UC Berkeley

SEMM Reports Series

Title

A Simple and Efficient Finite Element for General Shell Analysis

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/63n1w6nq>

Author

Kanok-Nukulchai, Worsak

Publication Date

1978

NISEE/COMPUTER APPLICATIONS DAVIS HALL UNIVERSITY OF CALIFOUNIA BERKELEY, XALIFORNIA 2920 (415) 642-5113

Report no. **UC SESM 78-1**

STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING AND STRUCTURAL MECHANICS

by

WORSAK KANOKNUKULCHAI

JANUARY 1978

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

Division of Structural Engineering and Structural Mechanics Department of Civil Engineering, University of California Berkeley, California.

Report No. 78-1

A SIMPLE AND EFFICIENT FINITE ELEMENT FOR GENERAL SHELL ANALYSIS

by

WORSAK KANOK-NUKULCHAI

Graduate student and research assistant

This report was prepared under contract number

DOT - HS - 6 - 01443

Faculty Investigators

J.L. SACKMAN R.L. TAYLOR

sponsored by

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Department of Transportation Washington, D.C.

January 1978

 $-1 -$

TABLE OF CONTENTS

 P e e

 $\overline{}$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared under the contract no. DOT-HS-6-01443; sponsored by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration of the Department of Transportation, administrated by Dr. L. Ovenshire. The project is under the supervision of Professors R.L. Taylor and J.L. Sackman of the Department of Civil Engineering, University of California at Berkeley, and Professor T.J.R. Hughes of the Division of Engineering and Applied Science, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California.

Acknowledement is also extended to his colleagues, A. Curnier, J. Rollins and Dr. H. Hilber for their continued interest.

A SIMPLE AND EFFICIENT FINITE ELEMENT FOR GENERAL SHELL ANALYSIS.

WORSAK KANOK-NUKULCHAI

Division of Structural Engineering and Structural Mechanics, Department of Civil Engineering, University of California Berkeley, California, U.S.A.

ABSTRACT

A simple, efficient and versatile finite element is introduced for shell applications. The element is developed based on a degeneration concept, in which the displacements and rotations of the shell mid-surface are independent variables. Bilinear functions are employed in conjunction with a reduced integration for the transverse shear energy. Several examples are tested to demonstrate the effectiveness and versatility of the element. The numerical results indicate that the shell element performs accurately for both thick and thin shell situations.

A SIMPLE AND EFFICIENT FINITE ELEMENT FOR **GENERAL SHELL ANALYSIS.**

WORSAK KANOK-NUKULCHAI

Division of Structural Engineering and Structural Mechanics, Department of Civil Engineering, University of California Berkeley, California, U.S.A.

INTRODUCTION

The importance of shell structures and their generic analysis complexities has naturally lead to a reliance on the finite element method for the solution to many types of shell problems. This, of course, requires a finite element representation of the shell behavior and over the last 20 years many elements have been developed and employed in a multitude of programs. A history of shell elements is traced in $[1,2]$ and only a brief summary will be included here. The paper's main theme is the development of a new shell element: the (B) ilinear (D) egenerated (S) hell. The BDS element attempts to rectify problems inherent to most shell elements: (a) the limited scope of problems which can be solved and, (b) the high formulation cost of computing the element stiffness. The former restricts most elements to one class of shells, either thin or thick shells, depending on the parent theory used for developing the element. The element stiffness formulation may not be a cost factor for most linear problems but is of paramount importance in nonlinear formulations. Thus the quest for the ideal shell element that is universally applicable and cheap to use was a motivating force in the present study.

The approach taken in this paper explores an avenue that was successfully exploited by Hughes et.al. [3] for developing a simple bilinear plate element. The element in [3] was based on a one-point quadrature for the tranverse shear strain energy. The solution, despite its simplicity, is surprisingly accurate for both thick and thin plates.

SHELL ELEMENT STRATEGIES

A shell element can be classified as a 3-D continuum, a classical shell, or a degenerated shell. Figure 1 portrays a skeletal outline of these classifications. To complement Figure 1, a brief paragraph will describe the highlights as they relate to the main theme of this paper. The details of previous shell formulations are contained in the references and the reader is referred to them for a detailed understanding of the development of previous shell elements.

3-D Continuum Elements

The three dimensional field equations can be processed to form a 3-D continuum

^{*} Graduate student and research assistant

element, Figure 1. This, of course, produces an element that is ignorant of the usual kinematic constraints, or assumptions, of most shell problems. Popular among these is: the thickness of the shell is small compared to the other dimensions. Coupled to this is that the shell generally carries load via bending and membrane action. The 3-D formulation is now at a distinct disadvantage: several layers of elements or higher order elements are required to portray bending. Thus ecomonic considerations usually curtail the usefullness of this element. In addition, a 3-D element is found to fail at a moderate length to thickness aspect ratio due to displacement locking through the thickness. Wilson [4] suggested the use of incompatible displacement modes to improve the basic 3-D thick shell performance. Dovey [2] followed with a study of both the reduced integration technique and the idea of adding incompatible modes. These modifications do produce the desired effect, a more flexible shell behavior hence better performance. However, the convergence of these modified 3-D elements can not be guaranteed [2].

