

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

A Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy



By

Jeevan George Abraham

School of Engineering and Design

Brunel University

January 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

ABSTRACT

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

CONTENTS

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

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

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

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE SURVEY

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

2.8 BUCKLING – AN INTRODUCTION.....	30
2.9 BUCKLING OF THIN WALLED STRUCTURES.....	31
2.10 RAYLEIGH – RITZ METHOD.....	35
2.11 THE RAYLEIGH QUOTIENT.....	37
2.12 LOCAL BUCKLING.....	39
2.13 TORSION IN STRUCTURES.....	40
2.14 TORSIONAL AND FLEXURAL TORSIONAL BUCKLING.....	42
2.15 LATERAL – TORSIONAL BUCKLING.....	43
2.16 SHEAR IN THIN WALLED CLOSED TUBE SECTIONS.....	44
2.17 TORSION IN THIN WALLED CLOSED TUBE SECTIONS.....	45
2.18 COMBINED SHEAR AND TORSION IN THIN WALLED CLOSED SECTIONS...	46
2.19 APPLICATIONS OF THE TELESCOPING CANTILEVER BEAM ASSEMBLY....	48
2.19.1 DEFINITION OF MOBILE ELEVATING WORK PLATFORM.....	48
2.19. (a) RELATED TERMINOLOGY.....	48
2.19. (b) ACCESS PLATFORM TYPES.....	51
2.19.2 TELESCOPIC RETRACTABLE ROOFING SYSTEMS.....	54
2.19.3 TELESCOPING MARINE ASSEMBLIES.....	58
2.19.4 TELESCOPING ADJUSTABLE COLUMNS.....	61
2.19.5 TELESCOPING ADJUSTABLE WHEELCHAIR RAMPS.....	61
2.19.6 TELESCOPING POLES AND ADJUSTABLE MASTS.....	62
2.19.7 STEEL TELESCOPING TOWERS.....	64
2.19.8 TELESCOPING STORAGE RACKS.....	67

CHAPTER 3 DEFLECTION ANALYSES

3.1 INTRODUCTION – DEFLECTION ANALYSES.....	70
3.2 TELESCOPIC BEAM THEORY.....	71
3.3 TIP REACTIONS.....	72

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

CHAPTER 4 BUCKLING ANALYSIS

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

4.6.2 BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE RECTANGULAR PYRAMID WHOSE SECTION'S DEPTH CHANGES	134
4.6.3 BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE RECTANGULAR PYRAMID WHOSE SECTIONS CHANGE BI-Dimensionally AT THE SAME AND DIFFERENT RATES.....	137
4.7 BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE SINGLE THIN WALLED RECTANGULAR SECTION.....	142
4.8 BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE SINGLE STEPPED STRUT.....	143
4.9 BUCKLING LOAD FOR THE THIN WALLED TWO SECTION CANTILEVER....	150
4.10 SUMMARY.....	158
 CHAPTER 5 SHEAR AND TORSION ANALYSES	
5.1 INTRODUCTION.....	160
5.2 SHEAR IN UNIFORM THIN WALLED CLOSED RECTANGULAR SECTIONS...	161
5.3 TORSION IN UNIFORM THIN WALLED CLOSED RECTANGULAR SECTIONS.....	165
5.4 COMBINED SHEAR AND TORSION IN UNIFORM THIN-WALLED RECTANGULAR SECTIONS.....	168
5.5 SUMMARY.....	172
 CHAPTER 6 STRESS ANALYSIS	
6.1 INTRODUCTION.....	173
6.2 BENDING STRESS.....	175
6.3 SHEAR STRESS.....	177
6.4 SUMMARY.....	186
 CHAPTER 7 FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS	
7.1 INTRODUCTION.....	188

