. In the first place, the complexity associated with a three-dimensional analysis would be excessive; the second reason is that anchorages in box section bridge girders would usually be located in the webs, which are thin, and therefore might be expected to show approximately planar behaviour. Thus, although the majority of experiments carried out in this field have been aimed at the three-dimensional case,\(^9\) to\(^16\) the resulting design recommendations are essentially two-dimensional in application. A detailed literature review on this subject is reported in ref. 17.

It was therefore decided to perform experiments on two-dimensional strip-loaded concrete prisms and to compare these results with the proposed two-dimensional methods of analysis. The behaviour of the test specimens could then be used to formulate and validate alternative analysis procedures. This Paper is thus the first in a series of three, and it provides the experimental results for reference by the subsequent papers, which look at plasticity analyses.
of these results and methods of designing general endblocks using the plasticity principles applied in association with finite-element analysis.

**Test specimen details**

In all tests the specimens had overall rectangular dimensions (b, 2a, w) 750 mm × 250 mm × 125 mm. Such proportions and specimen size were chosen to be large enough to model the real problem, while allowing ease of laboratory handling and loading.

In all, seven series of tests were carried out. The specifications of the test specimens are outlined in Figs 1 and 2.

The series I specimens were unretrofitted, mass concrete prisms.

The series II specimens contained rectangular steel stirrup reinforcement over a depth of 2a (250 mm). This reinforcement varied from 0.56 to 2.01% of the reinforced region. During series II testing it was found that fairly highly reinforced specimens (greater than 0.5% steel) underwent lateral expansion in the third direction under load. This caused out-of-plane failure so that a negligible increase in strength was obtained by increasing planar reinforcement percentages.

The series III specimens contained rectangular steel stirrup reinforcement identical to that used in series II. However, additional cross-links, tying the two stirrup-legs together, were used in this series; this maintained planar conditions, so that the study of the effect of reinforcement percentage on the prisms could continue.

The series IV specimens contained steel reinforcement located centrally within the prisms. These specimens were thus not aid in any way by the confinement contribution of rectangular stirrups (as was the case in series II and III).

The series V specimens were designed to investigate the influence of a duct hole on the strength of a prestressed concrete primary prism. The duct diameter was 25 mm in all these tests.

The series VI specimens consisted of steel stirrup reinforcement cages of varying length and steel percentage. Collins and Mitchell suggested that beneficial behaviour might be obtained by spreading the steel stirrups over greater depths. Most of the steel was placed over the elastically highly stressed region (a depth of 1.6a), and the rest of the steel over what remained of the reinforcement depth (3a or 4a), as shown in Fig. 3.

The series VII specimens (all unreinforced) contained an initial central 'crack', running axially from 50 mm below the loading plate to 50 mm above the basal platen. To achieve this, a 650 mm long, 0.8 mm thick, steel sheet was placed centrally in the formwork during casting. The sheet was removed after 24 hours, leaving an artificial crack in the prism. These specimens were tested to determine whether any energy was being dissipated in the central crack during collapse of the prisms, for use in the formulation of an upper-bound solution to the problem, as reported in a subsequent paper.

![Fig. 1. Specification details for test specimens](image-url)
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All specimens were strip-loaded through rigid 25 mm thick steel plates of width 125 mm. Such a loading was assumed to represent satisfactorily the transfer of force from cable to concrete at an anchorage in a prestressed concrete structure. The loading plates were placed centrally on the specimens, with a thin layer of gypsum plaster separating steel from concrete, allowing an even distribution of load. The ratio of loaded length $2a_l$ to total length $2a$ was varied between 0·1 and 0·7 to produce a spread of results applicable to primary prism loadings.

To determine the effects of steel reinforcement on the behaviour of the prisms, rectangular steel stirrups were cast into several specimens (see Fig. 1). The stirrups were bent from either 2·4, 4·0 or 6·1 mm diameter mild steel bars. From load–strain plots, taking the 0·2% proof strain as the yield strength of each bar, the following values were obtained:

(a) 2·4 mm diameter, $f_y = 429$ N/mm$^2$
(b) 4·0 mm diameter, $f_y = 417$ N/mm$^2$
(c) 6·1 mm diameter, $f_y = 438$ N/mm$^2$.