Classical Shell Elements

The classical shell element is derived by reducing the 3-D field equations to a particular class of shell equations using analytical integration over the thickness while employing shell assumptions. Common assumptions take advantage of one or more facets of the shell geometry such as the rotation of the cross-section is simply the slope of the shell. This applies only when the shell is relatively thin and its shear strain is negligible. As a result the normal to the reference surface remains normal. This is the Kirchhoff-Love hypothesis. Since most shell elements of classical type invoke this assumption, its implications will be reviewed. The Kirchhoff-Love hypothesis leads to displacement equations of equilibrium that are a coupled set of two secondorder differential equations inplane and a fourth-order differential equation in the transverse direction of the shell. Therefore, a shell element based on this theory needs $C¹$ continuity, thus, higher order interpolation functions are required than for the 3-D continuum. Nodal variables must include at least three displacements and two derivatives of the transverse displacement. The inplane, membrane, interpolation functions are usually of lower order than the transverse, bending, function. This can create gaps or overlaps between the edges of two nonplanar elements. Many shell elements and shell theories also lack the presence of rigid body modes. Despite these shortcomings many elements are reported to work satisfactorily in the linear infinitesimal-displacement regime $[4,5,6]$.

Degenerated Shell Elements

The degeneration concept described in Figure 1 directly discretizes the 3-D field equation in terms of mid-surface nodal variables. This usually employs a shell assumption, i.e., the straight normal at any point on the mid-surface remains straight. The formulation also includes the transverse shear effect, thus no Kirchhoff-Love hypothesis is presumed. The equilibrium equations in terms of independent variables (e.g., displacements and rotations) are secondorder differential equations, therefore, the elements require only $C⁰$ -continuous shape functions.

Many authors [7,8,9,10] who developed shell elements based on this concept obtained unsatisfactory results when these elements are applied in the thin shell regime. The difficulty can be traced to the transverse shear energy which is $O[(L/h)^2]$ higher than the remaining terms, where L/h denotes the element length to thickness aspect ratio. Thus as the thickness approaches zero, the computed shear stiffness completely dominates, and no effect of the bending stiffness remains with a finite computer word length. As a result, the element produces an excessively stiff solution which does not reflect the correct bending behavior. Physically, this phenomenon is known as a *shear-locking* [3].

Several techniques have been studied in an attempt to solve the shear-locking problem. Wempner [10] introduced a *discrete Kirchhoff hypothesis* which enforced the Kirchhoff hypothesis only at the mid-side of the elements. The poor performance of this element was due, presumably, to too many constraints being enforced. The correction employed in [10] was to reduce the number of constraints. All shear energy was suppressed and good results were obtained. The element with no shear energy reverts to being good for only thin shells hence this solution is wanting. In addition the technique used in [10] leads to either unsymmetric coefficient matrices to be solved for the nodal displacements or an increased number of unknowns if Lagrange multiplier methods are used to satisfy the constraints. Zienkiewicz et.al. [11] retained the transverse shear energy but used reduced integration for quadratic and cubic isoparametric serendipity elements [12] and obtained good results for some thin and thick shells. In this formulation, the transverse shear strain energy in the thin shell situation is a penalty function for the Kirchhoff-Love hypothesis and requires under integration to avoid the locking effect [13]. For certain boundary conditions, however, this element shows a tendency to lock in thin shell analysis due to the additional constraints imposed by the boundary conditions.

THE BILINEAR DEGENERATED SHELL ELEMENT

The BDS element (Figure 2) evolves from an eight-node three dimensional brick. The mid-surface, enclosed by four straight sides, forms a hyperbolic paraboloid and, as the name implies, the concept of degeneration is used. Due to the simplicity of the bilinear mid-surface geometry and the displacement field, the strain energy can be integrated analytically over the shell thickness. The integration over the reference mid-surface can then be performed numerically. This not only simplifies the derivation but also saves computer effort in formulating the element stiffness. The rigid body modes are present since this is an isoparametric element. The transverse shear strain energy is retained, consequently, the element is applicable to either thick or thin shells. Only one-point numerical integration is used for this shear strain energy at the center of the element to avoid the shear-locking effect. The element, when applied to plates is equivalent to the plate element presented in [3].

Several examples are tested using the BDS element. The results show that the element is capable of performing accurately for both thin and thick shells. The details of the formulation are now presented.

Geometry and Displacement Field

The shell element, Figure 2, is defined by the natural, curvilinear coordinates, $\{r,s,t\}$ such that a bi-unit cube is uniquely mapped into the shell element. As the thickness of the shell element is being input in the direction normal to the mid-surface at each node, the position at any point in the element can be uniquely given in terms of nodal coordinates and thicknesses as

$$
\mathbf{x}(r,s,t) = \sum_{l=1}^{4} N^{l}(r,s) \{ \mathbf{x}^{l} + \frac{1}{2} t \ h^{l} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{z_{3}}^{\mathbf{I}} \}
$$
 (1)

where x^{\prime} are the coordinates of the mid-surface, h^{\prime} the thickness and $\hat{e}_{z_3}^{\prime}$ the normal unit vector, all at a node I. The interpolation function N^t is bilinear, i.e.,

$$
N^{I}(r,s) = \frac{1}{4} (1 + r^{I}r) (1 + s^{I}s)
$$
 (2)

where r^{\prime} , s^{\prime} are the natural coordinates of node I.