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

CHAPTER 8 EXPERIMENTAL ANALYSIS

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

CHAPTER 9 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

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

REFERENCES.....	283
------------------------	------------

APPENDIX A – THE TWO SECTION TELESCOPIC CANTILEVER BEAM ASSEMBLY

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

A.2 TIP REACTIONS.....	294
A.3 DERIVATION OF THE DEFLECTION CURVE FOR SECTION AC IN BEAM AB	296
A.4 DERIVATION OF THE DEFLECTION CURVE FOR SECTION CB IN BEAM AB	298
A.5 DERIVATION OF THE DEFLECTION CURVE FOR SECTION CB IN BEAM CD	299
A.6 DERIVATION OF THE DEFLECTION CURVE FOR SECTION BD IN BEAM CD.....	301
 APPENDIX B – THE C PROGRAM.....	304
 APPENDIX C – PART 1 – INLINE LOADING ANALYSIS OF INDUCED STRESS IN THE TWO SECTION TELESCOPIC ASSEMBLY	
C.1 CALCULATION OF TIP REACTIONS.....	310
C.2 SHEAR FORCE AND BENDING MOMENT DIAGRAMS FOR BEAM ACB.....	311
C.3 SHEAR FORCE AND BENDING MOMENT DIAGRAMS FOR BEAM CBD.....	312
C.4 CALCULATION OF BENDING AND SHEAR STRESSES FOR BEAM ACB.....	314
C.5 CALCULATION OF BENDING AND SHEAR STRESSES FOR BEAM CBD.....	316
 APPENDIX D – PART 2 – OFFSET LOADING ANALYSIS OF INDUCED STRESS IN THE TWO SECTION TELESCOPIC ASSEMBLY	
D.1 CALCULATION OF TIP REACTIONS.....	322
D.2 SHEAR FORCE, BENDING MOMENT AND TORQUE DIAGRAMS FOR BEAM ACB.....	324
D.3 SHEAR FORCE, BENDING MOMENT AND TORQUE DIAGRAMS FOR BEAM CBD.....	325
D.4 CALCULATION OF BENDING AND SHEAR STRESSES FOR BEAM ACB.....	327
D.5 CALCULATION OF BENDING AND SHEAR STRESSES FOR BEAM CBD.....	329

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

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

APPENDIX G – FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS

G.1 PART MODULE.....	336
G.2 MATERIAL AND ELEMENT PROPERTIES DEFINITION.....	339
G.3 ASSEMBLING THE TWO SECTION TELESCOPIC CANTILEVER BEAM ASSEMBLY.....	345
G.4 THE STEP MODULE.....	347
G.4.1 CREATION OF ANALYSIS STEPS.....	348
G.5 INTERACTION DEFINITIONS.....	351
G.6 LOADING CONDITIONS.....	355
G.7 BOUNDARY CONDITIONS.....	359
G.8 MESHING DEFINITIONS.....	354
G.8.1 STRUCTURED MESHING.....	362
G.8.2 SWEPT MESHING.....	363
G.8.3 FREE MESHING.....	364
G.9 GENERATION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS.....	368
G.9.1 TIP DEFLECTION RESULTS EXTRACTION.....	369
G.9.2 STRESS ANALYSIS RESULTS EXTRACTION.....	374
G.9.3 BUCKLING ANALYSIS RESULTS EXTRACTION.....	378

APPENDIX H –STRAIN GAUGING PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

H.1 THE STRAIN GAUGE.....	382
H.2 STRAIN TRANSFORMATION AND ROSETTE GAUGE THEORY.....	386
H.3 INSTRUMENTATION AND DATA ACQUISITION SYSTEM.....	396

H.4 STRAIN GAUGE SELECTION.....	03
H.5 SURFACE PREPARATION STEPS.....	408
H.6 STRAIN GAUGE BONDING PROCEDURE.....	413
H.7 LEAD WIRE ATTACHMENT.....	416

LIST OF SYMBOLS

T_1, T_2, T_3 = Stress Tensors acting on each face perpendicular to coordinate axes x_1, x_2, x_3

