

Experimental Investigation of Hardness and Impact Variability in Wooden Agricultural Equipment

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to determine the hardness testing and Impact testing of selected Timbers to be used in agricultural implements in Pantnagar, Udham Singh Nagar, between September 2015 and April 2016. The Rockwell hardness test is generally performed when quick and direct reading is desirable. The Rockwell hardness test was carried on the Digital Hardness testing machine on HRV-Scale. The impact strength of a material is determined with a Charpy or Izod impact test named after their inventors. the hardness of different types of timber, namely, Teak, Sal, Java plum, Eucalyptus, Yellow teak, North Indian Rose timber, red cedar, Mango, Margosa and Lebbeck was found to be 75.4, 79.1, 68.2, 69.1, 64.0, 87.1, 30.8, 63.2, 61.7 and 64.3 respectively. the Impact Strength of different types of timber, namely, Eucalyptus, Yellow teak, Teak, Lebbeck, Java plum, Mango, Red cedar, North Indian Rose timber, Margosa and Sal was found to be 49.2, 39.23, 56.71, 52.21, 46.3, 48.37, 49.2, 45.23, 41.6 and 58.89 KJ/m² respectively. And their standard deviations were as follows: yellow teak (0.67), Red cedar (1.09), North Indian Rose timber (2.12), Teak (0.23), Lebbeck (7.95), Java plum (0.34), Eucalyptus (0.34), Margosa (0.71), Mango (0.87) and Sal (1.36) respectively. The timber of North Indian rose timber and Sal was found suitable for making Plankar, pulley and bearing block. The timber of North Indian rose timber, Sal and Eucalyptus was found best for making plough bottom.

Keywords: Hardness, indentation resistance; agricultural equipment; material performance; animal safety; human safety; optimum hardness; timber material; rockwell HRV-scale; impact strength; material properties.

ABBREVIATIONS

ASTM : American Society for Testing and Materials
ISI : Indian Standards Institution
BIS : Bureau of Indian Standards

1. INTRODUCTION

Agricultural practices require certain traditional techniques including tools and implements due to steep and hilly terrain comprising of shallow and stony soils. Present study has been undertaken to describe agriculture tools and implements from the local plants to facilitate the agriculture during harsh condition. Besides these agricultural tools and implements, author documented the

traditional knowledge of locals about the use of plants in making the handles of harvesting tools on the basis of their preference and choice. Traditional agricultural tools and implements were made up of locally available materials like stone, timber and iron, constructed at local level or standardized factory-made implements. These tools and implements were economical in term of labor, money and time saving [1]. Also, they are operated easily without any special skills. Each

of these tools and implements are usually used in connection with specific operation in the sequence of agricultural operations; land preparation, sowing, weeding, irrigation, harvesting, post-harvesting operations and transportation. Mostly, all the animal drawn implements utilize timber for as a construction material, if yoke for animal, are developed using locally available timber all the regions India [2-6].

The strength of a timber depends on its species and the effects of certain growth characteristics [7]. Different timber species have different strength characteristics, and also within a species these characteristics may vary. Therefore, in practice, a classification system of strength classes is used.[13] Timber is a fibrous rigid material of plant origin. It is broadly classified as hard timber and soft timber. Hard timber is derived from angiosperm or broad-leaved trees such as Mango (*Mangifera indica*), Sal (*Shorea robusta*), Lebbeck (*Albizia*), North Indian rose timber (*Dalbergia sissoo*), Red Cedar (*Toona ciliate*) and Teak (*Tectona grandis*). Hard timber is mainly used for structural application because of their high strength and durability[11]. Soft timber is obtained from coniferous trees, which have needle-like leaves. Examples of soft timber trees are: Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*), Norway spruce (*Picea abies*), and Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziessii*) [8].

Mechanical property values are given in terms of stress (force per unit area) and strain (deformation resulting from the applied stress) [9]. The mechanical property values of timber are obtained from laboratory tests of lumber of straight-grained clear timber samples (without natural defects that would reduce strength, such

as knots, checks, splits, etc. [7]. Strength properties mean the ultimate resistance of a material to applied loads. With timber, strength varies significantly depending on species, loading condition, load duration, and a number of assorted material and environmental factors. Observing the above facts, the Hardness and Impact testing of timber are important factors used in determining the suitability and application of timber material, these in turn depends on the timber species [9,10].

2. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

2.1 Hardness Testing

The Rockwell hardness testing is generally performed when quick and direct reading is desirable. The Rockwell hardness test was carried on the Digital Hardness testing machine on HRV-Scale.[14]

The load in kg required to penetrate a steel ball of 1.128 cm diameter into the specimen to half its diameter (0.564 cm) was taken as hardness. The ball indenters are generally built of hardened tool steel or Tungsten carbide. The indicator is then set at zero and a major load of 150 kg enforced to the indenter and is allowed to continue for a few seconds. Hardness was taken at various points on the specimen and the average value was recorded. Fig. 1 shows Specimen geometry of the Hardness test. The Rockwell Hardness Machine used for present investigation is presented in Fig. 2. Fig. 3 shows the prepared specimens for Hardness test. Testing specimen were prepared per IS 1708 (part - 5:1986) for Hardness as shown in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. Specimen geometry of the hardness test [2]



Fig. 2. Digital rockwell hardness tester



Fig. 3. Prepared specimens for hardness test




Fig. 4. Specimen geometry of the impact test [8]




Fig. 5. Prepared specimens for impact test



Fig. 6. Impact testing machine

2.2 Impact Testing

The impact strength of a material is determined with a Charpy or Izod impact test named after their inventors and were developed in the early 1900's before fracture mechanics theory was available. Impact properties are not precisely used in fracture mechanic estimates, but the commercially impact tests extended to be used as a quality control mechanism to assess notch sensitivity. Indian Standard Specification IS 1708 by Universal Testing Machine (AMT-SC, A.S.I make)[12].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Hardnes

Hardness implies a resistance to indentation, permanent or plastic deformation of materials. In agricultural equipment the optimum amount of hardness is required for better performance as they come directly in contact with animal and human body. The inauspicious hardness causes adverse effect which causes many health problems to animals like gal or injuries. Our main

aim is to optimize the hardness value up to the hardness of timber material. Hardness values measured on the Rockwell HRV-Scale at load H_3 are presented in Table 1 and the effect of timber on the hardness are presented in Fig. 7.

It was concluded from table 1 that the hardness of different types of timber, namely, Teak, Sal, Java plum, Eucalyptus, Yellow teak, North Indian Rose timber, red cedar, Mango, Margosa and Lebbeck was found to be 75.4, 79.1, 68.2, 69.1, 64.0, 87.1, 30.8, 63.2, 61.7 and 64.3 respectively. And their standard deviations were as follows: North Indian Rose timber (0.311), Yellow teak (0.194), Red cedar (0.164), Teak (0.182), Lebbeck (0.162), Margosa (0.173), Java plum (0.193), Eucalyptus (0.172), Mango (0.182), and Sal (0.192) respectively (Table 1). It was clear that the North Indian Rose timber has higher hardness value as compared to other various types of timber and red cedar has less value of hardness. North Indian Rose timber has a greater standard deviation as compared to other various types of timber. The Hardness at different Types of timber was compared presented in Fig 7.

Table.1 Hardness value of different types of timber in HRV- scale

Sl. No	Types of timbers	Hardness	Standard deviation
1	Yellow teak	64	0.19
2	Red cedar	30.8	0.16
3	North Indian rose timber	87.1	0.31
4	Teak	75.4	0.18
5	Lebbeck	64.3	0.16
6	Java plum	68.2	0.19
7	Eucalyptus	69.1	0.17
8	Margosa	61.7	0.17
9	Mango	63.2	0.18
10	Sal	79.1	0.19




Fig. 7. Hardness value of different types of timber

The effects of timber on Hardness were analyzed using Analysis of Variance. The results of Statistical analysis are presented in Appendix-A-1. The analysis shows significant effect of timber type significant effects on the Hardness at the 5% level of significance. There was significant difference observed between the Hardness of (yellow Teak and Red cedar), (yellow teak and North Indian rose timber), (Yellow Teak and Teak), (Yellow Teak and Teak), (yellow Teak and Lebbeck), (yellow teak and Java Plum), (Yellow Teak and Eucalyptus), (Yellow Teak and Margosa), (Yellow Teak and Mango), (Yellow Teak and Sal), (Red cedar and North Indian rose timber), (Red cedar and Teak), (Red cedar and Teak), (Red cedar and Lebbeck), (Red cedar and Java Plum), (Red cedar and Eucalyptus), (Red cedar and Margosa), (Red cedar and Mango) and (Red cedar and Sal) and other types of timber have no significant difference.

