

STABILITY OF DRY- STACK MASONRY

by

Joseph Vincent Ngowi

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Engineering, University of the Witwatersrand, in the fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Engineering.

Johannesburg, 2005

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted in the Faculty of Engineering at the University of the Witwatersrand, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Engineering. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other University

.....

(Signature of candidate)

..... day ofyear

ABSTRACT

This thesis presents the findings on empirical study of dry-stack masonry. Dry-stack masonry refers to a method of building masonry walls, where most of the masonry units are laid without mortar in the joints. Of late (since mid eighties) in modern construction, dry-stacking or mortarless technology is increasingly becoming popular because of its advantages. The construction industry is acknowledging the need to accelerate the masonry construction process, as the traditional method is labour intensive and hence slower due to the presence of a large number of mortar joints. Early attempts were made to increase the size of masonry units (block instead of brick), thereby reducing the number of mortar joints, wherein the use of bedding mortar imposed constraints on the number of courses to be constructed in a day. Elimination of bedding mortar accelerates construction; thereby reducing cost, variation due to workmanship and generally small pool of skilled labour is required in dry stacking. Dry-stack masonry is a relatively new technology not yet regulated in the code of practice and therefore very limited information on the structural behaviour of the masonry is available. This project is based on the investigation of the HYDRAFORM dry-stack system, which utilises compressed soil-cement interlocking, blocks. The system is now widely used in Africa, Asia and South America. The main objective of the project was to establish through physical testing the capacity of the system to resist lateral load (e.g. wind load), vertical load and dynamic load such as earthquake loading.

In the first phase of the project investigations were conducted under static loading where series of full-scale wall panels were constructed in the laboratory and tested under lateral loading, and others were tested under vertical loading to establish the mode of failure and load capacity of the system. Series of control tests were also conducted by testing series of wallettes to establish failure mechanism of the units and to establish the flexural strength of the system. Finally the test results were used for modelling, where load prediction models for the system under vertical loading and under lateral loading were developed. The theoretical load prediction models were tested against the test results and show good agreement. After the

load capacity was established the next step in the study was to further improve the system for increased capacity particularly under dynamic loading. The normal Hydraform system was modified by introducing a conduit, which allows introduction of reinforcements. Series of dry-stack seismic systems were constructed and initially tested under static lateral loading to establish the lateral load capacity.

The second Phase of the project was to investigate the structural behaviour and performance of the Hydraform system under seismic loading. A shaking table of 20 tonnes payload, (4m x 4m) in plan was designed and fabricated. A full-scale plain dry-stack masonry house was constructed on the shaking table and subjected to seismic base motions. The shaking table test was performed using sine wave signals excitations starting from low to very severe intensity. A conventional masonry test structure of similar parameters was also constructed on the table and tested in a similar manner for comparison. The tests were conducted using a frequency range of 1Hz to 12Hz and the specimens were monitored for peak accelerations and displacements. For both specimens the initial base motion was 0.05g.

The study established the mode of failure of the system; the structural weak points of unreinforced dry-stack masonry, the general structural response of the system under seismic condition and the failure load. The plain dry-stack masonry failed at 0.3g and the conventional masonry failed at 0.6g. Finally recommendations for further strengthening of system to improve its lateral capacity were proposed.

STATEMENT OF ACHIEVEMENT

I believe that the work reported in this thesis has made a contribution to the field of dry-stack masonry. The following technical papers were derived from this investigation:

1. Uzoegbo, H; Ngowi J.V;(2004) “Lateral Strength of Dry-stack Wall System”, International Journal of British Masonry Society Vol.17,No.3 Dec. 2004, pp 122-128.
2. Uzoegbo, H; Ngowi J.V;(2005) “Empirical Studies of Flexural Strength for Interlocking Masonry”, Botswana Journal of Technology (in press).
3. Uzoegbo H; Ngowi J.V; “Structural Behaviour of Dry-stack Interlocking block Walling Systems subjected to In-Plane Loading” Journal of the Concrete Society of the Southern Africa. Issue No 103, May 2003 pp. 8-13.
4. Uzoegbo H; Ngowi J.V; “Structural Behaviour of Dry-stack Interlocking block walling systems”. Proceedings of the Sixth International Masonry Conference, British Masonry Society, London, 4th –6th Nov. 2002. pp. 498-502,
5. Uzoegbo H; Ngowi J.V; “Load prediction Model for Laterally Loaded Dry-stack Masonry”, International Conference on Structural and Road Transportation (START), 3rd –5th Jan. 2005 INDIA
6. Uzoegbo H; Ngowi J.V; Senthivel R.:(2004) “Load Capacity of Dry-stack Masonry walls” The Masonry Society Journal –USA (*under review*)