T_i = Universal stress tensor

T = Stress tensors distributed over surface S

n = Unit outward normal to the plane

h = Perpendicular distance from origin to plane ACB of tetrahedron

V = volume

∂W_E = External virtual work

∂W_I = Internal virtual work

U = Strain energy

U^* = Complementary strain energy

σ = Direct stress

e = Direct strain

Π = Total potential energy of the body

i, j = tensor notation

P = Applied tip load

P_{cr} = Critical buckling load

λ = Load displacement

δ = Lateral or out-of-plane displacement

I = Second moment of area

L = Length

E = Young's modulus of elasticity

$x=z$ = Arbitrary length

z' = Non dimensional length parameter

ΔU_T = Change in total potential energy

ΔU_B = Change in bending strain energy

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

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

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

q = Shear flow

T = Torque

τ = Shear stress

F_y = Vertical force

A = Area

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

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

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

L_1 = Length of fixed-end section

α = overlap ratio

a_1 = Overlap length

L_2 = Length of free-end section

ϕ = Length variation ratio

$w_1 = w$ = Self weight of fixed-end section

γ = Self weight ratio

w_2 = Self weight of free-end section

$H = d$ = Depth

$B = b$ = Breadth

$T = t$ = Thickness

y = Overall Deflection

y_0 = Deflection of single fixed-end section cantilever

I_1 = Second moments of area of fixed-end section

I_2 = Second moments of area of overlap section

I_3 = Second moments of area of free-end section

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

I_e = Second moments of area of section at apex

I_o = Second moments of area of section at base

β = Second moment area ratio

F^V = Virtual force

M^V = Virtual moment

d_e = diameter of apex

d_z = diameter at arbitrary length z from datum

d_o = diameter at base

σ_o = Stress at d_o

b_e = breadth at apex

b_z = breadth at arbitrary length z from datum

b_o = breadth at base

h_e = height at apex

h_z = height at arbitrary length z from datum

h_o = height at base

f = Shape factor

Q = Geometrical coefficient

W = Weight of section

K = Buckling coefficients

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Beam in bending (Adapted from [20]).....	9
Figure 2.2: Beam in bending (Adapted from [19]).....	14
Figure 2.3: Stress tensors and their components (Adapted from [28]).....	17
Figure 2.4: Stresses on an infinitesimal tetrahedron (Adapted from [28]).....	17
Figure 2.5: Stress-strain curve of a non-linearly elastic rod (Adapted from [28]).....	22
Figure 2.6: Differentiation between (a) Bending and (b) Buckling (Adapted from [33]).....	31
Figure 2.7: Behaviour of buckling system showing the differentiation between the load and lateral displacements [33].....	32
Figure 2.8: Stability of equilibrium [28].....	34
Figure 2.9: Local buckling of edge supported thin plate with load-load induced displacement curve ($P-\lambda$) and the lateral displacement curve ($P-\delta$) [33].....	39
Figure 2.10: Local buckling of model box girder [33].....	40
Figure 2.11: Examples of (a) Torsional Buckling (b) Flexural-Torsional Buckling (c) Lateral Buckling [33].....	41
Figure 2.12: Net Shear Flow in a closed thin walled tube.....	44
Figure 2.13: Static Equivalence between torque ($F_y p$) and shear flow q_b [25].....	46
Figure 2.14: Terminology associated with the mobile elevating access platform (Taken from [2]).....	50
Figure 2.15: Straight or “stick boom” access platform [74].....	52
Figure 2.16: Scissor lift [75].....	52
Figure 2.17: Articulating boom machine (Taken from [2]).....	53
Figure 2.18: Trailer mounted machine (Taken from [2]).....	53
Figure 2.19: Vehicle mounted access platform [76].....	54
Figure 2.20: A retractable roof enclosure (a) before deployment and (b) after deployment [77].....	55
Figure 2.21: A retractable commercial garden roof canopy (a) before deployment and (b) after deployment [77].....	55
Figure 2.22: A retractable pool enclosure [77].....	56

Figure 2.23: A retractable awning [77].....	56
Figure 2.24: Retractable stadium roof system consisting of two parts (a) before deployment and (b) after deployment [77].....	57
Figure 2.24: Enclosure with a retractable stadium roof system consisting of three parts a) before deployment and (b) half way through full deployment [77].....	57
Figure 2.25: The SL-DEX Type hydraulic overhead beam crane manufactured by Nautical Structures USA [78].....	58
Figure 2.26: Applications of the SL-DEX Type hydraulic overhead beam crane [78].....	59
Figure 2.28 (a) Single telescoping gangplank (b) Double telescoping gangplank and (c) Triple telescoping gangplank [78].....	60
Figure 2.29: Telescoping adjustable column [79].....	61
Figure 2.30: Telescoping adjustable wheelchair ramps [80].....	62
Figure 2.31: Construction of the “Wonder Pole [®] ” [81].....	63
Figure 2.32: A telescoping “Wonder Pole [®] ” in use [81].....	63
Figure 2.33: Examples of trailer mounted US Tower manufactured telescoping towers [82].....	64
Figure 2.34: A self contained US Tower manufactured Command, Control, Communications and Tactical Shelter or C3T Trailer [82].....	65
Figure 2.35: Examples of vehicle mounted US Tower manufactured telescoping towers [82].....	66
Figure 2.36: Aerial view of a large installation of SpaceSaver Racks in a steel service center [83].....	67
Figure 2.37: SpaceSaver Racks installed outdoors [83].....	68
Figure 2.38: ‘8 Tall SpaceSaver Rack’ installed with optional electric lift cage. For maximum density 8Tall models nearly twenty feet high are available [83].....	69
Figure 2.39: ‘5 Tall SpaceSaver Rack’ storing 20’-24’ tubing at Marmon/Keystone. A rolling platform ladder is used to access the upper levels [84].....	69
Figure 3.1: Two-section, telescopic cantilever.....	71
Figure 3.2: Deflection Plot obtained from Macaulay’s Theorem vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200mm and 1000mm respectively.....	76
Figure 3.3: Two section telescopic cantilever.....	78

