This article appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. The attached copy is furnished to the author for internal non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the authors institution and sharing with colleagues.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post their version of the article (e.g. in Word or Tex form) to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding Elsevier's archiving and manuscript policies are encouraged to visit:

<http://www.elsevier.com/copyright>

Experimental verification of a micromechanical model for polycrystalline shape memory alloys in dependence of martensite orientation distributions

K. Hackl^a, R. Heinen^{a,*}, W.W. Schmahl^b, M. Hasan^{b,c}

^a Lehrstuhl für Allgemeine Mechanik, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 44780 Bochum, Germany

^b Department für Geo- und Umweltwissenschaften, Sektion Kristallographie, Ludwig-Maximilian Universität, 80333 München, Germany

^c Fakultät für Geowissenschaften, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, 44780 Bochum, Germany

Received 17 May 2006; received in revised form 10 October 2006; accepted 26 October 2006

Abstract

We make use of a micromechanical model for polycrystalline shape memory alloys, whose main focus is the orientation distribution of the martensitic low symmetry variant. By energy minimization, the internal reorientation of martensite can be predicted. Hysteresis effects are included via the hypothesis that changes in the orientation distribution are connected to energy dissipation. From these considerations, we obtain evolution equations for the orientation distribution in terms of the thermomechanical driving forces. Comparing our model to results from synchrotron diffraction experiments, good agreement is found between experimentally observed and analytically predicted orientations of austenite and stress-induced martensite.

© 2007 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Micromechanical modeling; Polycrystals; Orientation distribution function; Reorientation of martensite; Driving forces; Shape memory alloys

1. Introduction

The focus of this paper is a comparison between analytical modeling and experimental testing of polycrystalline shape memory alloys. The material behavior is modeled based on the orientation distribution of the martensitic low-symmetry phase within the polycrystal. The model we use here has first been presented in [1]. By optimization of the global energy over all possible orientation distributions, we identify the thermodynamical driving forces as fundamental parameters governing the microstructural development. These driving forces are then compared to experimental results obtained by synchrotron diffraction experiments.

Details of the experimental procedure used are given in [2,3].

A first ansatz to model the material behavior of microstructured shape memory alloys by energy optimization has been presented in [4] and extended to include dissipative effects and inelasticity in [5]. A thermodynamical framework with a focus similar to this paper has been given in [6].

2. Micromechanical model

An ideal polycrystalline shape memory alloy consists of an infinite number of randomly oriented grains. For modeling purposes, however, the number of different crystal orientations is restricted to a large, but finite number N . Starting from an arbitrary fixed coordinate system, every crystal orientation j is described by a rotational tensor $\mathbf{R}_j$. Together with the linearized Bain strain $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ describing the transformation from the undeformed austenite reference configuration to the lower symmetry martensitic structure, the transformation strain for orientation j is

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_j = \mathbf{R}_j^T \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \mathbf{R}_j. \quad (1)$$

Here the arbitrary reference coordinate system has been chosen such that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ is a diagonal matrix with entries ε_{t1} , ε_{t2} , and ε_{t3} .

The volume fraction corresponding to the j th martensite orientation is now denoted by λ_j , $j = 1, \dots, N$, whereas λ_0 corresponds to the transformation strain $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ of the austenite. Mass conservation then leads to the constraints

$$\lambda_j \geq 0, \quad \sum_{j=0}^N \lambda_j = 1, \quad j = 0, \dots, N. \quad (2)$$

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +49 234 32 27090; fax: +49 234 32 14154.
E-mail address: Rainer.Heinen@rub.de (R. Heinen).

We assume a simple linear elastic material law:

$$\Psi_j(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j, \boldsymbol{\eta}_j) = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j - \boldsymbol{\eta}_j) : \mathbb{A} : (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j - \boldsymbol{\eta}_j) + \alpha_j, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbb{A}$ is the elasticity tensor with components $\mathbb{A}_{klmn} = \Lambda \delta_{kl} \delta_{mn} + 2\mu \delta_{km} \delta_{ln}$, “:” means contraction with respect to two indices, and α_j denotes the chemical energy of the j th variant, which only differs from austenite to martensite but is the same for all martensite variants for reasons of symmetry. The isotropy of the elastic constants may be assumed for a polycrystalline material since anisotropies are averaged out for a sufficiently large number of randomly oriented grains. Isotropy is, however, not a necessary condition required in our model.

In the energy formulation (3), we introduced the strain $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ of the crystals of orientation j . The global strain $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is then given as the average

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \sum_{j=0}^N \lambda_j \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j, \quad (4)$$

which leads to the following formulation of the global energy for fixed volume fractions:

$$\Psi^{\text{rel}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^N \lambda_j \Psi_j(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j, \boldsymbol{\eta}_j) \mid \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \sum_{j=0}^N \lambda_j \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j \right\}. \quad (5)$$

This way of calculating the free energy corresponds to a relaxation by convexification, which is actually a very crude way of obtaining lower bounds as estimates to the energy of a multi-variant material. For more sophisticated ways of relaxing energy functions and the corresponding mechanical interpretations, see [7,8]. For a comparison of upper and lower bounds to the free energy in order to estimate the quality of the convexification bound, see [9–11].