At any point on the mid-surface, an orthogonal set of local coordinates, $\{z\}$, is constructed such that its unit vectors are:

$$
\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{z_3}(r,s) = \mathbf{x}_{,r}(r,s) \times \mathbf{x}_{,s}(r,s) / |\mathbf{x}_{,r} \times \mathbf{x}_{,s}|
$$
\n(3)

$$
\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{z_2}(r,s) = \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{z_3}(r,s) \times \mathbf{x}_{,r}(0,0) / |\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{z_3} \times \mathbf{x}_{,r}(0,0)|
$$
\n(4)

$$
\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{z_1}(r,s) = \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{z_2}(r,s) \times \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{z_3}(r,s)
$$
 (5)

The first is normal, while the others are tangent to the midsurface at a point $(r, s, 0)$ on the mid-surface (Figure 2).

The displacement vector at any point (r, s, t) in the element can be given in the form:

$$
\mathbf{u}(r,s,t) = \sum_{l} N^{l}(r,s) \{ \mathbf{u}^{l} + \mathbf{u}^{l}_{\alpha}(t) \}
$$
 (6)

where \mathbf{u}' is the nodal displacement vector on the mid-surface, and \mathbf{u}'_{α} is the relative nodal displacement vector produced by a normal rotation at the node. The vector \mathbf{u}'_{α} is to be expressed explicitly in terms of the rotation vector, α^{\dagger} , about each of the global axes at the node. Using the shell assumption that straight normals to the reference mid-surface remain straight after deformation, the displacement vector based on the local z coordinates, produced by the normal rotation α' about local axes, is w_{α} and expressed by

$$
\mathbf{w}_{\alpha}(t) = \frac{1}{2} t h \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_2' \\ -\alpha_1' \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}
$$
 (7)

For infinitesimal rotations, the usual transformations from w_α^l to u_α^l and $\alpha^{l'}$ to α^l , in view of (7) lead to

$$
\mathbf{u}_{\alpha}^{l}(t) = \frac{1}{2} t h^{l} \Phi^{l} \alpha^{l}
$$
 (8)

where

$$
\Phi' = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \theta_{33}^1 & -\theta_{23}^1 \\ -\theta_{33}^1 & 0 & \theta_{13}^1 \\ \theta_{23}^1 & -\theta_{13}^1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}
$$
 (9)

in which θ_{ij} denotes the direction cosine from global to local coordinates, i.e.,

$$
\theta_{ij} = (\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{x_i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{z_j}) \tag{10}
$$

Substituting (8) into (6) yields the expression of the displacement vector at any point in the shell element in terms of nodal variables:

$$
\mathbf{u}(r,s,t) = \sum_{l} N^{l}(r,s) \{ \mathbf{u}' + \frac{1}{2} t h^{l} \Phi^{l} \alpha^{l} \}
$$
 (11)

Stresses - Strains

At any point in the shell element, the local strain components of interest are

$$
\boldsymbol{\epsilon}(r,s,t) \equiv \begin{cases} \epsilon_{11} \\ \epsilon_{22} \\ \epsilon_{12} \\ \epsilon_{13} \\ \epsilon_{23} \end{cases} = \begin{cases} w_1/z_1 \\ w_2/z_2 \\ w_1/z_2 + w_2/z_1 \\ w_1/z_3 + w_3/z_1 \\ w_2/z_3 + w_3/z_2 \end{cases}
$$
(12)

The symbol $(.)/z$, defines a derivative with respect to local curvilinear coordinates. The derivation of these strain components can be achieved by using the second-order tensor transformation of the displacement gradients, i.e.,

$$
\begin{bmatrix} w_1/z_1 & w_2/z_1 & w_3/z_1 \ w_1/z_2 & w_2/z_2 & w_3/z_2 \ w_1/z_3 & w_2/z_3 & w_3/z_3 \end{bmatrix} = \Theta^T \begin{bmatrix} u_{1,x_1} & u_{2,x_1} & u_{3,x_1} \ u_{1,x_2} & u_{2,x_2} & u_{3,x_2} \ u_{1,x_3} & u_{2,x_3} & u_{3,x_3} \end{bmatrix} \Theta
$$
(13)

where $(.)_{x_i}$ denotes a partial derivative with respect to the global cartesian coordinates and $\Theta = [\theta_{ij}]$ is the transformation matrix defined in (10).

For a linear isotropic elastic material, the local stress components are obtained from the usual shell constitutive equations which assume a state of plane stress in each lamina. Accordingly

$$
\boldsymbol{\sigma}(r,s,t) = \mathbf{D} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}(r,s,t) \tag{14}
$$

where $\sigma(r,s,t) \equiv [\sigma_{11} \sigma_{22} \sigma_{12} \sigma_{13} \sigma_{23}]^T$ is the local stress vector and

$$
\mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{\lambda} + 2\mu & \overline{\lambda} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \overline{\lambda} & \overline{\lambda} + 2\mu & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu/\kappa_s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu/\kappa_s \end{bmatrix}
$$
(15)

in which κ_s is a shear deformation correction (1.2 is used for BDS), μ is the shear modulus, and $\overline{\lambda}$ is the plane-stress reduced Lame constant, i.e., $\overline{\lambda} = \nu E/(1-\nu^2)$, where E is the modulus

é

4

ğ

¢

 $-6-$

of elasticity and ν is Poisson ratio.