Figure 3.4: Cross sectional view of the two section telescopic cantilever.....	79
Figure 3.5: Mohr’s Moment Area Method applied to the two section tip loaded cantilever beam.....	80
Figure 3.6: Mohr’s Moment Area Method applied to the two section cantilever beam subjected to uniformly distributed loading.....	83
Figure 3.7: End Deflection Plot of Equation (3.11) obtained from Mohr’s Moment Area Theorem vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200mm and 1000mm respectively.....	88
Figure 3.8: Cross sectional view of the two section telescopic cantilever.....	89
Figure 3.9: Castigliano’s Theorem applied to the two section cantilever beam.....	90
Figure 3.10: End Deflection Plot of Equation (3.18) obtained from Castigliano’s Theorem vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200mm and 1000mm respectively.....	96
Figure 3.11: Principle of Virtual Work applied to the two section cantilever beam.....	97
Figure 3.12: End Deflection Plot of Equation (3.26) obtained from Virtual Work Theorem vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively.....	104
Figure 3.13: End Theoretical Deflection Plots vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively.....	105
Figure 3.13 (a): End Theoretical End Deflection Plots vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively, for a wL/P ratio of 10.....	106
Figure 3.13 (b): End Theoretical End Deflection Plots vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively, for a wL/P ratio of 1.....	107
Figure 3.13 (c): End Theoretical End Deflection Plots vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively, for a wL/P ratio of 0.1.....	108

Figure 3.13 (d): End Theoretical End Deflection Plots vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 3.1, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively, for a wL/P ratio of 0.01.....	109
Figure 4.1: Geometry of the tapered circular cantilever column.....	113
Figure 4.2: Geometry of the tapered circular cantilever column.....	114
Figure 4.3: Plot of d_o/d_e against z' from Equation (4.7), for the tapered circular cantilever column.....	116
Figure 4.4: Plot of σ/σ_e against z' from Equation (4.8), for the tapered circular, cantilever column.....	117
Figure 4.5: Plot of σ/σ_e (obtained from Equation (4.5)) against z' , where z' varies from 0 to 1, in increments of 0.1, for the tapered circular, cantilever column. The curves in turn represent the values of d_o/d_e varying from 2 to 10.....	118
Figure 4.6: Section Properties of Tapered Beams (a) Section changing breadth; (b) Section changing depth; (c) Section changing bi-dimensionally at the same rate; (4) Section changing bi-dimensionally at different rates (Adapted from [93]).....	119
Figure 4.7: Geometry of the tapered rectangular cantilever column whose cross section changes in breadth.....	120
Figure 4.8: Geometry of the tapered rectangular cantilever column whose cross section changes in depth.....	121
Figure 4.9: Geometry of the cantilever column (Adapted from [15]).....	124
Figure 4.10: (a) A fixed-free column subjected to a tip load (b) Cross sections of an axially symmetric truncated cone (Adapted from [94]).....	125
Figure 4.11: Plot of Equation (4.31) vs. d_o/d_e , for the axially symmetric, truncated cone.....	130
Figure 4.12: (a) A fixed-free column subjected to a tip load (b) Cross sections of columns for a square pyramid whose section changes breadth.....	131
Figure 4.13: Plot of Equation (4.35) vs b_o/b_e , for the truncated, square pyramid, whose breadth changes.....	133
Figure 4.14: (a) A fixed-free column subjected to a tip load (b) Cross sections of columns for a square pyramid whose section changes depth.....	134
Figure 4.15: Plot of Equation (4.41) vs h_o/h_e , for the truncated square pyramid, whose depth changes.....	136

