

In-situ Mud-Concrete as a material for load-bearing walls and sustainable building practices

Fathima Rizna Arooz
158023H

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Civil Engineering
University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka
January 2019

Declaration

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis, in whole or in part in print, electronic or another medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works.

Archt. F.R.Arooz,
Department of Civil Engineering,
University of Moratuwa,
Sri Lanka.

The above candidate has carried out research for the PhD thesis under my supervision.

Supervisor,
Prof. R. U. Halwatura,
Department of Civil Engineering,
University of Moratuwa,
Sri Lanka.

Abstract

The world is still struggling to find solutions for the increasing demand for housing with the growing population. To deal with this problem the greater importance has given in researching alternative materials and technologies which can cater sustainable solutions to these evolving demands. However, this materials and technologies must be suitable and appropriate to the local economy, social background and the cultural setting of that country. In the context of innovating sustainable building materials, 'soil' receives great attention as an environmental-friendly material, due to its economic affordability, low embodied energy and enhanced natural moisture buffering capacities.

Self-compacting Mud-Concrete load-bearing walling (MCW) system is an in-situ cast walling system that combines well-graded soil, cement (stabilizer) and water in their correct proportions. It receives great attention due to its sustainable advantages such as less raw material wastage, low-cost methods, quick construction technology and the low embodied energy consumption. This research presents a detailed analysis of mix design development, system development, thermal performances, long-term performance and cost-effectiveness of self-compacting Mud-Concrete load-bearing walls (MCW).

Results demonstrate that optimum usable gravel range is 4.75-32mm in MCW technology. Further, the mix design was finalized as fine - 5% (\leq sieve size 0.425mm), sand - 50 % (sieve size 0.425mm \leq sand \leq 4.75 mm) and gravel - 45% (sieve size 4.75mm \leq gravel \leq 32mm) with 4% minimum cement of the total dry mix. In addition, optimum 20% of water can use to keep the self-compacting quality of the mix. Grading curves were developed constantly at 4%, 6%, 8% and 10% cement produced the best mix design with standardized methods. Also, the methods were introduced to predict the exact strength of MCW prior to construction. Accelerated erosion tests were conducted to determine the durability of MCW cast of the best mix design and the results satisfied the standard durability requirements under SLS1283. In addition, MCW can be listed as one of the excellent moisture buffering materials according to NORDEST classification system.

Optimum lifting height of a wall segment was found as 1200mm which can cast at once without proposing any joints. In every 1200mm height, the proper horizontal joint should be introduced in in-situ cast process and the introduced joint should keep the maximum continuity in between the wall segments. In addition, the results show maximum horizontal shrinkage is 0.23% and maximum vertical shrinkage is 0.22% within 07 days of curing period. Increasing the curing period from 07 days to 14 days, the shrinkage strain was reduced from 0.23% to 0.15%. It depicts that shrinkage strain can reduce in 65% by increasing the curing period for 14 days. Thus 14 days proper

curing procedure was recommended to in-situ cast MC wall and the curing should start soon after dismantling the formwork of the wall segments. MCW has 1.2 W/m.K of conductivity, 1440 J/kg.K of specific heat capacity, 1540 kg/m³ of density, 0.366 m².K/W of R-value and 2.17 W/m².K of U-Value. MCW acts as a good thermally resistive material due to its thermal mass and insulation characters. Comparatively, MCW has a low embodied energy and life-cycle cost due to the less material wastage, high reusability, fewer labour consumption and quick in-situ construction technologies. Ultimately the research invented a self-compacting in-situ cast load-bearing walling system through Mud-Concrete, which can highly cater to sustainable demands in the construction industry.

Keywords: Sustainability, Construction industry, Soil-based technologies, Mud-Concrete, Self-compaction, in-situ cast walling, load-bearing characteristics

Acknowledgement

The author is immensely grateful to the research supervisor, Prof. R. U. Halwatura of the Department of Civil Engineering for his invaluable guidance and support throughout the research period.

The Author wishes to extend her sincere gratitude to the National Science Foundation for funding the experimental programme throughout the research work.