Derivation of the Element Stiffness

The standard form of the element stiffness, as derived by the general finite element procedure, is [20]

$$
\mathbf{K}^{H} = \int_{V} (\mathbf{B}^{\prime})^{T} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{B}^{J} dV
$$
 (16)

in which B' is the standard strain matrix relating the local strain vector to the nodal variables $\delta' \equiv [\mathbf{u}', \alpha']^T$ such that

$$
\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \left(\boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{s}, t \right) = \sum_{l} \mathbf{B}^{l} \, \boldsymbol{\delta}^{l} \tag{17}
$$

It is convenient to split the stiffness in (16) into two parts : the transverse shear effect and the bending and membrane effects. This will allow use of an appropriate order of numerical integration for each part. Accordingly, let

$$
\mathbf{K}^{IJ} = \mathbf{K}_m^{IJ} + \mathbf{K}_s^{IJ} \tag{18}
$$

where

$$
\mathbf{K}_m^{\,IJ} = \int_V \left(\mathbf{B}_m^{\,I} \right)^T \mathbf{D}_m \, \mathbf{B}_m^{\,J} \, dV \tag{19}
$$

$$
\mathbf{K}_s^{\; \; \mu} = \int_V \; (\mathbf{B}_s^{\; \prime})^{\; \, T} \, \mathbf{D}_s \; \mathbf{B}_s^{\; \, \prime} \; dV \tag{20}
$$

and \mathbf{B}_m , \mathbf{B}_s , \mathbf{D}_m , \mathbf{D}_s are defined according to

$$
\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_m \equiv [\epsilon_{11} \ \epsilon_{22} \ \epsilon_{12}]^T = \sum_l \mathbf{B}_m^l \ \boldsymbol{\delta}^l \tag{21}
$$

$$
\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_s \equiv [\epsilon_{13} \ \epsilon_{23}]^T = \sum_l \mathbf{B}_s^l \, \boldsymbol{\delta}^l \tag{22}
$$

$$
\mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{D}_m & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D}_s \end{bmatrix}
$$
 (23)

To formulate the matrices \mathbf{B}_m and \mathbf{B}_s , substitute (11) into (13) and the result into (12) to yield

$$
\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{m}(r,s,t) \\ \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{s}(r,s,t) \end{cases} = \sum_{l} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}_{1m}^{l} & \mathbf{B}_{2m}^{l}+ t & \mathbf{B}_{3m}^{l} \\ \mathbf{B}_{1s}^{l} & \mathbf{B}_{2s}^{l}+ t & \mathbf{B}_{3s}^{l} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}^{l} \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{l} \end{bmatrix}
$$
 (24)

in which

$$
\mathbf{B}'_{1m} = \mathbf{L}_m(N') \mathbf{\Theta}^T \tag{25a}
$$

$$
\mathbf{B}'_{1s} = \mathbf{L}_s(N') \ \Theta'
$$
 (25b)

$$
\mathbf{B}_{2m}^{\,l} = \frac{1}{2} \ h^{\,l} \ N^{\,l} \ \mathbf{L}_m(t) \ \mathbf{\Theta}^T \mathbf{\Phi}^{\,l} \tag{25c}
$$

$$
\mathbf{B}_{2s}^I = \frac{1}{2} h^I N^I \mathbf{L}_s(t) \Theta^T \Phi^I
$$
 (25d)

$$
\mathbf{B}_{3m}^I = \frac{1}{2} h^I \mathbf{L}_m(N^I) \Theta^T \Phi^I
$$
 (25e)

$$
\mathbf{B}_{3s}^{I} = \frac{1}{2} h^{I} \mathbf{L}_{s}(N^{I}) \Theta^{T} \Phi^{I}
$$
 (25f)

The operators $L_m(.)$ and $L_s(.)$ are gradient operators with respect to local coordinates which are defined as

$$
\mathbf{L}_m(f) = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_k \theta_{k1} f_{,x_k} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \sum_k \theta_{k2} f_{,x_k} & 0\\ \sum_k \theta_{k2} f_{,x_k} & \sum_k \theta_{k1} f_{,x_k} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{26}
$$

and

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{R}}$.

$$
\mathbf{L}_{s}(f) = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{k} \theta_{k3} f_{,x_{k}} & 0 & \sum_{k} \theta_{k1} f_{,x_{k}} \\ 0 & \sum_{k} \theta_{k3} f_{,x_{k}} & \sum_{k} \theta_{k2} f_{,x_{k}} \end{bmatrix} \tag{27}
$$

Physically, B_1 is the strain contribution of the inplane displacements at node I, and B_2 + tB_3 is the strain contribution of the rotations at node I, which also includes the curvature effect.

