1. Introduction

Plaster fiber boards have a wide use in the construction industry. They can be used as construction boards for cladding the load-bearing walls of wooden constructions as an alternative to wood-based board – OSB. Plaster fiber boards are used for fire-cladding of building structures and can be used in areas with high humidity. Wooden fibers have class of reaction to fire B2, according to DIN 4102-1 [1] and class of reaction to fire E, according to ČSN EN 13501-1 [2]. Compared with plasterboards, plaster fiber boards are flexible and have a higher hardness. Fiber is used as a reinforcement but mostly reduces their compressive strength. The effect of the reinforcement on the compressive strength of gypsum composite reinforced with wooden fibers has an impact on the mechanical-physical parameters. The main purpose of the research is to clarify whether natural wooden fibers could be used as the reinforced of composite gypsum building materials. Wooden fibers are used as a blown or board thermal insulation. The article presents the results of tests aimed at determining the mechanical and physical properties of gypsum composite reinforced with wooden fibers. The effect of the reinforcement on the compressive strength as a compressive strength, flexural strength was verified on a series of test specimens. The results of the tests have shown that the reinforcing of gypsum composite has an impact on the mechanical-physical parameters.
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2. Preparation of test specimens

For production of test samples, building plaster and wooden fibers were selected.

The building plaster (bonding material) is a powdered mixture of hemihydrate of calcium sulphate (CaSO₄ · 0.5H₂O) with strength G2 (2 MPa). The wooden fibers (filler) have been added in a percentage ratio to the mixture of plaster with 750 ml of water [5, 6].

Fig. 1. Wooden fibers used in research

Mixture proportions

The mixture proportions of tested samples, which were prepared in five series of three samples, are shown in Table 1. The first series was created only from mixture of water and building plaster. In the following four series wooden fibers were added to the mixture of building plaster and water in 7.50% dispersion at 2.50%.

Description of the test samples

Each series was prepared in proportions of mixture shown in Table 1. For compressive test and flexural strength test there were created five series of three samples with dimensions 40 × 40 × 160 mm. The samples were created in steel moulds for testing the mechanical properties of mortar and cement materials.

Experimental part

The samples were created in technical laboratory that is adapted to the production of experimental samples. The mixing method was performed as follows:
1) The ingredients of each series were weighed in the amount shown in Table 1.
2) After weighing the dry ingredients were mixed and then mixed with 750 ml of water for three minutes.
3) Steel moulds were filled by resulting mixture. All samples were placed on the vibration table and vibrated for one minute. The surface of samples was levelled to be smooth by the trowel.
4) Samples were removed from steel moulds after 24 hours and properly marked. Samples were left for 7 days in the test environment, dried at 40 °C

![Mixture of plaster with wooden fibers](image)

**Fig. 2. Mixture of plaster with wooden fibers**

| Series | Plaster | Wooden fibers |
|--------|---------|---------------|
|        | Percentage proportions [%] | Weight [kg] | Percentage proportions [%] | Weight [kg] |
| 1      | 100.00  | 1.200         | 0.000        | 0.000         |
| 2      | 99.00   | 1.185         | 1.250        | 0.015         |
| 3      | 97.50   | 1.170         | 2.500        | 0.030         |
| 4      | 95.00   | 1.140         | 5.000        | 0.060         |
| 5      | 92.50   | 1.110         | 7.500        | 0.090         |
3. Results and discussion

Compressive strength and flexural strength

The samples were tested at the material age of 7 days in compression and flexural strength test. Temperature and relative humidity of the indoor air during sample testing were 23.9 °C and 48%. Samples were weighed before testing as is shown in Table 2. Test results are shown in Tables 3 and 4.

The weighed samples were placed in the press during testing in the order from the smallest proportion of wooden fibers to the biggest.