Further, the Author wishes to acknowledge thankfully the excellent support given by Dr. Narein Perera of Department of Architecture and Prof. A. A. D. A. J. Perera (Research Coordinator, Department of Civil Engineering) of Department of Civil Engineering.

Sincere gratitude is also due for all those who participated in the questionnaire survey. The support given by Prof. S. M. A. Nanayakkara and Prof. Saman Bandara (Heads, Department of Civil Engineering during the period of the research) is acknowledged gratefully.

All the other lectures and research students are thanked for the positive attitude they adopted in promoting research at Civil Engineering Department.

The technical officers of the Department of Civil Engineering, Ms Rukma, Ms. Priyantha, Mr.Lanka, Ms.Dilhani and all the supportive staff who helped in many ways to make this project owns sincere gratitude as well. Finally, the author wishes to thank all those who contributed to the completion of this project successfully.

Table of content

Declaration.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgement	iv
Table of content	v
List of Figures	vii
List of Tables	xi
List of abbreviations	xiv
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Need of the Study.....	1
1.2. Research gap	2
1.3. Aims and objectives	3
1.4. Methodology	3
1.5. Main Findings	5
1.6. Arrangement of the dissertation	8
2. CHAPTER ONE – LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1. General introduction.....	9
2.2. Mud and its production around the world	9
2.3. The existing soil based technologies	11
2.4. Soil classification systems.....	20
2.5. Soil stabilization.....	22
2.6. Summary of literature.....	24
3. CHAPTER TWO - MIX DESIGN DEVELOPMENT	25
3.1. General	25
3.2. Introduction	25
3.3. Selecting the best mould to cast Mud-Concrete specimens.	26
3.4. Developing a method to check workability and self-compacting consistency of Mud-Concrete.....	30
3.5. Optimum gravel size which gives the maximum compressive strength	34
3.6. Finding optimum Gravel: Sand: Fine proportion for the best workable mix	42
3.7. Developing grading curves and standardising the water percentage from dry mix	48
3.8. Durability of MCW in laboratory conditions.....	72

3.9.	Investigation on moisture buffering capacities	75
3.10.	Concluding remarks.....	92
4.	CHAPTER THREE - SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT.....	95
4.1.	General	95
4.2.	Developing the formwork	95
4.4.	Investigation of linear drying shrinkage of MCW segment.....	121
4.5.	Investigation of crack development between possible construction joints of MCW segments.....	133
4.6.	Concluding remarks	140
5.	CHAPTER FOUR – THERMAL PERFORMANCES AND MOISTURE BUFFERING CAPACITIES	141
5.1.	General	141
5.2.	Investigation on thermal performances	141
5.3.	Optimising the thickness of MCW segment	151
5.4.	Concluding remarks	154
6.	CHAPTER FIVE– LONG TERM PERFORMANCE AND COST EFFECTIVENESS.....	155
6.1.	General	155
6.2.	Life Cycle Costing (LCC) of MCW.....	155
6.3.	LCC techniques	157
6.4.	Real scale work study of calculating the unit cost MCW material	158
6.5.	Selecting a basic house model for LCC calculation and energy accounting	160
6.6.	Embodied Energy (EE) of MCW	164
6.7.	Concluding remarks	168
7.	CONCLUSIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS.....	169
8.	FUTURE WORK.....	174
	Reference	175