Figure 4.16: Plot of Equation (4.46) vs. η, ψ , for the truncated square pyramid, whose section changes bi-dimensionally at the same rate	140
Figure 4.17: Geometry of a thin walled rectangular section.....	142
Figure 4.18: Single Stepped composite strut.....	143
Figure 4.19: Geometry of the cantilever column.....	145
Figure 4.20: Cross sectional view of the single stepped composite strut.....	146
Figure 4.21: Plot of Equation (4.59) vs. ϕ , for the single stepped strut, having dimensions outlined in Table 4.3 and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively.....	149
Figure 4.22: Two section telescopic cantilever.....	150
Figure 4.23: Cross sectional view of the two section telescopic cantilever.....	152
Figure 4.24: Plot of Equation (4.64) vs. α , where α varies from 0 to 1, in increments of 0.1, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly, having dimensions outlined in Table 4.5, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively.....	155
Figure 4.25: Plot of Equation (4.64) vs. ϕ , where ϕ varies from 0 to 1, in increments of 0.1, for overlap ratios α varying from 0 to 0.6, determined for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly, having dimensions outlined in Table 4.5, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively.....	156
Figure 4.26: Plot of Equation (4.64) vs. ϕ , where ϕ varies from 0 to 1, in increments of 0.1, for overlap ratios α varying from 0.7 to 1, determined for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly, having dimensions outlined in Table 4.5, and fixed and free-end lengths of 1200 mm and 1000 mm respectively.....	157
Figure 5.1: Uniform, rectangular tube.....	161
Figure 5.2: Flexural shear flows q_B must be added to q_{net} with F_y be applied at the shear centre E.....	162
Figure 5.3: Rectangular tube with uniform thin-walled thickness.....	166
Figure 5.4: Uniform rectangular tube showing net shear flow.....	168
Figure 6.1: Moment of resistance within section at x-position.....	173
Figure 6.2: Telescopic beam assembly with two sections.....	175
Figure 6.3 (a) Cross section of the uniform rectangular tube (b) Net shear stress distribution in the cross section of the uniform rectangular tube.....	177

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Figure 7.7: Offset loading induced shear stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end along $A_3C_3B_3D_3$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm.....	201
Figure 7.8: Offset loading induced shear stress (MPa) vs Distance from the fixed end along $A_2C_2B_2D_2$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm.....	202
Figure 7.9: FEA extracted values of P_{cr}/P_{Eu} vs. Overlap ratio α , where α varies from 0.2 to 0.8, in increments of 0.2, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly, having dimensions outlined in Table 7.1.....	204
Figure 8.1: The Experimental test rig.....	207
Figure 8.2: Loading arm through which loads are applied.....	208
Figure 8.3: Loading arm configuration for (a) Inline Loading (b) Offset Loading.....	209
Figure 8.4: Tufnell wear pads attached to beam 2. These four wear pads are located on the four walls of beam 2, at the end opposite to that where loads are applied.....	209
Figure 8.5: Unattached wear pads, inserted into the gap at the three position's A, B and C, at the start of the overlap between beam 1 and beam 2.....	210
Figure 8.6: Position where the strain gauges were bonded onto the telescopic assembly. positions W and X are 300mm from the Fixed End of Beam 1, whilst positions Y and Z are 200mm from the inner end of Beam 2.....	211
Figure 8.7: Strain gauge rosettes bonded at (a) position W (b) position X (c) position Y and (d) position Z, as shown in Figure 9.5.....	212
Figure 8.8: Front view of the telescopic assembly. The arrow indicates the position where dial gauge readings of deflection for different load magnitudes were taken.....	213
Figure 8.9: Frontal view of the experimental mounting jig clamped to support column.....	214
Figure 8.10: Details of the mounting mechanism.....	215
Figure 8.11: (a) Front view of the mounting jig (b) Rear view of the mounting jig.....	215
Figure 8.12: Left hand view of the mounting jig showing the method by which the same is clamped to the support column.....	216
Figure 8.13: Load Applied in Newton vs Tip Deflection in mm for the experimental test rig having dimensions outlined in Table 8.1.....	219
Figure 8.14: Extrapolated Deflection Curves vs. Overlap ratio α for the experimental test rig having dimensions outlined in Table 8.1.....	220

Figure 8.15: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	222
Figure 8.16: Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	222
Figure 8.17: Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	223
Figure 8.18: Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	223
Figure 8.19: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	224
Figure 8.20: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	224
Figure 8.21: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	225
Figure 8.22: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	225
Figure 8.23: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	226
Figure 8.24: Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	226
Figure 8.25: Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	227
Figure 8.26: Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	227
Figure 8.27: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	228
Figure 8.28: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	228
Figure 8.29: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	229
Figure 8.30: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	229
Figure 8.31: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	230