Fig. 2. Overall dimensions of test specimens

Fig. 3. Configurations of steel reinforcement for series VI specimens: (a) 10033aS-4; (b) 10034aS-4; (c) 09053aS-4; (d) 09054aS-4; (e) 050073aS-4; (f) 05074aS-4 (dimensions in mm)
The stirrups were spot-welded to closure in every case to prevent the possibility of bond-slip, and they were assembled on to four 4-0 mm diameter longitudinal bars to form cages. These cages were of varying length, as shown in Fig. 1. The minimum cover all round the stirrup steel was always 10 mm, regardless of the bar size. The commonly accepted bursting region in primary prisms is of dimensions 2a in depth and w in width. Therefore, the steel reinforcement quantity is in every case expressed as a percentage of the area 2aw, even when the steel stirrups were placed over depths other than 2a. Such percentages of steel ranged from 0% to about 2% in the tests.

It will be convenient to define another measure of the amount of steel present, which takes account of the depth over which the steel is distributed. The steel parameter \( \Phi \) is defined as

\[
\Phi = \frac{A_s f_y}{D w f_{cu}}
\]

(1)

where \( A_s \) is the total area of reinforcement across the central crack plane (both stirrup legs included), \( f_y \) is the yield strength of the steel bars, \( D \) is the depth of reinforcement, \( w \) is the width of the specimen (125 mm in all cases), and \( f_{cu} \) is the compressive cube strength of the concrete.

In several reinforced specimens, electrical resistance strain gauges were fixed to the steel reinforcing stirrups. The strain gauges were 3 mm long and of type TML-FLA-3-11. They were placed centrally along one leg of each stirrup, so that the variation in strain along the axis of the loaded specimen might be recorded.

The specimens were cast in a horizontal position in a timber mould that produced three specimens at each pour.

The strength of the concrete in most prestressed concrete structures is usually higher than that in reinforced concrete structures. Consequently, it was decided to use a fairly high strength concrete (about 60 N/mm² cube compressive strength). Moreover, owing to time constraints, it was necessary for this strength to be achieved at age seven days, so that many specimens could be tested over a short period. The mix proportions chosen for the concrete were: stone 1030 kg/m³ (10 mm rounded river gravel); sand 683 kg/m³ (5 mm (max.) natural glacial); cement 545 kg/m³ (ordinary Portland); water 186 kg/m³; plasticizer 5·3 l/m³ (Supaflor).

A stress—strain curve for the concrete was found by testing a 200 mm × 100 mm concrete cylinder in a displacement-control Avery-Denison compression testing machine. The initial Young’s modulus for the concrete was found to be about 28 kN/mm² at seven days.

The control specimens for each batch of three prisms consisted of two 100 mm cubes, and one 200 mm × 100 mm cylinder, for determination of the compressive and split-tensile strengths of the concrete, respectively. Both the test and control specimens were demoulded after 24 h and left for four days to cure under damp hessian cloth and plastic sheeting. The test specimens were then painted, connected to data loggers and tested on the seventh day.

A 250 t load range on a load-controlled Amsler compression testing machine was used for all tests. A thin layer of gypsum plaster was placed between the base of the specimen and the lower platen of the machine, to ensure a uniform distribution of load. Care was taken to ensure both vertical and horizontal alignment of the specimens in the machine.

Strain readings (from those specimens containing strain gauges) were collected on an Orion data-logger at 5 s intervals during loading.

The load to cause first cracking was noted, as was the ultimate load for each specimen. Crack propagation directions and rates were also noted. Initial cracking was detected purely by visual inspection of the specimens at intermittent load levels.

All specimens have associated codes to distinguish them. These codes have the following format for series I–III

\[
\text{ppcc-d}
\]

where \( pp \) is the percentage steel present over depth 2a (e.g. 05 is 0·5%), \( cc \) is the concentration ratio \( a_1 / a \) (e.g. 03 is \( a_1 / a = 0·3 \)), and \( d \) is the diameter of the steel bar used, to the nearest millimetre.

In series IV and V, the \( C \) and \( D \) symbols represent ‘central steel positioning’ and ‘ducted prism’, respectively, as described in Fig. 1. The formats for these two series are thus

\[
\text{ppccC-d} \quad \text{or} \quad \text{ppccD-d}
\]

where \( pp \), \( cc \) and \( d \) are as defined above.

In series VI, the format is

\[
\text{ppccNaE-d} \quad \text{or} \quad \text{ppccNaS-d}
\]

where \( Na \) is the depth to which the steel is placed (2a = 250 mm), \( E \) means that the stirrups are evenly spaced, \( S \) means that the stirrups are spread out non-uniformly, and \( pp \), \( cc \) and \( d \) are as defined above.