DEDICATION

For my family, my wife Magdalena and my two sons

Nelson and Imani Ngowi

“By the way the African pyramids are dry-stacked”

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing a PhD is an arduous task. The author wishes to thank the following people and organisations for the contributions they made to make this research a success.

Prof. H.C Uzoegbo my supervisor, Mr A. Hofmeyr and J. Meyer for showing me how to use some of the instruments reported in this research.

The government of Tanzania for sponsoring my studies.

HYDRAFORM (Pty) Ltd for sponsoring the project and technical advice.

MEGMET (Pty) Ltd for their involvement in the design and fabrication of affordable Shaking Table.

SPOORNET for permission to use their Laboratory.

Mi TeK South Africa (Pty) Ltd for supply of some of roof materials.

Members of staff from WITS and SPOORNET laboratories for their support.

Finally, my sincere thanks to my wife, Magdalena and my sons for being encouraging and understanding during my study period away from home.

CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
STATEMENT OF ACHIEVEMENT.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi
LIST OF TABLES	xxiii
LIST OF SYMBOLS.....	xxvi

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1	General	1-1
1.2	Problem Statement.....	1-2
1.3	Objective and Scope.....	1-3
1.4	Outline of the Thesis	1-4

CHAPTER 2

EVALUATION OF THE EXISTING INTERLOCKING DRY-STACK MASONRY SYSTEMS

2.1	Introduction.....	2-1
2.2	Hollow interlocking dry-stack masonry wall systems.....	2-1
2.3	Solid interlocking dry-stack masonry wall systems.....	2-2
2.4	General Advantages and Disadvantages of Interlocking Dry-stack Masonry System.....	2-2
2.4.1	Advantages.....	2-2

2.4.2	Disadvantages	2-3
2.5	Evaluation Criteria for Dry-stack Masonry System.....	2-3
2.5.1	Aesthetic.....	2-4
2.5.2	Social and political.....	2-4
2.5.3	Nominal dimensions and tolerance.....	2-5
2.6	Ancient dry-stack masonry in Africa.....	2-5
2.6.1	Structural problems in ancient walls.....	2-6
2.7	Concrete Dry-stack Masonry systems.....	2-7
2.7.1	Introduction.....	2-7
2.7.2	Azar dry-stack system – Canada.....	2-7
2.7.3	Spurlock dry-stack system – Canada.....	2-9
2.7.4	Haener dry-stack system – USA.....	2-10
2.7.5	Linkblock dry stack system - South Africa.....	2-11
2.7.6	The Baker system.....	2-13
2.7.7	The German KLB system.....	2-13
2.7.8	Sparfill system.....	2-14
2.7.9	The Sinustat system.....	2-14
2.7.10	The Whelan-Hatznikolas-Drexel (WHD).....	2-15
2.7.11	Smart dry-stack system –Australia.....	2-15
2.7.12	The modified H-Block system.....	2-16
2.7.13	The Stepoc building system.....	2-17
2.7.14	Jordanian interlocking system.....	2-18
2.7.15	The Mecano system.....	2-19
2.7.16	Barlock interlocking system.....	2-19
2.7.17	Whelan interlocking masonry.....	2-20
2.7.18	McIBS, Inc. mortarless interlocking system.....	2-21
2.7.19	The Etherington “building system”.....	2-21
2.7.20	The ACECOMS dry-stack system – Thailand	2-22
2.8	Soil-Cement Dry-stack Masonry Systems	2-24
2.8.1	Introduction.....	2-24
2.8.2	The Unique dry-stack building system - South Africa.....	2-24
2.8.3	IPI dry-stack system –Tanzania	2-25

2.8.4	Hydraform dry-stack building system – South Africa.....	2-27
2.8.4.1	Construction details of Hydraform building system and use limitations.....	2-28
2.8.4.2	Manufacture of Hydraform Blocks	2-31