Figure 8.32: Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	230
Figure 8.33: Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	231
Figure 8.34: Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	231
Figure 8.35: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	232
Figure 8.36: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	232
Figure 8.37: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	233
Figure 8.38: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	233
Figure 8.39: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	234
Figure 8.40: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	234
Figure 8.41: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	235
Figure 8.42: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	235
Figure 8.43: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	236
Figure 8.44: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	236
Figure 8.45: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	237
Figure 8.46: Principal Stresses (σ_1, σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	237
Figure 9.1: Comparison of Deflection Curves vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 8.1.....	243

Figure 9.1 (a): Comparison of Deflection Curves vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 8.1, for an applied load of 80N.....	244
Figure 9.1 (b): Comparison of Deflection Curves vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 8.1, for an applied load of 50N.....	245
Figure 9.1 (c): Comparison of Deflection Curves vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 8.1, for an applied load of 40N.....	244
Figure 9.1 (d): Comparison of Deflection Curves vs. Parameter α , for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 8.1, for an applied load of 30N.....	244
Figure 9.2: Experimental Deflection linear Plots showing Load Applied in Newton vs Tip Deflection in mm, extended such that they meet the ordinate at 20Newtons.....	248
Figure 9.3: Inline Loading induced Bending Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_1C_1B_1D_1$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm.....	251
Figure 9.4: Inline loading induced Shear Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_3C_3B_3D_3$ for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm.....	252
Figure 9.5: Inline loading induced Shear Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_2C_2B_2D_2$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm.....	253
Figure 9.6: Offset loading induced Bending Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_1C_1B_1D_1$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm.....	254
Figure 9.7: Offset loading induced Shear Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_3C_3B_3D_3$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm.....	255
Figure 9.8: Offset loading induced Shear Stress (MPa) vs Distance from the Fixed End along $A_2C_2B_2D_2$, for the two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly having individual part dimensions outlined in Table 7.1, and an overlap of 400mm.....	256
Figure 9.9: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	258
Figure 9.10: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	258

Figure 9.11: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	259
Figure 9.12: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	259
Figure 9.13: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	260
Figure 9.14: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	260
Figure 9.15: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	261
Figure 9.16: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 400mm overlap.....	261
Figure 9.17: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	262
Figure 9.18: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	262
Figure 9.19: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	263
Figure 9.20: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	263
Figure 9.21: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	264
Figure 9.22: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	264
Figure 9.23: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	265
Figure 9.24: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 500mm overlap.....	265
Figure 9.25: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	266
Figure 9.26: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position X (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	266
Figure 9.27: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Y (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	267

Figure 9.28: Comparison of Principal Stresses at Position Z (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	267
Figure 9.29: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	268
Figure 9.30: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	268
Figure 9.31: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	269
Figure 9.32: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 600mm overlap.....	269
Figure 9.33: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	270
Figure 9.34: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	270
Figure 9.35: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	271
Figure 9.36: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Inline Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	271
Figure 9.37: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position W vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	272
Figure 9.38: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position X vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	272
Figure 9.39: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Y vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	273
Figure 9.40: Comparison of Principal Stresses (σ_1 , σ_2 (MPa)) at Position Z vs Offset Load Applied (Kg) with 700mm overlap.....	273
Figure 9.41: Comparison between buckling curves generated from theoretical predictions and FEA, for the telescopic assembly whose individual part dimensions are outlined in Table 7.1.....	276
Figure A.1: Deflected shapes of the two section telescoping cantilever beam assembly.....	293
Figure A.2: Fixed-end beam loading.....	294
Figure A.3: Free-end beam loading.....	295
Figure A.4: A Section in AC.....	296

Figure A.5: A Section in CB.....	298
Figure A.6: Deflection of Beams AB and CD.....	299
Figure A.7: Deflection of Beam CD.....	301
Figure C.1: Tip Reaction Model – Beam Assembly and Reactions on Individual Beams....	310
Figure C.2: Shear Force and Bending Moment Diagrams for the Individual Sections.....	313
Figure C.3: A Telescopic Beam Assembly with Two Sections and the Vertical and Horizontal planes of symmetry shown.....	314
Figure C.4: Telescopic beam bending stresses induced by inline loading, from tip reaction analysis.....	319
Figure C.5: Telescopic beam shear stresses induced by inline loading, from tip reaction analysis.....	320
Figure D.1: Tip Reaction Model – Beam Assembly and Reactions on Individual Beams....	322
Figure D.2: Shear Force, Bending Moment and Torque Diagrams for the Individual Sections.....	326
Figure D.3: A Telescopic Beam Assembly with Two Sections and the Vertical and Horizontal planes of symmetry shown.....	327
Figure D.4: Telescopic beam bending stresses induced by offset loading, from tip reaction analysis.....	331
Figure D.5: Telescopic beam shear stresses, induced by offset loading from tip reaction analysis.....	332
Figure G.1: Sketcher Window in ABAQUS/CAE.....	337
Figure G.2: Extrusion of the Part Instance sketched in Figure 7.2, the arrow indicates the depth to which the part is extruded.....	337
Figure G.3 (a) Dimensioned Sketch of the second or free end beam instance, (b) Extrusion of the second beam instance (as sketched in 7.4(a)), (c) Dimensioned Sketch of the wear pad instance, (d) Extrusion of the wear pad instance (as sketched in I.3(c)).....	338
Figure G.4: Assigning Normals to the shell elements (Purple is the negative direction while Brown is the positive direction).....	339
Figure G.5: Property Module Tools.....	340
Figure G.6: Steps to create and define Material Properties.....	340
Figure G.7: Tabs to be filled in order to create material section having properties of Steel..	341