The format for series VII is

\[
\text{ppcc1}
\]

where \( I \) means that the prism has a initial central ‘crack’ along its axis.

Experimental results

Table 1 shows a detailed summary of all the tests carried out in the seven series of experiments.

To be able to compare the enhancement in strength of the prisms due to steel reinforcement with enhancement in strength due to surrounding concrete, a notional value \( F_0 \) of load is introduced. \( F_0 \) is defined as that load which would cause compression failure of a full-face loaded unreinforced concrete column of dimensions 2a × 125 mm × 750 mm. Such a test on a specimen of dimensions 250 mm × 125 mm × 750 mm produced an
<p>| Table 1. Summary of all results from testing programme |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Specimen code</th>
<th>Concentration ratio $a_1/a_2$</th>
<th>No. of stirrups</th>
<th>Diameter of stirrups: mm</th>
<th>Reinforcing depth $D_2$: mm</th>
<th>$f_{ck}$: N/mm²</th>
<th>$f_{uk}$: N/mm²</th>
<th>Ultimate load $P_u$: t</th>
<th>Cracking load $P_c$: t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0001</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>60-3</td>
<td>3-88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0503-4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>55-7</td>
<td>4-07</td>
<td>0.0422</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0503-5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>61-1</td>
<td>4-32</td>
<td>0.0714</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0505-4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>56-2</td>
<td>3-72</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0505-5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>66-9</td>
<td>4-24</td>
<td>0.0672</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0507-4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>56-6</td>
<td>3-70</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0507-5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>62-1</td>
<td>4-35</td>
<td>0.0378</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0507-6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>56-1</td>
<td>3-90</td>
<td>0.0709</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0501-4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>60-3</td>
<td>3-88</td>
<td>0.0389</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0501-5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>56-0</td>
<td>3-88</td>
<td>0.0723</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0503-4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>56-0</td>
<td>4-22</td>
<td>0.0392</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0503-5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>62-0</td>
<td>4-02</td>
<td>0.0724</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0505-4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>56-1</td>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>0.0413</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0505-5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>55-2</td>
<td>3-77</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0507-4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>56-1</td>
<td>4-01</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0507-5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>60-0</td>
<td>3-96</td>
<td>0.0414</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0503C-4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>58-3</td>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>0.0403</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0503C-5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>58-3</td>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>0.0403</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0503C-7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>58-3</td>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>0.0403</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>0003D</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>59-4</td>
<td>4-31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0003E</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>59-4</td>
<td>4-31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0007D</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>59-4</td>
<td>4-31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1003D-4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>61-4</td>
<td>4-07</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1003D-5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>69-0</td>
<td>3-96</td>
<td>0.0486</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1007D-4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>69-0</td>
<td>3-96</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1003S16E-4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>58-5</td>
<td>4-22</td>
<td>0.0932</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100516E-4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>58-5</td>
<td>4-22</td>
<td>0.0717</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>050716E-4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>58-5</td>
<td>4-22</td>
<td>0.0502</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100351E-4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>080516E-4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>080571E-4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>080572E-4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50-9</td>
<td>9-3</td>
<td>0.0359</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>080541E-4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50-9</td>
<td>9-3</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>080542E-4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50-9</td>
<td>9-3</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>080543E-4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50-9</td>
<td>9-3</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>080544E-4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50-9</td>
<td>9-3</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>00011</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>61-4</td>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0003I</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>61-4</td>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0005I</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>61-4</td>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Lower concrete failed in compression)*
ultimate load of 132 t when the cube strength of the concrete was 62.7 N/mm². The compressive failure stress of the specimen was thus about 0.67f<sub>cm</sub>. Hence, the notional load is defined as \( P_N = 2a_1 \times 125 \text{ mm} \times (0.67f_{cm}) \), for each particular specimen. The ratio of the ultimate load \( P \) obtained from the tests to the notional load \( P_N \) then represents the total enhancement in strength \( k_e \) that is derived from the surrounding concrete and steel reinforcement.

**Series I**

The series I specimens were tested to assess the unreinforced bursting resistance of mass concrete prisms. In addition, it was important to study the modes of failure of these specimens, so that suitable reinforcement schemes could be developed for the subsequent test series.

The concentration ratio \( a_1/a \) was varied between 0.1 and 1.0, so that a large spread of possible loading cases was covered.