CHAPTER 3

DEVELOPMENT OF LOAD PREDICTION MODEL FOR DRY-STACK WALL PANELS UNDER STATIC VERTICAL LOAD

3.1	Introduction.....	3-1
3.2	Materials	3-1
3.3	Experimental Procedures.....	3-2
3.4	Test results.....	3-5
3.4.1	Wall Panel Tests.....	3-5
3.4.2	Prism test results.....	3-7
3.4.3	Test on conventional wall panel.....	3-8
3.5	Discussions and Conclusions	3-10
3.5.1	Relationship between wall panel capacity and masonry unit strength.....	3-10
3.5.2	Relationship between the strengths of masonry unit, prism and wall panel.....	3-11
3.5.3	Comparison with Conventional masonry.....	3-12
3.5.4	Conclusion.....	3-14

CHAPTER 4

LATERAL STRENGTH OF DRY-STACK MASONRY WALL SYSTEMS WITHOUT PRECOMPRESSION

4.1	Introduction.....	4-1
4.2	Materials.....	4-1
4.3	Experiment procedures.....	4-2
4.3.1	General.....	4-2

4.4	Effect of span on lateral strength on dry-stack masonry wall panel.....	4-3
4.4.1	Introduction.....	4-3
4.4.2	Testing of the Short Span wall	4-4
4.4.3	Testing of the Medium Span wall	4-5
4.4.4	Testing of the Long Span wall	4-6
4.4.5	Testing of the Medium Span- Standard Conventional masonry for Comparisons.....	4-7
4.4.6	Discussions	4-9
4.5	Effect of Block unit Strength on Lateral strength on Dry-stack masonry.....	4-11
4.5.1	General	4-11
4.5.2	Testing of the low unit strength wall panel	4-11
4.5.3	Testing of the medium unit strength wall panel	4-13
4.5.4	Testing of the high unit strength wall panel	4-14
4.5.5	Discussions	4-15
4.6	Effect of degree of Interlocking mechanism on lateral strength.....	4-16
4.6.1	General.....	4-16
4.6.2	Testing of the wall of shallow interlocking mechanism	4-17
4.6.3	Testing of the wall of deep interlocking mechanism	4-18
4.6.4	Discussions.....	4-19
4.7	Effect of Everbond on the lateral strength on dry-stack masonry wall panel partially bonded.....	4-20
4.7.1	General.....	4-20
4.7.2	Testing of the wall with Everbond after every three courses.....	4-20
4.7.3	Testing of the wall with Everbond every course.....	4-21
4.7.4	Discussions.....	4-22
4.8	Effect of plaster on the lateral strength on dry-stack masonry wall panel.....	4-23
4.8.1	General.....	4-23
4.8.2	Test results and Discussions.....	4-24
4.9	Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Study.....	4-26

CHAPTER 5

INVESTIGATION OF FLEXURAL STRENGTH FOR DRY-STACK MASONRY

5.1	Introduction.....	5-1
5.2	Flexural Test of the Specimens under Vertical Bending.....	5-2
5.2.1	Introduction.....	5-2
5.2.2	Testing of 9 MPa specimens all joints dry-stack.....	5-3
5.2.3	Testing of 16 MPa specimens all joints dry-stack.....	5-5
5.2.4	Testing of 9 MPa specimens with horizontal joints laid in mortar and vertical joints dry-stack	5-5
5.2.5	Testing of 16 MPa specimens with horizontal joints laid in mortar and vertical joints dry-stack	5-6
5.3	Flexural Test of Specimens under Horizontal Bending	5-7
5.3.1	Introduction.....	5-7
5.3.2	Testing of 9 MPa specimens all joints dry-stack.....	5-7
5.3.3	Testing of 16 MPa specimens all joints dry-stack.....	5-8
5.3.4	Testing of 9 MPa specimen with horizontal joints laid in mortar and vertical Joints dry-stacked.....	5-9
5.3.5	Testing of 16 MPa specimen with horizontal joints laid in mortar and vertical Joints dry-stacked.....	5-10
5.4	Flexural tests results discussion.....	5-10
5.4.1	Introduction	5-10
5.5	Orthogonal ratio.....	5-12
5.6	Discussions.....	5-13
5.7	Conclusions.....	5-15

