


NASA/TM-2000-210309
ARL-TR-2253



Validation of High Displacement Piezoelectric Actuator Finite Element Models

*Barmac K. Taleghani
U. S. Army Research Laboratory
Vehicle Technology Directorate
Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia*

August 2000

The NASA STI Program Office ... in Profile

Since its founding, NASA has been dedicated to the advancement of aeronautics and space science. The NASA Scientific and Technical Information (STI) Program Office plays a key part in helping NASA maintain this important role.

The NASA STI Program Office is operated by Langley Research Center, the lead center for NASA's scientific and technical information. The NASA STI Program Office provides access to the NASA STI Database, the largest collection of aeronautical and space science STI in the world. The Program Office is also NASA's institutional mechanism for disseminating the results of its research and development activities. These results are published by NASA in the NASA STI Report Series, which includes the following report types:


- **TECHNICAL PUBLICATION.** Reports of completed research or a major significant phase of research that present the results of NASA programs and include extensive data or theoretical analysis. Includes compilations of significant scientific and technical data and information deemed to be of continuing reference value. NASA counterpart of peer-reviewed formal professional papers, but having less stringent limitations on manuscript length and extent of graphic presentations.
- **TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM.** Scientific and technical findings that are preliminary or of specialized interest, e.g., quick release reports, working papers, and bibliographies that contain minimal annotation. Does not contain extensive analysis.
- **CONTRACTOR REPORT.** Scientific and technical findings by NASA-sponsored contractors and grantees.
- **CONFERENCE PUBLICATION.** Collected papers from scientific and technical conferences, symposia, seminars, or other meetings sponsored or co-sponsored by NASA.
- **SPECIAL PUBLICATION.** Scientific, technical, or historical information from NASA programs, projects, and missions, often concerned with subjects having substantial public interest.
- **TECHNICAL TRANSLATION.** English-language translations of foreign scientific and technical material pertinent to NASA's mission.

Specialized services that complement the STI Program Office's diverse offerings include creating custom thesauri, building customized databases, organizing and publishing research results ... even providing videos.

For more information about the NASA STI Program Office, see the following:

- Access the NASA STI Program Home Page at <http://www.sti.nasa.gov>
- E-mail your question via the Internet to help@sti.nasa.gov
- Fax your question to the NASA STI Help Desk at (301) 621-0134
- Phone the NASA STI Help Desk at (301) 621-0390
- Write to:
NASA STI Help Desk
NASA Center for AeroSpace Information
7121 Standard Drive
Hanover, MD 21076-1320

NASA/TM-2000-210309
ARL-TR-2253



Validation of High Displacement Piezoelectric Actuator Finite Element Models

*Barmac K. Taleghani
U. S. Army Research Laboratory
Vehicle Technology Directorate
Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia*

National Aeronautics and
Space Administration

Langley Research Center
Hampton, Virginia 23681-2199

August 2000

The use of trademarks or names of manufacturers in the report is for accurate reporting and does not constitute an official endorsement, either expressed or implied, of such products or manufacturers by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the U.S. Army.

Available from:

NASA Center for AeroSpace Information (CASI)
7121 Standard Drive
Hanover, MD 21076-1320
(301) 621-0390

National Technical Information Service (NTIS)
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161-2171
(703) 605-6000

Validation of High Displacement Piezoelectric Actuator Finite Element Models

Barmac Taleghani*
Army Research Laboratory
Vehicle Technology Directorate
NASA Langley Research Center
Hampton, VA

ABSTRACT

The paper presents the results obtained by using NASTRAN[®] and ANSYS[®] finite element codes to predict doming of the THUNDER piezoelectric actuators during the manufacturing process and subsequent straining due to an applied input voltage. To effectively use such devices in engineering applications, modeling and characterization are essential. Length, width, dome height, and thickness are important parameters for users of such devices. Therefore, finite element models were used to assess the effects of these parameters. NASTRAN[®] and ANSYS[®] used different methods for modeling piezoelectric effects. In NASTRAN[®], a thermal analogy was used to represent voltage at nodes as equivalent temperatures, while ANSYS[®] processed the voltage directly using piezoelectric finite elements. The results of finite element models were validated by using the experimental results.