Minimizing (5) over the crystal strains $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j$ yields the straightforward expression for the relaxed energy

$$\Psi^{\text{rel}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{eff}}) : \mathbb{A} : (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{eff}}) + \alpha_{\text{eff}}, \quad (6)$$

with the effective transformation strain and chemical energy

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{j=0}^N \lambda_j \boldsymbol{\eta}_j \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{j=0}^N \lambda_j \alpha_j. \quad (7)$$

The crystal strains for which this minimal energy is achieved are

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_j - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{eff}}. \quad (8)$$

3. Time evolution

In order to fully describe the material behavior, an ansatz for the dissipation within the polycrystal is needed. Since changes in the orientation distribution correspond to a growth and shrinking of domains containing certain variants, an intuitional assumption is the dissipation function

$$\Delta(\dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) = r|\dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}| \quad (9)$$

which connects the Euclidian norm of the rate of change of the orientation distributions linearly to the dissipated energy. A

discussion of different dissipation functions in micromechanical and multiscale models for shape memory alloys may be found in [12].

To derive the evolution equations, we start from the minimum principle

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) &= \frac{d}{dt} \Psi^{\text{rel}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) + \Delta(\dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}) \\ &\rightarrow \min \quad \text{under the constraints (2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

A mathematically identical formulation has been derived in [13], however in a mechanically different setting.

Furthermore, we introduce the thermodynamically conjugate driving forces to $\dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$

$$q_j = -\frac{\partial \Psi^{\text{rel}}}{\partial \lambda_j} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_j : \mathbb{A} : (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{eff}}) - \alpha_j. \quad (11)$$

Variational calculus and a Legendre transform with respect to the driving forces then yield the evolution equation

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}_{\mathcal{A}} = \rho \operatorname{dev}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathbf{q}_{\mathcal{A}} \quad (12)$$

constrained by (2) and the Kuhn–Tucker conditions

$$\rho \geq 0, \quad \Phi(\mathbf{q}) = |\operatorname{dev}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathbf{q}_{\mathcal{A}}| - r \leq 0, \quad \rho \Phi = 0. \quad (13)$$

Here we have introduced the notions of an *active set* $\mathcal{A} = \{j | \lambda_j > 0\}$ and its *active deviator* $\operatorname{dev}_{\mathcal{A}} \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{A}} - (\sum_{\mathcal{A}} x_j) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}/n$, n being the number of elements of the active set and $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$ the n -vector with 1 in every entry. The index $\mathcal{A}$ means the restriction of an $(N+1)$ -vector to the active set $\mathcal{A}$.

A more detailed derivation of this model is given in [1,14].

4. Examples

The ability of the procedure presented above to model the most important effects in the behavior of polycrystalline shape memory alloys, such as pseudoelasticity and the shape-memory effect, has been shown in [1,14]. In this work, we focus on the comparison of analytically and experimentally obtained orientation distributions.

In Eq. (11), the term

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mathbb{A} : (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text{eff}}) \quad (14)$$

equals the global stress. From experimental observations and analytical results obtained with the model presented above, it is known that the transformation between austenite and martensite mainly takes place in the plateau where the stress is approximately constant. Consequently, the driving forces and thus, following Eq. (12), also the growth rates of the domains of certain orientations are constant over the whole plateau in which the transformation takes place. For a qualitative comparison, we may therefore assume that the probability of finding a certain orientation of the martensite is proportional to the corresponding driving force, hence

$$\lambda_j = \max\{0, k_1(\boldsymbol{\eta}_j : \boldsymbol{\sigma} - k_2)\} \quad \text{for } j \neq 0, \quad (15)$$

for appropriate constants $k_1, k_2 > 0$.

In order to compare the evolution of the internal variables used in our model, we calculate the orientation distribution λ from Eq. (15) corresponding to orientations in the plane of a polycrystalline shape memory alloy specimen. The constant k_2 has been adapted for best agreement with the experiments explained below, while k_1 is a proportionality factor which remains undetermined.

Note that, to capture the hysteretic behavior of the material, k_2 would have to be adjusted to a higher value for the retransformation during unloading. However, since the experiments we want to compare our model to have been carried out for loading only, consideration of the unloading and thus of the hysteretic behavior is beyond the scope of this paper.