3.2 Impact Strength

The impact strength was calculated by the formula given in equation 1. Table 2 gives the impact strength of the different wood species.

It was concluded from table 2 that the Impact Strength of different types of timber Eucalyptus, Yellow teak, Teak, Lebbeck, Java plum, Mango, Red cedar, North Indian Rose timber, Margosa and Sal was found to be 49.2, 39.23, 56.71, 52.21, 46.3, 48.37, 49.2, 45.23, 41.6 and 58.89 KJ/m² respectively. And their standard deviations were as follows: yellow teak (0.67), Red cedar (1.09), North Indian Rose timber (2.12), Teak (0.23), Lebbeck (7.95), Java plum (0.34), Eucalyptus (0.34), Margosa (0.71), Mango (0.87) and Sal (1.36) respectively. It was clear from the Table 2 that Sal has the highest value of Impact strength compared to other types of different timber and the minimum impact strength relates to of red cedar. The impact strength of different types of timber was compared presented in Fig 8.

The effects of timber on Impact strength were analysed using Analysis of Variance. The results of Statistical analysis are presented in Appendix-A-2. The analysis shows Timber significant effects on the impact strength at the 5% level of significance. There was significant difference observed between the Hardness of (Red cedar and Eucalyptus), (North Indian rose timber and Margosa), (Lebbeck and Java Plum), (Lebbeck

and Margosa), (Lebbeck and Sal), (Java Plum and Margosa), (Java Plum and Mango), (Margosa and Sal) and) and (Mango and Sal)

and other types of timber have no significant difference.




Fig. 8. Effect of various types of timber on Impact Strength

Table 2. Impact strength of different types of timber

Sl. No	Types of Timber	Impact Strength (kJ/m ²)	Standard deviation
1.	Yellow teak	47.23	0.67
2.	Red cedar	39.23	1.09
3.	North Indian rose timber	56.71	2.13
4.	Teak	52.21	0.24
5.	Lebbeck	46.3	7.96
6.	Java plum	48.37	0.35
7.	Eucalyptus	49.2	0.35
8.	Margosa	45.23	0.71
9.	Mango	41.6	0.88
10.	Sal	58.89	1.37

4. CONCLUSION

The Hardness of Yellow Teak, Red cedar, North Indian rose timber, Lebbeck, Java plum, Margosa, Eucalyptus, Teak, Mango and Sal were observed as 64.00, 38.8, 87.1, 64.3, 68.2, 61.7, 69.1, 75.4, 63.2 and 79.1 respectively. ANOVA results show that interactions among the linear term Yellow Teak, Red cedar, North Indian rose timber, Lebbeck, Java plum, Margosa, Eucalyptus, Teak, Mango and Sal timber over the Hardness is significant at 0.05 % level of confidence. The Impact strength of Yellow Teak, Red cedar, North Indian rose timber, Lebbeck,

Java plum, Margosa, Eucalyptus, Teak, Mango and Sal were observed as 47.23, 39.23, 56.71, 46.3, 48.37, 45.23, 49.2, 52.21, 45.23 and 58.81 kJ/m² respectively. ANOVA results show that interactions among the linear term Yellow Teak, Red cedar, North Indian rose timber, Lebbeck, Java plum, Margosa, Eucalyptus, Teak, Mango and Sal timber over the Impact strength is significant at the 0.05 % level of confidence. The following conclusions have been drawn on the basis of physical and mechanical properties to make the different component of agriculture implements and tools. The timber of yellow teak, teak was found suitable for making Yoke. The

timber of North Indian rose timber and Sal was found suitable for making Plankar, pulley and bearing block.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Please write this section

Option 1:

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I Would Like to Express My Deepest Gratitude to Dr. T.K. Bhattacharya, For Their Invaluable Guidance, Support, And Encouragement Throughout the Duration of This Research Project. Their Profound Knowledge, Insightful Feedback, And Unwavering Patience Have Been Instrumental in Shaping the Direction and Quality of This Work. Without Their Dedicated Mentorship, This Project Would Not Have Been Possible.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Karthikeyan D, Veeraragavathatham D, Karpagam, Ayisha Firdo. Traditional tools in agricultural practices. *Ind. J. of Traditional Knowledge*. 2008;8(2):212-217.
2. de Assis AA, Alexandre RP, Ballarin AW. Dynamic hardness of wood-measurements with an automated portable hardness tester. *Holzforschung*. 2017;71(5):383-9.
3. Salca EA, Hiziroglu S. Evaluation of hardness and surface quality of different wood species as function of heat treatment. *Materials & Design (1980-2015)*. 2014;62:416-23.
4. Gašparík M, Gaff M, Šafaříková L, Vallejo CR, Svoboda T. Impact bending strength and Brinell hardness of densified hardwoods. *BioResources*. 2016;11(4):8638-52.
5. de Abreu Neto R, de Assis AA, Ballarin AW, Hein PR. Effect of final temperature on charcoal stiffness and its correlation with wood density and hardness. *SN Applied Sciences*. 2020;2(6):1020.
6. Lykidis C, Nikolakakos M, Sakellariou E, Birbilis D. Assessment of a modification to the Brinell method for determining solid wood hardness. *Materials and structures*. 2016;49:961-7.
7. Chidananda S, Keshava N, Kavya DS, Saniya Banu, Documentation of traditional agricultural practices with some scientific relevances in selected Villages of Chitradurga District Karnataka India. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, 2021;9 (2).
8. Sylvester Obinna Osuji, Iziengbe Inerhunwa, *Int. Journal of Engineering Research and Application*. 2017;7(10).
9. Fasiku OO, Ogunsanwo OY. *International Journal of Research Studies in Science, Engineering and Technology*. 2020;7(1):9-17
10. ISI.Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS), New Delhi.1708;36:6-10.
11. Rani, Annu, Jayant Singh, T.P. Singh, Ajit Kumar, and Mukesh Kumar Choudhary. 2024. "The Comparison of Tensile Strengths of Different Tree Species and Their Evaluation in Agricultural Tools". *Archives of Current Research International* 24 (5):718-27.
12. Rani, Annu, Jayant Singh, T.P. Singh, Ajit Kumar, and Mukesh Kumar Choudhary. 2024. "Evaluation of Compressive Strength in Various Timbers for Agricultural Implements in Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India". *Archives of Current Research International* 24 (5):785-91.
13. Rani, Annu, T.P. Singh, Jayant Singh, Ajit Kumar, and Mukesh Kumar Choudhary. 2024. "Evaluating the Flexural Strength of Different Timbers Using the Three-Point Bending Test". *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports* 30 (7):862-68.
14. RaniAnnu, T.P. Singh, Jayant Singh, Vishal Patel, Mukesh Kumar Choudhary. 2022 "Abrasive wear behavior of EN42 steel used in agricultural discs in field conditions" *Engineering Failure Analysis* 142.

APPENDIX

Table (A-1). ANOVA table for the effect of different types of timber on Hardness

Test of between –Subject Effects						
Dependent Variable: Hardness						
Source	Df	Sum of Square	Mean Square	F value	R squared	Sig
Replication	4	16.36	4.09	1.23	0.999	
Treat	9	78.36	8.70	2.62		**
Error	36	119.3	3.31			
Total	49	214.06				
Critical difference at 5 %	2.33					
Table value of $F_{0.05}(4,36)$	3.89					
Coefficient of variance	1.32					

Table A-2. ANOVA table for the effect of different types of timber on Impact strength

Test of between –Subject Effects						
Dependent Variable: Impact strength						
Source	Df	Sum of Square	Mean Square	F value	R squared	Sig
Replication	4	69.99	17.49	0.33	0.99	
Treat	9	132.13	1468.17	27.5		**
Error	36	1923.46	53.43			
Total	49	15206.9				
Critical difference at 5 %	9.37					
Table value of $F_{0.05}(4,36)$	3.89					
Coefficient of variance	25.71					

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.