Keywords: NASTRAN[®], ANSYS[®], finite element, THUNDER, piezoelectric, actuator

1. INTRODUCTION

THUNDER [1] (**TH**in Layer **Unimorph** Ferroelectric **DrivER**), shown in Figure 1, is a high displacement piezoelectric actuator (developed at NASA Langley Research Center) that provides significantly larger displacements than those available previously in other piezoelectric actuators. THUNDER is a composite laminate consisting of a metal substrate (e.g., stainless steel) LaRC-SITM, PZT, LaRC-SITM, and aluminum (Figure 2) that is formed when the composite laminate is heated to a temperature beyond the glass transition temperature of LaRC-SITM and cooled to room temperature. During cooling, the different coefficients of thermal expansion (CTE) lead to a domed shape. The dome shape results in a component of stress being out of plane, and that out-of-plane stress results in increase of the dynamic deflection. The design has made this type of actuator attractive for applications such as motors, speakers, and air pumps.



Figure 1. THUNDER actuator

To date, there have been limited modeling efforts to understand the THUNDER dynamic behavior [1, 2]. The major parameters that determine the behavior of the THUNDER actuators are the type of PZT used, the physical properties of constituent layers, the uniformity of the LaRC-SITM layer, the autoclave temperature and pressure profile, and the thickness of the piezo ceramic.

* b.k.taleghani@larc.nasa.gov; Telephone: +1-757-864 8499; Fax: +1 757-864 8808

Recently, a nonlinear NASTRAN® [3] (Version 70.5) model was developed to capture the influence of the above-cited parameters and to analytically predict doming of the actuator during the manufacturing process and due to applied voltage. A simple approach was used in which temperature-induced expansion simulated voltage actuation, as described by Babuska et al. [4]. Since then, various finite element codes (e.g. ANSYS®), which have coupled field capabilities, have been investigated by the author. The objective of this research is to evaluate the results of NASTRAN® and ANSYS® [5] (Version 5.6) finite element modeling capability for piezoelectric actuators and compare the analyses with experimental data.




Figure 2. THUNDER composite laminate

2. MODELING APPROACHES

2.1 NASTRAN® Approach

The NASTRAN® linear modeling approach assumes that at a glass transition temperature of LaRC-SI™ (assumed to be 250°C), all layers are bonded. The bonding constrains all layers to move together while the specimen is cooled to room temperature (25°C). The model only accounts for the portion of the process in which the device is cooled from 250°C to room temperature, thus generating thermal stress due to differing CTE's in the layers. The analysis subsequently is divided into two parts, as described in ref. 2. The first part is the fabrication cooling process where the initial doming occurs. The second part is the straining of the device due to applied voltage where the voltage is represented by an equivalent temperature.

2.2 ANSYS® Approach

The ANSYS® linear modeling approach uses a coupled field capability, which allows for direct application of the voltage to the PZT layers.

The constitutive equations for piezoelectricity from reference [5] are

$$\{T\} = [c]\{S\} - [e]\{E\} \quad (1)$$

$$\{D\} = [e]^T\{S\} + [\epsilon]\{E\} \quad (2)$$

where

T represents 6 components of stress,

c diagonal matrix is the system stiffness matrix,
 S represents 6 components of strain,
 e is the piezoelectric matrix,
 E represents the 3 components of the electric field,
 D represents the 3 components of the electric flux density, and
 ϵ is the dielectric matrix relating the electric field to electric flux density.