Taking into account the way the local coordinates (z) are constructed, it can be shown via an orthogonality condition that

$$
\mathbf{L}_m(t) = \underline{0} \tag{28}
$$

which results in

$$
\mathbf{B}_{2m}^{\prime} = \underline{0} \tag{29}
$$

Substituting (24) into (19) , in view of (21) and (29) , results in

$$
\mathbf{K}_{m}^{H} = \int_{-1}^{1} \int_{-1}^{1} \int_{-1}^{1} \left[\frac{(\mathbf{B}_{1m}^{H})^{T} \mathbf{D}_{m} \mathbf{B}_{1m}^{H}}{t(\mathbf{B}_{1m}^{H})^{T} \mathbf{D}_{m} \mathbf{B}_{3m}^{H} t^{2}(\mathbf{B}_{3m}^{H})^{T} \mathbf{D}_{m} \mathbf{B}_{3m}^{H}} \right] |J(r,s,t)| dr ds dt
$$
 (30)

where $|J|$ is the determinant of the Jacobian matrix obtained from (1). To be consistent with the shell assumption of straight normals, $|J(r,s,t)|$ can be approximated by $|J(r,s,0)|$. Since B_1 and \mathbf{B}_3 are functions of r and s only, the integral in (30) can be analytically integrated with respect to t which leads to

$$
\mathbf{K}_{m}^{IJ} = \int_{-1}^{1} \int_{-1}^{1} \begin{bmatrix} 2(\mathbf{B}_{1m}^{I})^{T} \mathbf{D}_{m} & \mathbf{B}_{1m}^{J} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \frac{2}{3}(\mathbf{B}_{3m}^{I})^{T} \mathbf{D}_{m} & \mathbf{B}_{3m}^{J} \end{bmatrix} |J(r,s,0)| dr ds
$$
(31)

Similarly, the shear part in (20) can be obtained as

$$
\mathbf{K}_{s}^{U} = \int_{-1}^{1} \int_{-1}^{1} \begin{bmatrix} 2(\mathbf{B}_{1s}^{U})^{T} \mathbf{D}_{s} \ \mathbf{B}_{1s}^{U} & 2(\mathbf{B}_{1s}^{U})^{T} \mathbf{D}_{s} \ \mathbf{B}_{2s}^{U} & 2(\mathbf{B}_{2s}^{U})^{T} \mathbf{D}_{s} \ \mathbf{B}_{2s}^{U} + \frac{2}{3}(\mathbf{B}_{3s}^{U})^{T} \mathbf{D}_{s} \ \mathbf{B}_{2s}^{U} \end{bmatrix} |J(r,s,0)| dr ds \qquad (32)
$$

The numerical integration is then used to evaluate the remaining integrals in (31) and (32). A two-by-two Gaussian quadrature is employed for the integral in (31) and, as mentioned before, a one-point Gaussian quadrature for the integral in (32). This will ensure singularity of the K_1^U which is necessary in order to avoid the shear-locking phenomenon.

Torsional Effect

In using a bilinear-element assemblage to approximate curved shells, convergence is spoiled by a weakly-restrained torsional mode after the mesh reaches some state of refinement. The reason can be explained as follows: The BDS element employs six degrees of freedom per node, however, no stiffness corresponding to the torsional-rotation degree of freedom exists locally in the formulation. All the resistance to this rotation at each node I comes directly from the coupling of the α -rotations of the non-planar elements surrounding node I. When the finite-element mesh is refined, angles of the kinks between these elements are close to 2 π and the coupling effect is reduced. This weak coupling only generates a minute amount of stiffness for the torsional rotation. Therefore, any slight disturbance in the generalized load corresponding to this degree of freedom can amplify the torsional mode to an unrealistic amount, which affects the global solution.

This problem is common to many shell elements which use six global degrees of freedom per node. In the past, a fictitious torsional spring was added either locally at the element level, or in some pseudo-normal direction defined at each node. This technique often is found unsatisfactory, especially for a flexible system in which an unrealistic amount of strain energy in the spring can be produced by a rigid body motion.

In a degenerated shell, the rotation of the normal and the mid-surface displacement field are independent. The idea then is to derive an additional constraint between the torsional rotation of the normal, α_3 ', and the rotation of the mid-surface, $1/2(\partial w_2/\partial z_1 - \partial w_1/\partial z_2)$.

The deviation of the associated rotation from the mid-surface slope, Figure $3(a)$, is governed by the transverse shear strain energy, i.e.,

$$
\pi_s = \kappa_s \mu \ h \int_S \left[\alpha_2'(r,s) + \frac{\partial w_3}{\partial z_1}(r,s,0) \right]^2 dA \tag{33}
$$

In fact, the transverse shear stiffness $K₂$, of Equation 20 can be obtained directly from the stationary value of π_s . Similarly, the deviation of the torsional rotation of the normal from that of the mid-surface, Figure $3(b)$, is assumed to have a governing strain energy,

$$
\pi_{t} = \kappa_{t} \mu h \int_{S} [\alpha_{3}^{\prime}(r,s) - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{\partial w_{2}}{\partial z_{1}}(r,s,0) - \frac{\partial w_{1}}{\partial z_{2}}(r,s,0) \right\}]^{2} dA \qquad (34)
$$

where κ_i is a parameter to be determined. If $\kappa_i \mu$ h is chosen to be large relative to the factor E h³ (which appears in the bending energy), Equation 34 will play the role of penalty function and results in the desired constraint:

$$
\alpha_3' \approx \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\partial w_2}{\partial z_1} - \frac{\partial w_1}{\partial z_2} \right]
$$
 (35)

at the Gauss points. A one-point numerical integration should be used in evaluating the penalty integral in order to avoid an over-constrained situation similar to shear locking.