CHAPTER 6

DEVELOPMENT OF LOAD PREDICTION MODEL FOR DRY-STACK MASONRY LATERALLY LOADED

6.1	Introduction.....	6-1
6.2	The lateral strength of dry-stack wall panel.....	6-1
6.3	Discussions and conclusions.....	6-5

CHAPTER 7

DEVELOPMENT OF DRY-STACK WALL SYSTEM FOR SEISMIC CONSTRUCTION USING HYDRAFORM BLOCKS

7.1	Introduction.....	7-1
7.2	Study of the seismic mortarless blocks	7-2
7.3	Wall system with reinforcements anchored to the returns	7-4
7.4	Wall system with corner columns.....	7-5
7.5	Discussions and recommendation.....	7-9
7.6	Recommendations for further study.....	7-11

CHAPTER 8

SHAKING TABLE STUDY OF A SINGLE STORY DRY-STACK MASONRY HOUSE

8.1	Introduction	8-1
8.2	Object and Scope.....	8-4
8.3	Description of the Test Structures.....	8-4
8.3.1	House 1 – Plain Dry-Stack Masonry	8-4
8.3.1.1	Wall construction details.....	8-4
8.3.1.2	Roof structure and dead load.....	8-7
8.3.2	House 2 - Standard Conventional masonry House for comparisons.....	8-8

8.3.2.1 Wall construction details.....	8-8
8.3.2.2 Roof structure.....	8-10
8.4 Test Facility.....	8-11
8.4.1 Earthquake Simulator	8-11
8.4.1.1 Introduction.....	8-11
8.4.1.2 Shaking Table specifications.....	8-12
8.4.1.3 Design of the Table.....	8-12
8.4.2 Data acquisition	8-16
8.4.3 Reference frame.....	8-18
8.5 Test Results.....	8-21
8.5.1 Introduction.....	8-21
8.5.2 Response of House 1.....	8-22
8.5.2.1 Input data	8-22
8.5.2.2 Response of the test structure.....	8-24
8.5.2.3 Performance of the roof structure	8-29
8.5.3 Natural frequency of the test structure - House 1.....	8-33
8.5.4 Discussions.....	8-36
8.6 Response of House 2	8-53
8.6.1 In put data.....	8-53
8.6.2 Response of the test structure.....	8-53
8.6.3 Performance of the roof structure	8-60
8.6.4 Natural frequency of the test structure - House 2.....	8-64
8.6.5 General discussion.....	8-78
8.6.6 Major observations from the study	8-82
8.6.7 Recommendations.....	8-84

REFERENCES	9-1
APPENDIX A	DRY-STACK MASONRY –HYDRAFORM STYTEM.....A-1
APPENDIX B	MODE OF FAILURE AND LATERAL DEFLECTIONS.....B-1
APPENDIX C	FLEXURAL STRENGTH TEST RESULTS AND CALCULATIONS.....C-1
APPENDIX D	HYDRAFORM BLOCKS.....D-1
APPENDIX E	FAILURE OF THE TEST STRUCTURES.....E-1

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
CHAPTER 2	
2.1 Zimbabwe Ruins.....	2-5
2.2 Azar System	2-8
2.3 Spurlock dry-stack System	2-10
2.4 Block and stacking of the original Haener System.....	2-11
2.5 Linkblock System.....	2-12
2.6 Baker System.....	2-13
2.7 KLB block	2-13
2.8 Sparfill Block	2-14
2.9 Sinustat System	2-14
2.10 Whelan Masonry System.....	2-15
2.11 Smart Masonry System	2-16
2.12 Modified H-Block System.....	2-17
2.13 Stepoc System	2-18
2.14. Jordanian System	2-18
2.15 Mecano System	2-19
2.16 Barlock Interlocking System.....	2-20
2.17 Whelan Interlocking System.....	2-20
2.18 McIBS Masonry System	2-21
2.19. Etherington System (1979).....	2-22
2.20 ACECOM Dry-stack blocks.....	2-23
2.21 Unique system.....	2-25
2.22 IPI dry-stack system.....	2-26
2.23 Ordinary dry-stack block.....	2-27
2.24 Partition block.....	2-28
2.25 Ordinary corner block.....	2-28
2.26(a) Dry-stacking Stretcher bond.....	2-29.