For \( a_1/a = 1.0 \), failure of the prism occurred suddenly, with no prior cracking. An inclined slip-plane was formed diagonally across the specimen at failure. This failure occurred in-plane.

For all other concentration ratios, however, initial cracking preceded ultimate failure. At first, a vertical crack formed at the point of maximum lateral tensile stress on the central axis of the specimens. This point varied between concentration ratios, but was usually about 100–150 mm (0.8–1.2a) below the loading plate.

For \( a_1/a = 0.1 \), propagation of this crack occurred almost instantaneously at constant load. The crack extended towards both the loading plate and the base. A redistribution of stress in the region immediately below the loading plate must have occurred to maintain equilibrium. Such conditions of stress led to immediate wedging failure punch-through, as shown in Fig. 4(a).

For \( a_1/a \) greater than 0.1, failure occurred in an obvious two-step process. Initial central cracking occurred as before. Propagation of this crack occurred in both directions in a controlled manner, under steadily increasing load. The central crack terminated about 25 to 50 mm below the loading plate, and between 50 and 200 mm above the base. At a higher load, wedging punch-through of the plate occurred (see Fig. 4(b)). In all unreinforced cases, the wedging failure itself was sudden, with no inclined cracks forming prior to ultimate collapse.

**Series II**

The probable mode of failure for series II tests had been established from the previous series. However, it was found that the quantity of primary steel reinforcement present in the specimens affected the ultimate failure mode of the prisms. It is useful, therefore, to distinguish between the behaviour of lightly reinforced prisms and that of more heavily reinforced ones.

**Lightly reinforced specimens.** Up to a steel parameter of about \( \Phi = 0.04 \) (steel percentage of about 0.5%), failure of all the specimens occurred in a two-step process.

---

Fig. 4. Planar wedge failures of series I specimens: (a) \( a_1/a = 0.1 \); (b) \( a_1/a > 0.1 \)

Fig. 5. Wedge action causing tapering of central crack and rotation of two outer blocks
the prism. This means that the basal conditions might have played a part in the behaviour of the prisms, as the central crack in no case extended right down to the base platen.

From Table 1 it is quite clear that light reinforcement increased the strength of the prisms substantially. Enhancement factors show a sharp increase for all concentration ratios for values of $\Phi$ up to about 0.04.

Heavily reinforced specimens ($\Phi > 0.04$ approximately). Initial cracking occurred as before along the central axis of the prism, ostensibly at the position of maximum bursting tensile stress. As the load increased, however, propagation of this crack was extremely slow and only directed towards the base. Maximum lengths of such cracks at failure were about 100–200 mm.

Collapse consisted of wedging in the lateral (third) direction, as shown in Fig. 6. This out-of-plane failure was caused by insufficient reinforcement in the third direction to bind the concrete together beneath the plate. The initial cracking which had been seen on the surface of the prism had probably not been of bursting origin, but rather was due to out-of-plane expansion incom-patibility. The fact that it occurred at the position of maximum planar bursting stress may be coincidental.

As the level of primary stirrup reinforcement was increased, insignificant additional strength was obtained from these prisms, as can be seen from Table 1 and from Fig. 7, which shows the enhancement fact $k_e$ plotted against the steel parameter $\Phi$ for all levels of reinforcement for series II tests (results from series I for $\Phi = 0$ are also included).

It became obvious that confinement of the concrete below the wedging plate was essential to increase the bearing capacity and to allow development of the full planar bursting strength of the prisms.

**Series III**

The series III specimens were designed to overcome the out-of-plane wedging failures encountered in series II and to allow the continuation of planar behaviour for increasing steel percentages. For the 4.0 mm diameter bar stirrups, two cross-links, also of 4.0 mm steel, were added to each rectangular stirrup to tie the parallel legs together and reduce the possibility of out-of-plane expansion and wedging. For the 6.1 mm diameter bar stirrups, two pairs of 4.0 mm diameter bar cross-links were used, to avoid sharp bends in the larger bars.

This reinforcement arrangement turned out to be successful in part, with no out-of-plane wedging occurring in lightly-to moderately reinforced prisms ($\Phi < 0.07$ approximately) for $a_t/a > 0.1$. However, lateral out-of-plane expansion was not entirely prevented for high reinforcement percentages. Failure in these cases was again by out-of-plane wedging, caused by the reduction in third-direction confinement as the cross-links yielded. Fig. 8 shows a plot of the enhancement factor $k_e$ against the steel parameter $\Phi$ for all levels of reinforcement for the series III tests.