To derive a torsional stiffness from Equation 34, the local variables are expressed in terms of global nodal variables, δ' , by bilinear shape functions. This gives Equation 34 in the form,

$$
\pi_{i} = (\delta^{\prime})^{\top} \mathbf{K}_{i}^{\prime \prime} \delta^{\prime}
$$
 (36)

where the torsional stiffness,

$$
\mathbf{K}_{i}^{IJ} = \kappa_{i} \mu h \int_{-1}^{1} \int_{-1}^{1} \left[\frac{(\mathbf{R}_{m}^{I})^{T} \mathbf{R}_{m}^{J} - (\mathbf{R}_{m}^{I})^{T} \mathbf{R}_{n}^{J}}{(\mathbf{R}_{n}^{I})^{T} \mathbf{R}_{m}^{J} - (\mathbf{R}_{n}^{I})^{T} \mathbf{R}_{n}^{J}} \right] | J(r,s,0) | dr ds
$$
 (37)

and

$$
\mathbf{R}_{m}^{I} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{k} \theta_{k2} N_{,x_{k}}^{I} - \sum_{k} \theta_{k1} N_{,x_{k}}^{I} \quad 0 \right] \Theta^{T}
$$
(38)

$$
\mathbf{R}_n^{\,l} = N^{\,l} \left[\theta_{13} \quad \theta_{23} \quad \theta_{33} \right] \tag{39}
$$

Since two penalty functions are included in the thin shell situation, the penalty factors, $\kappa_s \mu$ h and $\kappa_t \mu$ h, should have magnitude of the same order. The result displayed in Figure 5 indicates that the converged solution is insensitive to κ_1 , as long as κ_1 is large enough (>0.1) to sufficiently restrain the troublesome torsional modes. This insensitivity demonstrates that the addition of a torsional stiffness will not degrade the behavior of the system after the torsional effect is deleted.

All numerical examples in this study employ a value of $\kappa = 10$. It should be noted that in example 2 when the real hyperbolic paraboloid shell geometry is exactly represented, an identical solution is obtained with or without the torsional stiffness.

NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

To demonstrate the effectiveness and the versatility of the element, several examples of different shell situations are analyzed.

Thin cylindrical shell roof: The thin cylindrical shell in Figure 4 is tested with meshes of 4,16 and 64 elements. The shell is supported at both ends on rigid diaphragms. This example shows a situation where both membrane and bending actions are significant.

Initially the problem is solved without the addition of a torsional stiffness K_i . The solution fails to converge as is evident in Figure 6, graph 8. A parameter study of κ_i is then carried out for both thick and thin shells, using different element meshes. The results are displayed in Figure 5. The adding of the torsional stiffness with sufficient amount of κ , to restrain the free torsional mode produces a unique and converged solution.

The convergence characteristics are compared with other elements in Figure 6. The present solution converges to a complete (non-shallow) shell solution. This is also true for many of the shell elements which possess no geometric slope continuity at the element boundaries [23]. The BDS element proves to be highly competitive ---- only some of the higher order elements perform better for the same number of degrees of freedom. The bilinear element, however, requires much less time to formulate due to its simplicity.

Figures 7 and 8 compare displacements to shallow-shell exact solutions. The corresponding deep-shell solutions are not available. The stress-resultants are also shown to be very accurate in Figure 9.

Clamped hyperbolic paraboloid shell: In this example, Figure 10, the element assemblage exactly represents the real shell geometry. The shell is subjected to a uniform normal pressure. The deflection along the center is plotted in Figure 11 and compared to the exact solution reported in [19]. Figure 12 shows the rapid convergence of the solution compared to the relatively slow convergence in [14]. In that reference, the element was specially designed for the shallow hypar shell in which a cubic transverse displacement and linear inplane displacements were used.

Thick cylindrical shell: The problem consists of a long cylindrical shell of uniform thickness, Figure 13, resting on a line suport and subjected to gravity loading. Figure 14 shows the deformed mid-surface which checks well with the simple ring analytical solution. In comparison solutions obtained by the 2-D plane-strain continuum element (Q-4) and the present element but with exact numerical integration are shown. As expected, they are both too stiff.

Arch dam: This example provides a good test of the element in the case of an arbitrary, thick shell with varying thickness. Figure 15 shows a doubly curved arch dam known to be type 5 [15,16]. Details of the geometry can be found in [15] and [16]. In Figure 16, the down stream displacement is plotted and compared with the solutions from a thin shell element, a 3-D continuum element, and a higher-order element [12]

It is remarkable to note that accurate results are attainable with a very crude mesh (16) elements) using this low order element, and are comparable to those of the finer mesh (32 elements) using the higher-order element of [12].

Curved box girder: The last example shows a more complex structure of a curved box girder as detailed in Figure 17. The present element is used for the flanges, curved webs and diaphragm

of the box girder. For webs, a 1-by-2 Gaussian quadrature, Figure 18, is employed for the inplane μ -energy term to avoid the poor beam-bending behavior which is analogous to the transverse shear-locking in the shell situation. The 2-point integration along the web thickness is necessary to include the equivalent effect of the analytical integration in a classical beam. The diaphragm is treated as a membrane by deleting the bending stiffness.

The vertical deflection and normal stresses in both flanges are plotted in Figures 19,20 and 21. The solutions are compared with both the experiment and the higher-order finiteelement solutions reported in [17]. The present element proves to perform surprisingly well in all aspects.