Figure G.8: Tabs to be filled in order to create material section having properties of Tufnel.....	341
Figure G.9: Creating a Homogeneous, Shell section of thickness 1.55mm, having properties of Steel.....	342
Figure G.10: Creating a Homogeneous, Solid section having properties of Tufnell.....	343
Figure G.11: Assigning the Homogeneous, Solid Tufnell section to the part highlighted...	343
Figure G.12: Assigning the Homogeneous, Shell Steel section to the part highlighted.....	344
Figure G.13: Assembly Module Tools.....	345
Figure G.14: Creation of part instances and their assembly to constitute the overall Two Section Telescopic Cantilever Assembly.....	346
Figure G.15: Step Module Tools.....	350
Figure G.16: Creation of Buckling Step as outlined in ABAQUS 6.10 Documentation and § G.4.1.....	350
Figure G.17: Interaction Module Tools.....	351
Figure G.18: Definition of constraints (Tie Contacts) between surfaces.....	353
Figure G.19: Definition of coupling constraint.....	353
Figure G.20: Existing Tie Definitions that can be controlled and edited from the Constraint Manager Tab.....	354
Figure G.21: Loading and Boundary Condition Tool Sets.....	355
Figure G.22: Application of self weight or gravity on the assembly.....	356
Figure G.23: Application of the concentrated end force at the free end of the assembly.....	356
Figure G.24: Application of the twisting moment at the free end of the assembly.....	357
Figure G.25: Application of ‘Dead’ load on the assembly.....	357
Figure G.26: Application of ‘Live’ load on the assembly.....	358
Figure G.27: Position where the Telescopic Assembly is constrained as indicated by the arrow, in all degrees of freedom to simulate an ‘Encastre’ type fixing.....	359
Figure G.28: Two-dimensional structured mesh patterns.....	362
Figure G.29: The swept meshing technique for an extruded solid.....	363

Figure G.30: The sweep direction can influence the uniformity of the swept mesh.....	364
Figure G.31: Controlling the screen view by switching of the irrelevant parts which provides more control in selecting parts in meshing process.....	365
Figure G.32: Adjustment of Mesh Size.....	366
Figure G.33: Meshed Telescopic Boom Assembly.....	367
Figure G.34: Submitting a job for analysis and monitoring its progress.....	368
Figure G.35: Selecting the displacement tab and its component in the negative y-direction.....	369
Figure G.36: The displacement at each of the nodes as is plotted along the assembly.....	370
Figure G.37: Node Label display options.....	371
Figure G.38: Node Labels displayed on Part.....	371
Figure G.39: Report generation procedure for deflection magnitude extraction at individual nodes.....	372
Figure G.40: Report arranged according to Node Labels.....	372
Figure G.41: Obtaining deflection values directly using the probe function available in ABAQUS.....	373
Figure G.42: Selecting the desired stress component tab.....	374
Figure G.43: The stress distribution is shown after the analysis is completed.....	375
Figure G.44: Report generation procedure for stress determination at individual nodes.....	376
Figure G.45: Report arranged according to Node Labels.....	376
Figure G.46: Obtaining Stress values directly using the Probe function available in ABAQUS.....	377
Figure G.47: Determination of Critical Buckling Load for the two section telescoping assembly, for an overlap ratio of 0.2.....	378
Figure H.1: Simple illustration for the strain measurement.....	381
Figure H.2: Uniaxial strain gauge.....	383
Figure H.3: Biaxial rosette.....	383