Below $\Phi$ of 0.07 the strengths of the specimens increased linearly, but the rate of strength increase reduced significantly above $\Phi = 0.07$.

Figure 9 shows a photograph of typical planar wedge failures of two series III specimens, 0507-4 and 0507-6. The wedge formation and central crack may be seen in these specimens.

It was found that for specimens with $a_t/a$ greater than 0.1, the maximum strain in the most highly stressed steel stirrup at visible cracking loads was between 1200 and 1800 $\mu e$, corresponding to a maximum stress between 240 and 360 N/mm². For $a_t/a = 0.1$, the maximum strain was about 600 $\mu e$ at cracking. These strains are much higher than might be expected from a simple tensile strain cut-off failure criterion for concrete, a finding similar to that of Taylor. It appears that although microcracking would have started earlier than reported, the presence of the steel helped substantially to delay the visible cracking of the specimens. The intermittent monitoring of the specimens for cracking would, however, have led to overestimates of the visible cracking capacities of the prisms.
Both the cracking and ultimate loads were significantly lower than those found in specimens of series II and III with similar steel percentages, where some confinement was created by the rectangular stirrups (see Table 1). It is reasonable to conclude that the rectangular stirrups employed in the other test series helped to create plane strain conditions across the prism.

Series V

A 25 mm diameter duct hole was located centrally down the length of series V specimens, which represented a 1-6% loss in material over the entire cross-section.

The loss in strength of the reinforced ducted specimens over the corresponding solid prism specimens was greater than the loss in cross-sectional area due to the duct hole. This is significant, as it is assumed at present that the duct hole may simply be treated as a loss in cross-sectional area of a primary prism for design purposes.16

Much resistance to cracking is lost with the presence of a duct. It seems likely, therefore, that it is unreasonable simply to assume a loss in cross-sectional area to account for the presence of a duct hole. There are three-dimensional effects occurring within the specimens which must complicate the problem of predicting the strength of such ducted prisms. However, the mode of failure was the same as before, with a stable central crack forming, followed by wedging failure.

Series VI

Collins and Mitchell20 proposed that it would be beneficial in primary prism design to spread steel out, perhaps non-uniformly, over a depth greater than the conventional 2a.

Steel was spread over 200 mm (1·6a), 375 mm (3a) and 500 mm (4a), both uniformly (even spacing of stirrups) and non-uniformly (more steel placed in the elastically highly stressed region, the rest placed over what remained of Dv). It was decided to place about 1% steel in specimens with a1/a = 0·3, 0·8% steel in specimens with a1/a = 0·5, and 0·5% steel in specimens with a1/a = 0·7. These quantities of steel would certainly allow planar wedging failure to occur in each specimen and permit several stirrups to be used, so that the non-uniform spreading of reinforcement over varying depths could be adequately studied.

All failures in this series consisted of initial central cracking, followed by planar wedging failure at a higher load. Rotation of the surrounding outer blocks caused tapering of the central crack to occur at failure.

Figure 10 shows the variation in the enhancement factor k, obtained for a1/a ratios of 0·3, 0·5 and 0·7, plotted against the depth over which the steel was placed. With the exception of specimens with a1/a = 0·3, there seems to be little difference in strength between prisms reinforced over depth 2a and those reinforced over depth 3a. Fig. 11 shows the variation in visible cracking load capacity of the prisms with the depth of reinforcement for various a1/a ratios.
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Fig. 10. Variation of enhancement factor $k_e$ against depth of reinforcing into prism for several $a_t/a$ ratios. Quantity of steel is constant for each $a_t/a$ ratio. Open symbols represent specimens with evenly spaced stirrups, solid symbols represent uneven spacing.

Fig. 11. Variation of cracking loads obtained from testing, with depth of reinforcing, for several $a_t/a$ ratios.

The general shape of the plots in Figs 10 and 11 may be explained as follows. When steel was placed over depth 1·6$a$ only, initial cracking was observed at the base of the reinforcing cage. This is because the tensile stress existing at this location exceeded the unreinforced tensile capacity of the concrete, as predicted by Collins and Mitchell. This premature cracking propagated along the prism. The unrestricted opening of this crack below the base of the reinforcement caused such a loss in stiffness, and a resultant redistribution of stress below the loading plate, that wedging failure occurred earlier than might have been expected. When steel was placed over depth 4$a$, the reduction in steel concentration over the bursting region resulted in low cracking load and ultimate capacities, as expected.