CONCLUSIONS

The attractiveness of the BDS element is attributed to its efficiency, effectiveness and versatility. The simplest element geometry is chosen so that the element can serve as a convenient basis for unlimited forms of shell geometry. The degeneration concept, coupled with a reduced integration technique, produces a shell element which performs accurately in both thick and thin shell situations. With slight modification, the element is also capable of analyzing other types of thin structures, such as a curved web of the curved box girder.

REFERENCES

- $[1]$ S.F. Pawsey, 'The analysis of moderately thick to thin shells by the finite element method,' SESM Report No. 70-12, Dept. of Civil Engineering, U.C. Berkeley, August 1970.
- $\lceil 2 \rceil$ H.H. Dovey, 'Extension of three dimensional analysis to shell structures using the finite element idealiztion,' SESM Report No. 74-2, Dept. of Civil Engineering, U.C. Berkeley, January 1974.
- $[3]$ T.J.R. Hughes, R.L. Taylor and W. Kanoknukulchai,' A simple and efficient finite element for plate bending', Int.J.num.Meth.Engng., 11,1529-1543(1977).
- $[4]$ E.L. Wilson, R.L. Taylor, W.P. Doherty and J. Ghaboussi,' Incompatible displacement models', Numerical and Computer Methods in Structural Mechanics, ed. S.J. Fenves et.al., Academic Press, New York (1973).
- $\lceil 5 \rceil$ R.W. Clough and R.J. Johnson,'A finite element approximation for the analysis of thin shell', Int.J.Solids Struct., 4, 43-60(1968).
- $[6]$ S.W. Key and Z.E. Beisinger, The analysis of thin shells with transverse shear strains by the finite element method', Proc. Conf.Matrix Meth.Struct.Mech. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, AFFDL-TR-68-150, 667-710(1968).
- B.M. Irons and K.J. Draper, Inadequecy of nodal connections in stiffness solution for $[7]$ plate bending', AIAA J. 3,5,965(1965).
- [8] R.J. Melosh,'A flat triangular shell element stiffness matrix', Proc.Conf.Matrix Meth.Struct.Mech., Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio ,AFFDL-TR-66-80, 503- $514(1965)$.
- [9] S. Utku, 'Stiffness matrices for thin triangular elements of non-zero Gaussian curvature', $AIAA$ J., 5,9,1659-1667(1967).
- [10] G.A. Wempner, J.T. Oden and D.A. Kross, 'Finite-element analysis of thin shell', J. Engng. Mech. Div. ASCE 94, EM6, 1273-1293 (1968).
- [11] O.C. Zienkiewicz, R.L. Taylor and J.M. Too, 'Reduced integration technique in general analysis of plates and shells', Int.J.num.Meth.Engng, 3,275-290(1971).
- [12] S. Ahmad, B.M. Irons and O.C. Zienkiewicz, 'Analysis of thick and thin shell structures by curved finite elements', Int.J.num.Meth.Engng. ,2,419-451(1970).
- [13] O.C. Zienkiewicz and E. Hinton, 'Reduced integration, function smoothing and nonconformity in finite element analysis', *J.Franklyn Inst.* 302,443-461(1976).
- [14] J.J. Connor and C. Brebbia, 'Stiffness matrix for shallow rectangular shell element', J. Engng. Mech. Div. ASCE 93, EM5, 43-65(1967).
- [15] J. Ergataudis, B.M. Irons and O.C. Zienkiewicz, 'Three-dimensional analysis of arch dams and their foundations', Proc. Symp. Arch dams Inst. civ. Engng., London, 37-50(1968).
- [16] O.C. Zienkiewicz, C.J. Parekh and I.P. King, 'Arc dams analyzed by a linear finite element solution program', Proc.Symp.Arch dams Inst.civ.Engng.,London,19-23(1968).
- [17] A.R.M. Fam and C. Turkstra,' Model study of horizontally curved box girder', J. Engng. Str. Div. , ASCE 102, ST5, 1097-1108 (1976).
- [18] A.C. Scordelis and K.S. Lo, 'Computer analysis of cylindrical shells', ACI J. 61,1,539-561(1964).
- [19] S. Chetty and H. Tottenham, 'An investigation into the bending analysis of hyperbolic paraboloid shells', Indian Concrete Journal , July, 1964.
- [20] O.C. Zienkiewicz, The Finite Element Method, McGraw-Hill, London (1977).
- [21] G.R. Cowper, G.M. Lindberg and M.D. Olson, 'A shallow shell finite element of triangular shape', Int.J. Solids Struct. 6, 1133-1156 (1970).
- [22] R.L. Taylor, private communications.
- [23] K. Forsberg, An Evaluation of Finite Difference and Finite Element Techniques for Analysis of General Shells, Symposium on high speed computing for elastic structures, IUTAM, Mechanics, Liege, 1970.

 $-14-$

 $\label{eq:1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{$

Figure 2. Bilinear shell element.

 \bar{z}

Figure 3. Penalty functions: (a) transverse shear (b) torsion.

Q

Ó

í

AREA

Service

 $\frac{1}{2}$

i.

ś

 $\frac{d_{\rm{max}}}{d_{\rm{max}}^2}$

Figure 4. Thin cylindrical shell. Geometry and meshes of 4 and 16 elements.