2.26(b) Dry-stacking the mid courses.....	2-29
2.26(c) Wall construction details.....	2-30
2.27 Production of Hydraform interlocking blocks.....	2-33
2.28 Block curing	2-34
2.29 Delivering of the blocks in pallets.....	2-34

CHAPTER 3

3.1 Normal Hydraform interlocking block.....	3-2
3.2 Wall panel construction details and strain gauge positions.....	3-3
3.3 Setting out the starter course on machine platen.....	3-4
3.4 Specimen under vertical load	3-4
3.5 Sketch of the dry-stack prism test set up	3-4
3.6 Testing bonded prism	3-4
3.7 Front view of wall panel showing failure line.....	3-5
3.8 Side view of cracks at top.....	3-5
3.9 Side view, crushing of the top courses (5 MPa specimen).....	3-6
3.10 Panel load vs unit strength.....	3-7
3.11 Four-unit dry-stack prism	3-7
3.12 Four-unit prism bonded with mortar	3-7
3.13 Mode of failure conventional panel.....	3-9
3.14 Panels of similar units strength	3-9
3.15 Panel load vs unit strength.....	3-10
3.16 Wall strength vs masonry unit strength.....	3-11

CHAPTER 4

4.1 Hydraform Interlocking block.....	4-2
4.2 Full-scale one-room structure in the laboratory.....	4-3
4.3 Testing rig and Position of dial gauges on the wall.....	4-3

4.4	Load deflection behaviour for the short span	4-4
4.5	Mode of failure short span wall.....	4-5
4.6	Load-deflection for the medium span wall	4-6
4.7	Mode of failure medium span wall.....	4-6
4.8	Load deflection behaviour long span wall.....	4-7
4.9	Deflection and mode of failure of the long span wall.....	4-7
4.10	load-deflection behaviour standard conventional masonry wall.....	4-8
4.11	Mode of failure standard conventional masonry (medium span).....	4-8
4.12	load - deflection behaviour of different specimens.....	4-10
4.13	Wall ultimate lateral load.....	4-10
4.14	Interlocking block.....	4-11
4.15	Test results low strength wall panel.....	4-12
4.16	Load deflection for the medium units strength wall	4-13
4.17	Mode of failure medium units strength wall.....	4-13
4.18	Load deflection high unit strength wall (23 MPa).....	4-14
4.19	Mode of failure high unit strength wall panel.....	4-15
4.20	Wall ultimate lateral load	4-16
4.21	Load-deflection for the wall of shallow interlocking mechanism.....	4-17
4.22	Mode of failure wall of shallow interlocking mechanism.....	4-17
4.23	Load deflection wall with increased interlock.....	4-18
4.24	Mode of failure wall of deep interlocking units.....	4-18
4.25	Load deflection wall with Everbond each 3 rd course.....	4-21
4.26	Mode of failure wall with Everbond each 3 rd course.....	4-21
4.27	Load - deflection wall with Everbond every course.....	4-22
4.28	Mode of failure wall with Everbond each course.....	4-22
4.29	Load - deflection for the plastered walls in comparison to dry-stack and bonded walls.....	4-23
4.30	Typical mode of failure - plastered wall.....	4-24
4.31	Ultimate lateral load different walls	4-25

CHAPTER 5

5.1	Wallette set up.....	5-3
5.2	Interlocking Block.....	5-3
5.3	Typical mode of failure wallette format 1.....	5-4
5.4	Typical mode of failure 16 MPa specimens.....	5-5
5.5	Typical mode of failure 9 MPa specimen in mortar.....	5-6
5.6	Typical mode of failure 16 MPa specimens in mortar.....	5-6
5.7	Wallette format 2 - set up.....	5-7
5.8	Mode of failure wallette format 2 (9MPa) - under horizontal bending after load removal.....	5-8
5.9	Typical modes of failure 16 MPa specimens dry-stack.....	5-9
5.10	Typical mode of failure 9 MPa specimens laid in mortar.....	5-9
5.11	Mode of failure 16 MPa specimens in mortar.....	5-10
5.12	Units - self-weight support by the interlocking mechanism.....	5-15

CHAPTER 6.