First, the samples were tested in flexural strength test. In this test, samples with low proportion of wooden fibers were totally damaged in their center, shown in Fig. 5, whereas samples with higher proportion of wooden fibers showed only cracks in the place of load impact by press roller. The biggest measured value of

| Series | Specification samples | Percentage proportions | Weight [kg] |
|--------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------|
|        |                       | Plaster [%]            |
|        |                       | Wooden fibers [%]      |             |
| 1      | 0₁                   | 100.00                 | 0.308       |
|        | 0₂                   | 0.00                   | 0.306       |
|        | 0₃                   | 0.00                   | 0.309       |
| 2      | 1.25₁                | 99.00                  | 0.304       |
|        | 1.25₂                | 1.25                   | 0.303       |
|        | 1.25₃                | 1.25                   | 0.301       |
| 3      | 2.5₁                 | 97.50                  | 0.266       |
|        | 2.5₂                 | 2.50                   | 0.266       |
|        | 2.5₃                 | 2.50                   | 0.267       |
| 4      | 5₁                   | 95.00                  | 0.245       |
|        | 5₂                   | 5.00                   | 0.234       |
|        | 5₃                   | 5.00                   | 0.242       |
| 5      | 7.5₁                 | 92.50                  | 0.205       |
|        | 7.5₂                 | 7.50                   | 0.203       |
|        | 7.5₃                 | 7.50                   | 0.201       |

Fig. 3. Steel mould

Fig. 4. Mixture of test specimens in test mould

Table 2. Weights of tested samples
the flexural loading limit was 2248 N, measured on sample No. 01. On the contrary the smallest value of the flexural loading limit was 900 N, measured on sample No. 7.53. Other values are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Flexural strength of the test samples

| Series | Specification samples | Percentage proportions | Flexural loading limit $f_l$ [N] | Flexural strength $\sigma_f$ [N·mm$^{-2}$] | Average value of flexural strength $\sigma_f$ [N·mm$^{-2}$] | Standard deviation of flexural strength $\sigma_f$ [N·mm$^{-2}$] |
|--------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 01     | 01                    | 100.00 0.00            | 2248.000                     | 5.260                            | 5.212                             | 0.229                       |
| 1      | 02                    | 100.00 0.00            | 2336.000                     | 5.466                            |                                    |                             |
| 1      | 03                    | 100.00 0.00            | 2099.000                     | 4.912                            |                                    |                             |
| 1.25   | 1.251                 | 99.00 1.25             | 1828.000                     | 4.278                            |                                    |                             |
| 1.25   | 1.252                 | 99.00 1.25             | 1670.000                     | 3.908                            |                                    |                             |
| 1.25   | 1.253                 | 99.00 1.25             | 2177.000                     | 5.094                            |                                    |                             |
| 2      | 2.51                  | 97.50 2.50             | 1697.000                     | 3.971                            |                                    |                             |
| 2      | 2.52                  | 97.50 2.50             | 1749.000                     | 4.093                            | 3.944                             | 0.133                       |
| 2      | 2.53                  | 97.50 2.50             | 1611.000                     | 3.770                            |                                    |                             |
| 3      | 51                    | 95.00 5.00             | 1127.000                     | 2.637                            |                                    |                             |
| 4      | 7.51                  | 92.50 7.50             | 1030.000                     | 2.410                            |                                    |                             |
| 3      | 7.52                  | 92.50 7.50             | 1080.000                     | 2.527                            | 2.348                             | 0.177                       |
| 3      | 7.53                  | 92.50 7.50             | 900.000                      | 2.106                            |                                    |                             |

Table 4. Compressive strength of the test samples

| Series | Specification samples | Percentage proportions | Compressive loading limit $f_c$ [N] | Compressive strength $\sigma_c$ [N·mm$^{-2}$] | Average value of compr. strength $\sigma_c$ [N·mm$^{-2}$] | Standard deviation of flexural strength $\sigma_f$ [N·mm$^{-2}$] |
|--------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 01     | 011                   | 100.00 0.00            | 25970                         | 16.231                           |                                    |                             |
| 1      | 012                   | 100.00 0.00            | 23710                         | 14.819                           |                                    |                             |
| 1      | 021                   | 100.00 0.00            | 25380                         | 15.863                           |                                    |                             |
| 1      | 022                   | 100.00 0.00            | 24560                         | 15.350                           |                                    |                             |
| 2      | 1.251                 | 99.00 1.25             | 16350                         | 10.219                           |                                    |                             |
| 2      | 1.252                 | 99.00 1.25             | 17650                         | 11.031                           |                                    |                             |
| 2      | 1.253                 | 99.00 1.25             | 18860                         | 11.787                           |                                    |                             |
| 3      | 2.51                  | 97.50 2.50             | 13350                         | 8.343                            |                                    |                             |
| 3      | 2.52                  | 97.50 2.50             | 12900                         | 8.063                            |                                    |                             |
| 3      | 2.53                  | 97.50 2.50             | 12380                         | 7.737                            | 7.797                             | 0.546                       |
### Table 4. (cont’d)