The material properties which populate the matrices in eqs. (1) and (2) are not easily measured directly. However, the properties in the inverses of the matrices are readily available; therefore, an alternate form of the equations is introduced

$$\{S\} = [c^E]\{T\} + [d]\{E\} \quad (3)$$

$$\{D\} = [d]^T\{T\} + [P]\{E\} \quad (4)$$

where

c^E diagonal is the compliance matrix for the elastic system,
 d is the dielectric matrix which related electric field to strain, and
 P is the diagonal permittivity matrix

Comparing eqs. (1) and (2) with (3) and (4) gives

$$[c] = [c^E]^{-1} \quad (5)$$

$$[e] = [c^E]^{-1}[d] \quad (6)$$

then

$$[e]^T = [d]^T [c^E]^{-1} \quad (7)$$

$$[\epsilon] = [P] - [d]^T [c^E]^{-1}[d] \quad (8)$$

In the above analysis, the material properties for all the layers, excluding the PZT layer, are isotropic. The modulus of elasticity, the Poisson ratio, and the coefficient of thermal expansion are directly input into the matrices $[c^E]$, $[d]$, and $[P]$ and equations (5) - (8) used to generate the matrices in equations (1) and (2). As an aid to ANSYS® users, the PIEZMAT macro has been created that will convert the manufacturer's data into ANSYS® form.

3. TEST SPECIMENS

To assess the NASTRAN® and ANSYS® finite element models, four groups of specimens were fabricated and tested. The material properties and the composition for the above comparison are shown in Table 1 (a) and (b) and Table 2.

(a) Properties of specimens (all groups)

Layers	Material	Thickness (in.)	Modulus of Elasticity (E) (psi) $\times 10^6$	Poisson's Ratio	Coefficient of Thermal Expansion (CTE) $10^{-6}/^{\circ}C$
1 (Top Layer)	Aluminum	0.001	10	0.33	24.0
2	LaRC-SI™	0.001	0.58	0.45	46
3	PZT 5A	0.0068	9.8	0.31	1.5
4	LaRC-SI™	0.001	0.58	0.45	46
5 (Bottom layer)	Stainless Steel		38	0.33	17.3

(b) PZT-5A Material Properties [6]

C_{11}^E	1.13E-7 in ² /lbf
C_{33}^E	1.29E-7 in ² /lbf
C_{44}^E	3.27E-7 in ² /lbf
C_{12}^E	-3.92E-8 in ² /lbf
C_{13}^E	-4.92E-8 in ² /lbf
d_{31}	-6.7E-9 in/Volt
d_{33}	1.47E-8 in/Volt
d_{15}	2.30E-8 in/Volt
P_{33}	3.82E-10 Farads/in.
P_{11}	3.88E-10 Farads/in.

There are four groups of specimens (see Table 2). The groups are based on two sets of planform dimensions (1 × 1 inch and 1 × 2 inch) and two sets of base metal thickness (3 mil and 5 mil).

Definition of groups

Thickness	Dimension L × W	
	1 × 1	2 × 1
3 mil	Group 1	Group 3
5 mil	Group 2	Group 4

Table 2. Composition of test specimens

For testing purposes, the wafers were mounted by using an adhesive tape to constrain lateral movement but to allow vertical displacement. This mounting technique can introduce variability in the displacement data which future improvements should alleviate.

4. FINITE ELEMENT MODEL DESCRIPTIONS

The models were developed and meshed by using I-DEAS® [7] Master Series (Version 6.0). Creating all the layers and stacking them developed the 3D geometry model. In all models, only a quarter of the actuator was modeled by using symmetry.

4.1 NASTRAN® Model

The NASTRAN® linear finite element models used CHEXA 8 solid elements. Free-free boundary conditions were used for these analyses. The smallest and the largest aspect ratios, which were measured in length and thickness for the solids were 1:12.5 and 1:5, respectively. The model for group 1 consisted of 16,810 nodes, 11,200 solid elements, 50,000 degrees of freedom, and 3362 multipoint constraints. The model for group 2 consisted of 18,499 nodes, 12,800 elements, 55,000 degrees of freedom, and 3362 multipoint constraints. Group 3 included 18,360 nodes, 12,250 elements, 55,000 degrees of freedom, and 3672 multipoint constraints. Group 4 used 3672 multipoint constraints, 20,196 nodes, 14,000 elements, and 60,000 degrees of freedom. Since solid elements were used in NASTRAN®, it was necessary to contain the applied temperature, which represented the voltage to the nodes belonging to the PZT layer. This containment was achieved by creating coincident nodes between the PZT and the LaRC-Si™ layers. The coincident nodes were then attached by using multipoint constraints.