6.1	Relationship of failing pressure to the length of dry-stack wall	6-2
6.2	Comparison between analytical model and experimental results.....	6-4

CHAPTER 7

7.1	Conduit Block type I	7-3
7.2	Conduit Block type II	7-3
7.3	Reinforcing details and mode of failure.....	7-4
7.4	Load - deflection behaviour under lateral load.....	7-4
7.5	Wall cross-section details.....	7-5
7.6	Construction and mode of failure of the specimen.....	7-6
7.7	Load - deflection behaviour under lateral load.	7-6

7.8	Wall cross-section – seismic block type II.....	7-7
7.9	Load-deflection – different wall systems.....	7-8
7.10	Load capacity of wall systems.....	7-8
7.11	Corner blocks profile.....	7-9
7.12	Modified conduit blocks.....	7-11

CHAPTER 8

8.1	Earthquakes in Africa continent.....	8-2
8.2:	House 1 constructed on the shaking table	8-4
8.3	Blocks for House 1.....	8-5
8.4	Brick force.....	8-6
8.5	Starter course set-up on the Table.....	8-6
8.6	Roof construction and dead load attachment	8-8
8.7	House 2 before test.....	8-9
8.8	Conventional bricks	8-9
8.9	Starter course set-up.....	8-10
8.10	Wall surface treatments	8-10
8.11	Fabrication of the roof structure.....	8-11
8.12	Table construction.....	8-13
8.13	Vibration mode shape	8-14
8.14	Stress distribution.....	8-15
8.15	Table response spectra.....	8-15
8.16	Spoornet data acquisition system.....	8-16
8.17	Monitoring Positions of the Test structures.....	8-17
8.18	Reference frame.....	8-19
8.19	House 1 and 2 Parameters	8-20
8.20	Initial failure West wall at 2Hz [0.05g].....	8-24
8.21	Initial failure at 4Hz [0.05g].....	8-24
8.22	Failure pattern at 9Hz [0.1g].....	8-25
8.23	North wall failure at 8Hz.....	8-26

8.24	Corner failure at 5Hz.....	8-26
8.25	East wall failure at 6Hz	8-26
8.26	Initial corner failure at 9Hz	8-27
8.27	East wall deflection at 1Hz.....	8-27
8.28	Bending of the door frame 2Hz.....	8-27
8.29	Typical diagonal failure of the walls.....	8-28
8.30	Collapse of out-of-plane walls at 1Hz [0.3g].....	8-28
8.31	East wall failure details.....	8-28
8.32	West wall failure details.....	8-28
8.33	Roof wire - mid trusses.....	8-29
8.34	Recorded max. accelerations at the roof and the supporting walls.....	8-30
8.35	Roof response against the base and the supporting walls.....	8-31
8.36	Truss failure -House1.....	8-32
8.37	Natural frequency House 1 at 0.05g.....	8-34
8.38	Natural frequency House 1 at 0.1g.....	8-35
8.39	Natural frequency House 1 at 0.2g.....	8-36
8.40	Sliding and opening of the perpend joints in the mid courses-House 1.....	8-37
8.41	Typical corner failure – House 1 [0.3g].....	8-38
8.42	Measured response: house 1, test 2 [0.05g @2hz].....	8-42
8.43	Measured response: house 1, test 4 [0.05g @4hz].....	8-44
8.44	Measured response: house 1 test 12 [0.1g @ 9hz].....	8-46
8.45	Measured response: house 1, test 21 [0.2g@ 9hz].....	8-48
8.46	Measured response: house 1, test 28 [0.2g @ 2hz].....	8-50
8.47	Measured response: house 1, test 30 [0.2g @ 1hz].....	8-52
8.48	Distribution of cracks: House 2 at 0.1g.....	8-56
8.49	Distribution of cracks on the walls: House 2 at 0.2g.....	8-57
8.50	Initial failure at lintel courses West wall [0.3g @ 9Hz].....	8-57
8.51	Diagonal failure East wall at 3Hz [0.4g].....	8-58
8.52	Diagonal failure at East wall [0.5g @ 5Hz].....	8-58
8.53	Collapse of the lintel courses East wall at 5Hz [0.6g].....	8-59
8.54	Window frame out of the structure.....	8-59
8.55	Local failure of the rafter.....	8-60