Appropriate experiments have been conducted by Schmahl et al., see [2,3]. They measured the orientation distribution for different refraction planes of both the austenite and the martensite lattice. The input data to our model are, in this case, the lattice parameters $a_0 = 3.008582 \times 10^{-10}$ m for the austenite and $a = 2.880011 \times 10^{-10}$ m, $b = 4.585065 \times 10^{-10}$ m, $c = 4.129873 \times 10^{-10}$ m, and $\gamma = 95.9939^\circ$ for the monoclinic martensite. Furthermore, orientation distributions of the austenite in the unstrained state have been included as initial conditions. This was necessary since the austenite was not equally distributed in the specimen, but clearly showed a rolling texture. The orientation distribution $\phi(\mathbf{R})$ of the specimen used is known from the experiments. We then replace Eq. (15) by

$$\bar{\lambda}_j = \max\{0, (\phi(\mathbf{R}_j) - k_3)\lambda_j\}, \quad (16)$$

where k_3 is a cut-off parameter used for reduction of experimental noise in the orientation distribution.

The experimental setting and the corresponding geometrical angle definitions are sketched in Fig. 1. The results of the comparison for different martensite refraction planes are shown in Figs. 2–4; here, the left scale corresponds to the measured radiation intensity for the corresponding refraction direction, whereas the right scale indicates the amplitude of the driving

Fig. 1. Sketch of the experimental setting.

Fig. 2. Orientation distribution of the $\{0\ 2\ 0\}_M$ plane; $k_2 = 0.96$, $k_3 = 0.2$.

Fig. 3. Orientation distribution of the $\{1\ 1\ 1\}_M$ plane; $k_2 = 0.96$, $k_3 = 0.2$.

forces. Since, at the present stage of our work, a quantitative comparison of experimental and analytical intensities is not yet possible, the results have been scaled to a similar level.

Note that, in Fig. 4, the dissipation parameter k_2 has been set to a lower value than in Figs. 2 and 3. This leads to a significantly better agreement with the experimental data. A reason for this may be that twinning of the martensite variants facilitates the formation of some plane orientations in comparison to others. This hypothesis, however, remains to be proven.

Fig. 4. Orientation distribution of the $\{0\ 0\ 2\}_M$ plane; $k_2 = 0.8$, $k_3 = 0.2$.

Obviously, a reasonably good agreement in the qualitative result has been achieved. The remaining differences, especially regarding the exact location of the maximum intensities, may be caused by uncertainties due to the interpolation of the rolling texture data, which was measured for a relatively low number of points only.

For details of the experimental procedure used, we refer to [3].

5. Conclusion

We have presented a micromechanically motivated model for polycrystalline shape memory alloys. The model relies only on physically relevant physical constants, most of which have been measured for a variety of materials and presented in the material science literature. The internal variables of the model, the distribution of martensite orientations, have been compared to experimental data obtained by synchrotron diffraction. Reasonably good agreement of experimental and analytical data has been shown.

Acknowledgement

This work has been funded by *Sonderforschungsbereich 459* “Formgedächtnistechnik”, project A9, by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Bonn, Germany.

References

- [1] K. Hackl, M. Schmidt-Baldassari, W. Zhang, *Mater. Sci. Eng. A* 378 (2004) 503–506.
- [2] W.W. Schmahl, J. Khalil-Allafi, B. Hasse, M. Wagner, A. Heckmann, Ch. Somsen, *Mater. Sci. Eng. A* 378 (2004) 81–85.
- [3] M. Hasan, W.W. Schmahl, K. Hackl, R. Heinen, J. Frenzel, S. Gollerthan, M. Wagner, J. Khalil-Allafi, *Mater. Sci. Eng. A* 481–482 (2008) 414–419.
- [4] J.M. Ball, R.D. James, *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* 100 (1987) 13–52.
- [5] C. Carstensen, K. Hackl, A. Mielke, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* 458 (2001) 299.
- [6] Y. Huo, I. Müller, *Cont. Mech. Thermodyn.* 5 (1993) 163.
- [7] K. Hackl, U. Hoppe, in: C. Miehe (Ed.), *Proceedings of the IUTAM Symposium on Computational Mechanics of Solid Materials at Large Strains*, Kluwer, 2003, pp. 77–86.
- [8] R. Roubíček, *Relaxation in Optimization Theory and Variational Calculus*, De Gruyter, 1997.
- [9] S. Govindjee, A. Mielke, G.J. Hall, *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* 51 (2003) 763+.
- [10] S. Govindjee, K. Hackl, R. Heinen, An upper bound to the free energy of mixing by twin-compatible lamination for n -variant martensitic phase transformations, in preparation.
- [11] R. Heinen, K. Hackl, U. Hoppe, *Mater. Sci. Eng. A* 481–482 (2008) 362–365.
- [12] T. Bartel, K. Hackl, in preparation.
- [13] A. Mielke, F. Theil, V.I. Levitas, *Arch Rational Mech. Anal.* 162 (2002) 137–177.
- [14] K. Hackl, R. Heinen, A micromechanical model for pre-textured polycrystalline shape memory alloys including elastic anisotropy, *Cont. Mech. Thermodyn.*, submitted for publication.