4.2 ANSYS® Model

The finite element models from IDEAS® were imported into ANSYS®. Since ANSYS® does not support external multipoint constraints from other codes, all the coincident nodes, as well as the multipoint constraints were removed. Solid 5 and solid 45 elements were used to model all layers. The number of nodes for groups 1 and 2 were 13,448 and 15,129, respectively. Group 3 and 4 had 14,688 and 16,524 nodes, respectively. All specimens included the same number of elements as the NASTRAN® models.

5. RESULTS

NASTRAN[®] and ANSYS[®] finite element results were compared to experimental results. Due to the variability in the test data, average values for all measured dome heights are presented. Dome heights due to the manufacturing process and voltage inputs were compared for four groups. The comparison with experimental data for displacements due to input voltages and the dome heights are shown in figures 3, 4, 5, and 6 and in Table 3.




Figure 3. Comparison between finite element models and experimental results for group 1




Figure 4. Comparison between finite element models and experimental results for group 2




Figure 5. Comparison between finite element models and experimental results for group 3




Figure 6. Comparison between finite element models and experimental results for group 4




Table 3. Comparison of dome heights due to manufacturing process

From Table 3, we see that all the dome heights due to the manufacturing process for both models agree very well with the experimental results. The difference for NASTRAN® and the experimental data was between 1% to 10%. For ANSYS®, the differences were 2% to 12%.

The THUNDER wafers were driven at 1 Hz at voltages of 120, 160, 200, and 240 volts peak-to-peak (Vp-p) with a 0-volt offset. A fiber optic sensor was placed above the wafer to measure the vertical displacement. The range of the sensor was 50 mils with micro-inch resolution at 1 Hz.

In figures 3, 4, 5, and 6, it is apparent that NASTRAN® follows the trend of experimental results. NASTRAN® has overpredicted the displacements for groups 1, 2, and 4. In all figures, NASTRAN® has slightly different slope than the experimental data. Figures 3 and 4 show a large bias between the NASTRAN® and experimental data. For figures 5 and 6, this bias is much less. In figure 5, the NASTRAN® error also increases as the voltage increases, while for figure 6, the error is reduced as the voltage increases. The percent differences for the third and fourth groups ranged between 12% to 24% and 0% to 15%, respectively. For groups 1 and 2, the percent differences were 34% to 53% and 31% to 50%, respectively.

ANSYS® also over predicted the displacements due to input voltages for all groups. In figure 5 ANSYS® shows a shallower slope compared to the experimental data. ANSYS® errors were largest at low voltages for groups 1 and 2. This trend was completely opposite for groups 3 and 4. In figures 3 and 4, ANSYS® errors are smallest as voltage increases. In all figures a bias exists between ANSYS® and experimental results. For groups 1 and 2, the percent differences for ANSYS® and the experimental results ranged between 87% to 188% and 70% to 143%, respectively. Groups 3 and 4 showed a percent difference of 6% to 78% and 27% to 87%, respectively.

A further study was done to see how ANSYS® and NASTRAN® compare when there is only voltage applied to a structure that is free of initial stresses, i.e., no initial doming. Figure 7 shows the comparison made for group 2. The NASTRAN® and ANSYS® finite element models show good correlation with experimental results and with each other. Both models follow the trend of the experimental results.

The experimental results depicted in ref. 2, as well as here, show a linear behavior. However, nonlinear analysis predicted displacements due to input voltage with much higher accuracy than the linear models. This apparent contradiction could be the result of choosing a narrow range of voltages for the analyses. In such a narrow range, the effects of nonlinearities are not readily observed.