| Series | Specification samples | Percentage proportions | Compressive loading limit $f'_c$ [N] | Compressive strength $\sigma_c$ [N·mm⁻²] | Average value of compr. strength $\sigma_c$ [N·mm⁻²] | Standard deviation of flexural strength $\sigma_t$ [N·mm⁻²] |
|--------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 4      | 5₁₁                    | 95.00                  | 6780                                  | 4.237                                    | 4.233                                           | 0.086                                           |
|        | 5₁₂                    |                        | 6720                                  | 4.200                                    |                                                 |                                                 |
|        | 5₂₁                    |                        | 6780                                  | 4.237                                    |                                                 |                                                 |
|        | 5₂₂                    |                        | 6650                                  | 4.156                                    |                                                 |                                                 |
|        | 5₃₁                    |                        | 7060                                  | 4.412                                    |                                                 |                                                 |
|        | 5₃₂                    |                        | 6650                                  | 4.156                                    |                                                 |                                                 |
| 5      | 7.₅₁₁                  | 92.50                  | 5250                                  | 3.281                                    | 3.323                                           | 0.033                                           |
|        | 7.₅₁₂                  |                        | 5340                                  | 3.337                                    |                                                 |                                                 |
|        | 7.₅₂₁                  |                        | 5250                                  | 3.281                                    |                                                 |                                                 |
|        | 7.₅₂₂                  |                        | 5330                                  | 3.331                                    |                                                 |                                                 |
|        | 7.₅₃₁                  |                        | 5400                                  | 3.375                                    |                                                 |                                                 |
|        | 7.₅₃₂                  |                        | 5330                                  | 3.331                                    |                                                 |                                                 |

![Fig. 5. Damage of sample No. 0₁ after the flexural strength](image5)

![Fig. 6. The sample No. 7.₅₁₁ during the compression strength test](image6)
Calculation of flexural strength

\[ \sigma_t = 0.00234F, \]

where

- \( \sigma_t \) – flexural strength [\(N\cdot\text{mm}^{-2}\)],
- \( F \) – average value of flexural strength [N]. [7].

After the flexural strength test, half samples resulted from original samples and were marked by the proportion of wooden fibers content. For example, from the sample 0, there were new samples 0,1, and 0,2 more in Table 4. These new samples were tested in compression strength test. Samples were placed in the press during testing in the order from the smallest proportion of wooden fibers to the biggest.

They were oriented so that the load was perpendicular to the direction of filling. The measured values are shown in Table 4.

The smallest strengths were shown by samples from series 5 (7.5, 11; 7.5, 12; 7.5, 21; 7.5, 22; 7.5, 31; 7.5, 32). The highest strengths were shown by samples from series 1 and sample number 1,25,22 with value 11.79 [\(N\cdot\text{mm}^{-2}\)]. The measured values are shown in Table 4.

Calculation of compressive strength

\[ \sigma_c = f_c/1600, \]

where

- \( \sigma_c \) – compressive strength [\(N\cdot\text{mm}^{-2}\)],
- \( f_c \) – maximum weight when test sample crush [N],
- 1600 – \(40 \times 40\) mm is area of boards [\(\text{mm}^2\)]. [7].

4. Conclusion

The results of the tests have shown that a larger amount of wooden fibers reduces compressive strength and flexural strength. The assumption that the wooden fibers reinforcement increases the flexural strength has not been confirmed. From the measured values it is clear that the reduction in compressive strength of the bend is linearly dependent on the proportion of wooden fibers. At 7.5% by weight of the wooden fibers, to the gypsum fraction, the compressive strength is reduced by 78% and the flexural strength by 55%. The reason can be its insufficient mixing with plaster and water or joining of the wooden fibers into small clumps. To improve compressive strength, it would be advantageous to use thinner stalks and to improve flexural strength by a longer stalk. Increasing the strength of the tested composite may also affect the strength of the plaster. For the research, plaster of class G2 with a compressive strength of 2 MPa was used.

In the framework of further research, we would like to verify the effect of gypsum strength on the strength of the composite. The aim of further research will be...
to investigate the influence of the added binder on the strength parameters.
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