Ç,

Figure 6. Convergence of deflection versus degrees of freedom, thin cylindrical shell roofs.

 $-20-$

 $-21-$

 $-22-$

 $\mathbf{g}_{\mathrm{DM},\mathrm{DM}}$ as

Figure 10. Clamped hyperbolic shell.

Figure 12. Clamped hyperbolic shell, convergence of central deflection.

 $-26-$

Figure 17. A horizontally curved box girder.

(b) MODIFICATION OF THE ELEMENT FOR WEB MEMBERS AND DIAPHRAGM

Figure 18. Curved box girder, finite element idealization.

APPENDIX A

Shell Stress-Resultants

 $\tau_{\rm{max}}^{ph}$

The usual shell stress-resultants: membrane forces, shears and couples, are defined as follow

$$
\mathbf{N}(r,s) \equiv \begin{cases} N_{11} \\ N_{22} \\ N_{13} \\ N_{13} \\ N_{23} \end{cases} = \int_{-h/2}^{h/2} \sigma(r,s,t) \ dz_3 \tag{A1}
$$

$$
\mathbf{M}(r,s) \equiv \begin{cases} M_{11} \\ M_{22} \\ M_{12} \end{cases} = \int_{-h/2}^{h/2} z_3 \, \sigma(r,s,t) \, dz_3 \tag{A2}
$$

The equation (24) is substituted in (14) and the result in (A1) and (A2) which are then integrated to yield

 λ

$$
\mathbf{N}_{m} \equiv \begin{cases} N_{11} \\ N_{22} \\ N_{12} \end{cases} = \sum_{l} h(r, s) \mathbf{D}_{m} \mathbf{B}_{1m}^{l} \mathbf{u}^{l}
$$
 (A3)

$$
\mathbf{N}_s \equiv \begin{Bmatrix} N_{13} \\ N_{23} \end{Bmatrix} = \sum_{I} h(r, s) \mathbf{D}_s \left[\mathbf{B}_{1s}^I \mathbf{B}_{2s}^I \right] \begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{u}^I \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}^I \end{Bmatrix}
$$
 (A4)

$$
\mathbf{M} = \sum_{l} \frac{h^2}{6} (r, s) \mathbf{D}_m \mathbf{B}_{3m}^l \alpha^{l}
$$
 (A5)

APPENDIX B

Element Manual : Bilinear Degenerated Shell (BDS) Element

ELEMENT DESCRIPTION

- $a)$ Geometry : 4-node bilinear quadrilateral mid-surface, uniform or non-uniform thickness.
- $b)$ Material: linear elastic.
- \mathbf{c}) Applications: infinitesimal displacement analysis of

-shells (thick, thin, non-uniform),

-membranes.

-deep beams, shear panels,

-and any thin structures with user's assigned selective integration scheme.

CODING ASPECT

- Main program: FEAP74 (by Prof. R.L. Taylor, University of California , Berkeley). $a)$
- $b)$ Element identification: ELM04

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$

- Modular subroutines : BMATRIX, CROSSP, JACOBI, LOAD, LOCALX, TRIMUL, c) TORSION and SPACKD.
- d Input data cards :

FLOAD, WTABL $(2F10.0)$ omitted if $LCDDE = 0$

E, ν , H, LCODE, κ_i , ZB, ρ , IBS $(TF10.0, I5)$

MA, 'ELM04' Alphanumerical information (Standard card in MATERIAL section of FEAP)

Notation:

E - Modulus of Elasticity

- Posson ratio $\boldsymbol{\nu}$

H - Uniform thickness (For non-uniform thickness, leave H blank and input nodal thicknesses in VECT(NUMNP,1) array - see section 6 of FEAP Manual)

LCODE-1 Dead load

- 2 Uniform load
- 3 Normal pressure
- 4 Water pressure

 κ_i - coefficient of torsional stiffness (> 0.1 recommended)

- ZB.ne.0 : all out-of-plane stiffness deleted. ZB

- Material density. $\boldsymbol{\rho}$

IBS - Selective integration scheme; three digits corresponding to numbers of quadrature points for (bending, inplane shear, tranverse shear) see Note. IBS = 441 for shell (default) and $IBS = 421$ for deep beam.

FLOAD- Load intensity according to

WTABL- x_3 -coordinate of water table for LCODE=4 only

Note

For the case of a deep beam application, the order of element nodal connection must be such that sides 1-4 and 2-3 represent the beam thicknesses at both ends of the beam element. In this case, H becomes the width of the beam. Integration scheme IBS = 421 should be employed. It denotes a two-by-two quadrature being used in evaluating the stiffness due to bending effect $(\lambda$ -energy), a one-by-two quadrature (the two on the line joining midsides 1-2 and 3-4) the stiffness due to inplane shear effect $(\mu$ -energy), and a one-by-one the stiffness due to transverse shear effect.

Content Committee

空影

 $-39-$

 $\bar{\epsilon}$,

 $-40-$

Í.

 ϵ or $\gamma_{\overline{1}}$.

 λ

 μ , where $\sigma_{\rm B}^2$

 $\label{eq:2.1} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}$

 $\frac{1}{4}$

 $\vec{\phi}$ $\frac{1}{3}$

 $\ddot{}$