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**1. Prelab**

**1.1. Investigation about impact hammer test**

도표, 스케치, 텍스트, 라인이(가) 표시된 사진

자동 생성된 설명

**Figure 1. Impact hammer test**

Modal testing is a common method of characterizing the vibrations of a structure by imparting a known force and measuring the response of the structure. By measuring both the input to the structure and the response, the frequency response of the structure can be calculated. Calculating the frequency response over multiple locations, either simultaneously or individually, will yield data that can be used to estimate the dynamic response of the structure. The scale of a modal test can vary greatly. Test structures can be as small as silicon wafers used in electronics, and as large as multistory industrial sifters used at rock quarries. The size and geometry of the test structure will play a role is choosing how to excite it. The two most common methods are impact testing using a modal hammer and shaker testing. After collection, the data can be processed using ME’scope, a popular modal analysis software from Vibrant Technologies. The result of the measurements and processing would be an animated model of the operating deflection shapes (ODS) that clearly illustrates the movement of the structure. Most commonly, these models are analyzed to identify modal frequencies. At these frequencies the structure vibrates with minimal input energy. Exciting the structure at these frequencies can easily cause damage to the system. Characterizing the response of the structure mean that the design can be changed to reduce the response, or the operating conditions can be adjusted to avoid failures.

**1.2. FFT for following signal and the sketch of spectrum of frequency domain**

**1) Impulse signal**

라인, 도표이(가) 표시된 사진

자동 생성된 설명

**Figure 2. Time domain and FFT result of impulse signal**

**2) Unit step function**

In order to find the Fourier transform of the unit step function, express the unit step function in terms of signum function as

Following that, the FFT result of unit step function can be calculated as follows:

라인, 도표, 그래프, 폰트이(가) 표시된 사진

자동 생성된 설명

**Figure 3. Time domain and FFT result of unit step signal**

**3) sinusoidal signal**

도표, 라인, 그래프, 텍스트이(가) 표시된 사진

자동 생성된 설명라인, 도표이(가) 표시된 사진

자동 생성된 설명

**Figure 4. Time domain and FFT result of sinusoidal signal**

**2. Results**

**2.1. Experimental values**

**1) Steel with cantilever beam condition**

**텍스트, 스크린샷, 번호, 그래프이(가) 표시된 사진

자동 생성된 설명**

**Figure 5. FFT result of steel with cantilever beam condition**

As can be seen in the **Figure 5**, four resonance frequencies can be observed in the frequency domain,

**2) Brass with cantilever beam condition**

**텍스트, 스크린샷, 도표, 번호이(가) 표시된 사진

자동 생성된 설명**

**Figure 6. FFT result of brass with cantilever beam condition**

As can be seen in the **Figure 6**, four resonance frequencies can be observed in the frequency domain,

**3) Aluminum with cantilever beam condition**

**텍스트, 도표, 스크린샷, 그래프이(가) 표시된 사진

자동 생성된 설명**

**Figure 7. FFT result of aluminum with cantilever beam condition**

As can be seen in the **Figure 7**, four resonance frequencies can be observed in the frequency domain,

**4) Steel with both fixed boundary condition**

텍스트, 스크린샷, 도표, 그래프이(가) 표시된 사진

자동 생성된 설명

**Figure 8. FFT result of steel with fixed boundary condition**

As can be seen in the **Figure 8**, four resonance frequencies can be observed in the frequency domain,

**2.2. Theoretical values**

To get the proper theoretical values, the specifications for the specimen and some properties of them are set with values below:

**Table 2.1. Main properties of materials used in experiment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Steel** | **Brass** | **Aluminum** |
| **Elastic modulus** |  |  |  |
| **Density** |  |  |  |

Under the cantilever beam condition, multiplication of beta and length are defined as follows, and the beta values can be calculated with known length, .

**Table 2.2. Beta values for cantilever boundary condition**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

And the following resonance frequency values can be calculated with following equation:

**Table 2.3. Theoretical resonance frequency values of each material: cantilever condition**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Steel** | **Brass** | **Aluminum** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Under both side fixed condition, multiplication of beta and length are defined as follows, and the beta values can be calculated with known length, .

**Table 2.4. Beta values for both fixed boundary condition**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

And the following resonance frequency values can be calculated with following equation:

**Table 2.3. Theoretical resonance frequency values of steel: both side fixed condition**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Steel** |  |  |  |  |

**2.3. Simulation values**

**1) Steel with cantilever beam condition**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Figure 9. Ansys simulation result of steel: cantilever beam**

**2) Brass with cantilever beam condition**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Figure 10. Ansys simulation result of brass: cantilever beam**

**3) Aluminum with cantilever beam condition**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Figure 11. Ansys simulation result of aluminum: cantilever beam**

**4) Steel with both fixed condition**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Figure 11. Ansys simulation result of aluminum: cantilever beam**

**3. Discussion and analysis**

**3.1. Comparison of experimental, theoretical, simulation values**

**Table 3.1. Steel beam: cantilever beam**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Experiment** |  |  |  |  |
| **Theory** |  |  |  |  |
| **Simulation** |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3.2. Brass beam: cantilever beam**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Experiment** |  |  |  |  |
| **Theory** |  |  |  |  |
| **Simulation** |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3.3. Aluminum beam: cantilever beam**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Experiment** |  |  |  |  |
| **Theory** |  |  |  |  |
| **Simulation** |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3.4. Steel beam: both fixed beam**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Experiment** |  |  |  |  |
| **Theory** |  |  |  |  |
| **Simulation** |  |  |  |  |

**3.2. Influence of material of specimen and boundary conditions**

**3.2.1. Influence of material**

Equation above shows that under same boundary condition, area and moment of inertia, the following relationship is established.

So, it is necessary to compare the values ​​of elastic modulus and density ratio for each material. Materials with similar values ​​will have similar resonant frequencies under the same conditions mentioned above. The units of elastic modulus and density used in the ratios below are ignored.

When comparing the above results, the ratio of elastic modulus and density of steel and aluminum is similar, so they have similar natural frequencies under same conditions mentioned above. However, in the case of brass, it can be confirmed that it has a lower natural frequency than steel and aluminum since its ratio mentioned above is lower steel and aluminum. Ultimately, under the same cross-sectional area, moment of inertia, and boundary conditions, if the material changes, the size of the resonance frequency can be compared according to the ratio of the corresponding elastic modulus and density.

**3.2.2. Material of boundary condition**

When comparing the natural frequency of the experiment when a steel beam was fixed with a cantilever and that when both sides foxed, the natural frequency of support at both ends was much higher. This is because the stiffness of the beam increases when both sides are supported compared to when one side is fixed. Under the same material, experiment result shows that the first resonance frequency with both fixed condition is 8 times higher than that with one side fixed although the whole length for both condition is slightly different, .

**3.3. Discuss the differences between the FFT results with hand pressing the end of the beam and the impact hammer experiment.**