It is not clear why the cracking loads for specimens reinforced over depths 2$a$ and 3$a$ should have been of similar magnitude, as initial cracking in both these cases occurred within the reinforced region. For specimens with steel spread over 3$a$ depth, however, the opening of this crack would have been restricted for a greater depth than in the specimen reinforced over depth 2$a$. This would have helped to prevent loss in stiffness of the prism and possibly aided its ultimate load capacity. With steel spread over depth 3$a$, however, the wedging planes would have crossed fewer steel bars, negating this strength enhancement.

It does seem possible, therefore, that there exists an optimum depth of reinforcement, somewhere between 2$a$ and 3$a$ in length, at which maximum advantage may be obtained from the given quantity of steel. It appears that there is little strength penalty paid for spreading the steel over depth 3$a$, instead of over 2$a$. However, many more tests would be necessary to confirm the above postulates fully.

Series VII

Three tests were carried out in this series to determine whether significant energy was dissipated along the central crack during ultimate collapse. To achieve this, unreinforced, artificially cracked specimens were tested to ultimate collapse.

With the exception of $a_t/a = 0·1$, similar ultimate strengths were obtained in the two series. It is therefore unlikely that any significant energy was dissipated along the central crack during the collapse of series I specimens. The fact that specimen 0001 failed at a load above that of specimen 0003 is inexplicable, and is attributed to exceptional scatter.

For $a_t/a = 0·1$, it was noticed during series I testing that ultimate wedging failure occurred at the same time as the appearance of the initial crack. It is therefore likely that the strength of this specimen was derived principally from the splitting resistance of the prism. With the presence of the crack from the start of the test, this resistance was removed, and the strength of the prism was governed by the wedging resistance of the split prism.

Comparison of results with literature

Several areas of interest exist for comparison between the experimental results and existing theories and design methods.

Bursting strain readings from the tests carried out were found to be in close agreement with linear elastic finite-element (FE) predictions at low loads. Corresponding bursting stress distributions from the FE analyses were then compared with existing theories and good agreement was again obtained. The only exception to this was with the results of Zielinski and Rowe, which predicted significantly higher stresses than those found during this research.

Figure 12 shows plots of the predicted design load capacities by several methods against the steel parameter for the present test specimens, with $a_t/a = 0·3$. The load capacity from each method is considered to be either the cracking or the ultimate load, whichever is less, for the given amount of steel present.
Experimental results from series III are plotted for comparison. An allowable concrete tensile strength of 2.48 N/mm² has been assumed for use in Guyon’s and Zielinski and Rowe’s methods, in accordance with ref. 23, assuming $f_a = 60$ N/mm².

Two interesting points are evident from these plots. In comparison with the other methods and test results, the method due to Zielinski and Rowe (which is in general use in the UK for bursting zone design) is somewhat conservative for the estimation of required reinforcement in the bursting zone of such planar specimens. The placement of an excessive quantity of steel in a primary prism causes severe congestion problems, leading to poor-quality compaction of concrete in this highly stressed region.

None of the design methods allows any significant portion of the tension to be carried by the concrete when designing the reinforcement. The design methods of Zielinski & Rowe and Guyon both include an allowable tensile strength of concrete, but they negate this by allowing very low stresses in the steel. It appears from Fig. 12 that more use could be made of the inherent strength of the concrete, particularly for low steel parameters, judging by the separation of the design curves from the experimental results in this region.

Conclusions

Many experiments have been undertaken in attempts to study the behaviour of strip-loaded reinforced concrete prisms. The general failure modes of the prisms have been studied and compared with existing literature on the subject. The following main conclusions are drawn from this study.

Reasonable agreement with other methods has been achieved in terms of stress and strain variation at low loads. However, it has been shown that the present methods used in the design of the reinforcement for primary prisms are generally very conservative. Although it is appreciated that design methods must, through necessity, be conservative, the over-reinforcement of a primary prism is problematic, as congestion may occur in this critical and highly stressed region.

A possible solution to this congestion would be to spread the steel reinforcement out over a greater depth than that presently used. It was found that there could be some benefit gained in terms of cracking and ultimate load capacities through such action.

The occurrence of out-of-plane behaviour in such strip-loaded specimens may be of significance in practice, particularly where insufficient spiral reinforcement is placed around an anchorage which is designed according to a planar failure mechanism.
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