Figure H.4: Three element rosette.....	384
Figure H.5: Shear patterns.....	384
Figure H.6: Basic Mohr's circle geometry.....	387
Figure H.7: Strain transformation of θ	389
Figure H.8: Some useful Mohr's circle configurations.....	390
Figure H.9: Typical strain gauge rosettes (a) Rectangular rosette (b) Delta rosette (c) Delta rosette (d) Stacked delta rosette.....	390
Figure H.10: Normal and Shear Strains.....	391
Figure H.11: Rectangular rosette strain orientation.....	392
Figure H.12: Mohr's circle for rectangular rosette.....	395
Figure H.13: Schematic strain measurement system.....	396
Figure H.14: Quarter bridge strain gauge circuit.....	398
Figure H.15: Quarter bridge strain gauge circuit with addition of two resistors.....	398
Figure H.16: Three-wire, quarter-bridge strain gauge circuit.....	399
Figure H.17: Fishbone diagram-Factors which affect the selection of an instrumentation system.....	400
Figure H.18: Strain indicator.....	401
Figure H.19: Data acquisition system.....	402
Figure H.20: Characteristic of a strain gauge.....	403
Figure H.21: Uni-axial strain gauge.....	403
Figure H.22: Bi-axial strain gauge.....	403
Figure H.23: 0° - 45° - 90° Rectangular Rosette & 0° - 120° - 240° Delta Rosette.....	404
Figure H.24: Stacked Strain Gauge Configuration.....	404
Figure H.25: Planar Gauge Configuration.....	404
Figure H.26: Use a liberal amount of degreaser.....	408
Figure H.27: Wipe the specimen surface thoroughly with a gauze sponge.....	408
Figure H.28: To avoid recontamination, discard soiled sponges and continue until the sponge comes up clean.....	409

Figure H.29: Flood the gagging area with conditioner.....	409
Figure H.30: A dozen strokes are usually adequate.....	409
Figure H.31: Wipe dry with a gauze sponge. Use only once through the gauging area. With a refolded or fresh sponge, wipe away from the gauging area.....	410
Figure H.32: Remove any excess chemicals from the work surface.....	410
Figure H.33: With a clean straight edge, and a 4H pencil firmly burnish a layout line. Hold the pencil perpendicular to the surface.....	410
Figure H.34: Use a liberal amount of conditioner to remove all graphite from the burnished layout line by scrubbing along the line with a cotton-tipped applicator.....	411
Figure H.35: Keep scrubbing, but check the applicator tip for soiled appearance. Continue until the tip comes up clean.....	411
Figure H.36: Now, flood and re-clean the entire gagging area.....	411
Figure H.37: Replace the applicators when they become soiled. As before, continue scrubbing until the tip comes up clean.....	411
Figure H.38: Refold, and dry the remaining area.....	412
Figure H.39: Removing the gauge from transparent envelope.....	413
Figure H.40: Positioning the gauge on the layout line.....	413
Figure H.41: Lift the tape to allow applying catalyst.....	414
Figure H.42: Applying M-Bond 200.....	414
Figure H.43: Applying adhesive.....	415
Figure H.44: Applying gauge on the test specimen.....	415
Figure H.45: Applying uniform pressure.....	416
Figure H.46: Remove the tape.....	416

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Nominal dimensions and sectional properties of rectangular hollow sections – Excerpt from ISO/FDIS 2633-2:2011 (E).....	74
Table 3.2: Flow Chart of the ‘C’ program to calculate tip deflection.....	75
Table 3.3: Individual rectangular section properties.....	79
Table 4.1: Comparison of critical buckling loads for a rectangular pyramid, whose section changes bi-dimensionally at different rates.....	141
Table 4.2: Individual rectangular section properties.....	144
Table 4.3: Nominal dimensions and sectional properties of solid rectangular sections [95].....	148
Table 4.4: Individual rectangular section properties.....	151
Table 4.5: Nominal dimensions and sectional properties of rectangular hollow sections – Excerpt from ISO/FDIS 2633-2:2011 (E).....	153
Table 7.1: Dimensional properties of the simulated two section telescopic cantilever beam assembly.....	189
Table 7.2: ABAQUS/CAE procedure for tip deflection analysis.....	191
Table 7.3: ABAQUS/CAE procedure for bending and shear stress analysis.....	192
Table 7.4: ABAQUS/CAE procedure for determining critical buckling load.....	193
Table 8.1: Sectional properties of the individual beams of the test specimen.....	208
Table 8.2: Position of gauges along the telescopic beam assembly.....	211
Table G.1: Materials and Elements defined in the analysis.....	342