8.56	Recorded max. accelerations at the roof and supporting walls.....	8-61
8.57	Natural frequency of the roof and supporting walls at 0.05g.....	8-61
8.58	Natural frequencies House 2 at 0.05g.....	8-65
8.59	Natural frequencies House 2 at 0.2g.....	8-66
8.60	Natural frequency House 2 at 0.3g.....	8-67
8.61	Natural frequency House 2 at 0.4g.....	8-68
8.62	Natural frequency House 2 at 0.6g.....	8-69
8.63	Measured response: house 2, test 22 [0.2g@10hz].....	8-71
8.64	Measured response: house 2, test 32 [0.3g@9hz].....	8-73
8.65	Measured response: house 2, test 37 [0.3g@ 4hz].....	8-75
8.66	Measured response: house 2, test 47 [0.4g@ 3hz].....	8-77
8.67	Response of out-of-plane walls.....	8-80
8.68	Roof response.....	8-80
8.69	Horizontal Force Distributions.....	8-89
8.70	Introduction of lintel ring beam/band.....	8-89
8.71	Dry-stack lintel beam.....	8-90
8.72	Insitu side column.....	8-90

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 2

2.1	Physical properties of Azar Block.....	2-9
2.2	Basic requirements of Soil for CEB's production.....	2-31

CHAPTER 3

3.1	Basic requirements of Soil for CEB's production.....	3-2
3.2.	Wall panel tests results.....	3-6
3.3	Prism compressive test results.....	3-8
3.4	Relationship between block strength and prism strength.....	3-11
3.5	Relationship between dry -stack prism and dry-stack masonry wall panel.....	3-12
3.6	Relationship between dry-stack masonry wall and unit strength.....	3-12
3.7	Effect of different joint materials on compression strength of brick couplets.....	3-13
3.8	Effect of different joint materials on the compressive strength of prisms.....	3-14

CHAPTER 4

4.1	Lateral load test results -walls of different units strength.....	4-15
4.2	Lateral load test results – specimens with different depth of interlock.....	4-19
4.3	Tests results -load deflection different walls of same span	4-25

CHAPTER 5

5.1	Flexural strength results for fully dry-stack specimens.....	5-11
5.2	Flexural strength results for the specimens (partially dry-stack) bed joints in mortar and perpend joints dry stack.....	5-12
5.3	Calculated Orthogonal ratio.....	5-13
5.4	Comparison of Allowable Stress in Flexure.....	5-14

CHAPTER 6

6.1	Lateral load test results	6-2
6.2	Flexural strength results for fully dry-stack specimens.....	6-3

CHAPTER 8

8.1	Moderate earthquake occurred in 20 th Century in South Africa.....	8-3
8.2	House 1 parameters	8-5
8.3	Analysis results.....	8-13
8.4	Sine wave signal input data	8-22
8.5	Test sequence – House 1.....	8-23
8.6	House 1 Peak Acceleration and Displacements at the top of Out-of-plane walls and Roof Peak Acceleration.....	8-39
8.7	House 1 Peak Acceleration and Displacements at the top of In -plane walls and Roof Peak Acceleration.....	8-40
8.8	Test sequence House 2 – conventional masonry.....	8-54
8.9	House 2 peak acceleration and displacements at the top of out-of-plane walls and roof peak acceleration	8-62
8.10	House 2 peak acceleration and displacements at the top of in-plane walls and peak roof acceleration.....	8-63
8.11	Structural damage of the walls at Total failure	8-79

8.12	Response of the out-of-plane walls and the roof.....	8-80
8.13	Performance of the Test Structures	8-81
8.14	Recommendations to improve UDRM.....	8-88

LIST OF SYMBOLS

f_{panel}	= average compressive strength of the dry-stack wall panel
f_{cu}	= masonry unit cube strength
f_{xdry}	= flexural strength of the dry-stack masonry
$f_{\text{kxparal-dry}}$	= flexural strength of dry-stack masonry parallel to bed joint
$f_{\text{kxperp-dry}}$	= flexural strength of dry-stack masonry perpendicular to bed joint
h ,	= height of the wall panel
L	= length of the wall panel
M_{cv}	= vertical bending moment capacity
M	= the bending moment
P	= failing lateral pressure
μ_{dry}	= orthogonal ratio fully dry stack masonry
μ_{pdry}	= orthogonal ratio partially dry-stack masonry
$k_{\text{dry-stack}}$	= factor varies with the block characteristics and the geometry of the interlocking mechanism
Z	= gross-sectional modulus
ϕ_m	= safety factor on material