Figure 7. Comparison between the two finite element models and experimental results for group 2 without the manufacturing process

6. CONCLUSION

Two linear finite element models, one using a simple thermal analogy (NASTRAN[®]) and the other using piezoelectric capability (ANSYS[®]), were developed and evaluated for predicting deformations of the THUNDER piezoelectric actuator concept. Experimental results were compared with each of the finite element results. Both NASTRAN[®] and ANSYS[®] showed very good agreement with test data for dome heights due to the manufacturing process. The comparison of dome heights due to the manufacturing process showed differences between 1% to 10% for NASTRAN[®] and 2% to 12% for ANSYS[®]. The comparison of displacements due to input voltages (with experimental results) showed differences of 0% to 53% for NASTRAN[®] and 6% to 188% for ANSYS[®]. This study suggests that both NASTRAN[®] and ANSYS[®] show promise for predicting the dome heights and displacements due to the manufacturing process, as well as induced voltages of THUNDER devices. However, due to geometric nonlinearity, which exists in this type of actuator, a nonlinear analysis is generally needed to predict deformations with high levels of accuracy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Michael Lindell and Dr. William F. Hunter, Engineering Analysis Branch, Tommy Jordan, Data Systems and Instrument Support Branch, Joycelyn Harrison, Composite and Polymers Branch, Robert Fox, Microelectronics and Technical Support Section at NASA Langley Research Center, and Zoubeida Ounaice, a National Research Council associate in residence in the Composite and Polymers Branch, for their assistance with finite element modeling as well as fabrication and testing of specimens.

REFERENCES

1. R. G. Bryant, K. M. Mossi, G. V. Selby, “*Thin-layer Composite Unimorph ferroelectric driver and sensor properties.*” *Materials Letters*, August 1997.
2. B.K. Taleghani, J.F. Campbell “Non-Linear finite element modeling of THUNDER piezoelectric actuators”, *Smart Structures and Materials. Smart Structures and Integrated Systems*, vol. 3668, Newport Beach 1999, pp. 555-566.
3. J. P. Caffrey and J. M. Lee, MSC / NASTRAN[®] Handbook for Non-Linear analysis, The MacNeil Schwendler Corporation, 1994.
4. V. Babuska and B. D. Freed, “Finite Element Modeling of Composite Piezoelectric Structures with MSC/NASTRAN[®].” *Proceedings, SPIE Smart Structures and Materials*. Paper 3041-60 March 1997.
5. Kohnke, P., ANSYS Theory Reference, Release 5.6, ANSYS Inc., 1999
6. Morgan Matroc Inc., Piezoceramic Databook. Morgan Matroc Inc., Electronic Division.
7. I-DEAS[™] Simulation User’s Guide, Vol. I & II, Structural Dynamics Research Corporation, 1996.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE August 2000		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Technical Memorandum
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Validation of High Displacement Piezoelectric Actuator Finite Element Models			5. FUNDING NUMBERS WU 522-32-31-02	
6. AUTHOR(S) Barmac K. Taleghani				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) NASA Langley Research Center Hampton, VA 23681-2199			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER L-17999	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, DC 20546-0001 and U.S. Army Research Laboratory Adelphi, MD 20783-1145			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER NASA/TM-2000-210309 ARL-TR-2253	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Presented at the EOS/SPIE Symposium on Applied Photonics, Glasgow, Scotland, May 22-25, 2000				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified-Unlimited Subject Category 39 Distribution: Standard Availability: NASA CASI (301) 621-0390			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The paper presents the results obtained by using NASTRAN® and ANSYS® finite element codes to predict doming of the THUNDER piezoelectric actuators during the manufacturing process and subsequent straining due to an applied input voltage. To effectively use such devices in engineering applications, modeling and characterization are essential. Length, width, dome height, and thickness are important parameters for users of such devices. Therefore, finite element models were used to assess the effects of these parameters. NASTRAN® and ANSYS® used different methods for modeling piezoelectric effects. In NASTRAN®, a thermal analogy was used to represent voltage at nodes as equivalent temperatures, while ANSYS® processed the voltage directly using piezoelectric finite elements. The results of finite element models were validated by using the experimental results.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS NASTRAN®, ANSYS®, finite element, THUNDER, piezoelectric, actuator			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 14	
			16. PRICE CODE A03	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	