List of Figures

Figure 1: Locations where earth architecture practiced in the world	10
Figure 2: Available soil based technologies in global context	11
Figure 3: Available soil based technologies in Sri Lankan context.....	12
Figure 4: Similarities of developing the concept of Concrete and Mud-Concrete	19
Figure 5: Grain Size Distribution – according to the diameter of Particle sizes.....	21
Figure 6: GSD are plotted on standard semi-log paper, they look different since the grain size will increase from left to right	21
Figure 7: Grain distribution of a well-graded soil	22
Figure 8: Tests specimens of Cubes and Cylinders	27
Figure 9: Existing Particle Size Distribution of selected soil	28
Figure 10: Slump test results with different moisture contents of Mud-Concrete mix	32
Figure 11: The MC mix has not spread at once due to the cohesiveness of the material.	32
Figure 12: Fill the test cone in one operation without mechanical compaction.	33
Figure 13: Plan view of the flow table. Spread of the self-compacting Mud-Concrete mix after giving 25 blows using the flow table.....	33
Figure 14: The mixture was poured into 150x150x150 mm cast iron moulds in two layers and a tamping rod used to remove the air existing in the mixture	33
Figure 15: Particle Size Distribution of existing soil samples.....	38
Figure 16: Wet & dry compressive strength curves for different soil types.....	39
Figure 17: Comparison of particle size distribution for prepared soil types.....	41
Figure 18: Conducting sieve analysis test to find the existing particle size distribution of soil	42
Figure 19: Comparison of particle size distribution of different soil samples use for sieve analysis	43
Figure 20: Particle size distribution of developed soil samples.....	46
Figure 21: Comparison of dry & wet compressive strength achieved for different gravel: sand ratios	47
Figure 22: Particle size distribution of selected soil	50
Figure 23: The dry compressive strength of Mud-Concrete in 14 days of the age of Mud-Concrete in different gravel ranges and different water percentages in the dry mix.	54
Figure 24: The dry compressive strength of Mud-Concrete in 28 days of the age of Mud-Concrete in different gravel ranges and different water percentages in the dry mix.	55
Figure 25: The wet compressive strength of Mud-Concrete with different cement percentages in 7, 14, 21 and 28 days	57
Figure 26: The dry compressive strength of Mud-Concrete with different cement percentages in 7, 14, 21 and 28 days	57
Figure 27: The dry compressive strength of 4% cement with a different water % dry mix	60
Figure 28: The wet compressive strength of 4% cement with a different water% dry mix	61
Figure 29: The dry compressive strength of 6% cement with a different water % dry mix	62

Figure 30: The wet compressive strength of 6% cement with a different water% dry mix	63
Figure 31: The dry compressive strength of 8% cement with a different water % dry mix	64
Figure 32: The wet compressive strength of 8% cement with a different water % dry mix	65
Figure 33: The dry compressive strength of 10% cement with a different water% dry mix	66
Figure 34: The wet compressive strength of 10% cement with a different water% dry mix	67
Figure 35: Grading Curve for wet strength - 20% water of the dry mix	70
Figure 36: Grading Curve for dry strength - 20% water of the dry mix	70
Figure 37: Arrangement of apparatus for accelerated erosion test	72
Figure 38: Accelerated erosion test conducted in laboratory.....	73
Figure 39: Moisture buffering performance at different levels	77
Figure 40: Particle size distribution of existing soil	78
Figure 41: Prepared Mud-Concrete samples.....	79
Figure 42: Test set-up in climatic chamber.....	80
Figure 43: MC sample was fixed and sealed to a PVC cup using epoxy resin.....	81
Figure 44: Testing set-up in climatic chamber	81
Figure 45: Measuring the thermal conductivity of Mud-Concrete walling material ...	83
Figure 46: Recorded mass-time profile for MBV practical measurement - MC with 4% cement.....	86
Figure 47: Recorded mass-time profile for MBV practical measurement - MC with 8% cement.....	86
Figure 48: Hairline cracks on 4S-3 Mud-Concrete sample (4% Cement with 25% water)	87
Figure 49: Recorded mass-time profile for MBV practical measurement – Comparison between 4% cement, 20% water of MC, 8% cement, 20% water of MC, brick and cement block.	87
Figure 50: SEM images of MC samples made with 4% Cement and 20% optimum water in 28 days	89
Figure 51: SEM images of MC samples made with 8% Cement and 20% optimum water in 28 days	89
Figure 52: Recorded mass-time profile for MBV practical measurement – Comparison between all tested samples	90
Figure 53: Recorded relative humidity and temperature profiles for the MBV measurement	90
Figure 54: Factors effecting for a formwork fabrication in developing an in-situ cast load-bearing walling system	96
Figure 55: Worker's preferences on concrete pouring height	97
Figure 56: Survey carried on different construction sites and surveyed percentage of workers.....	97
Figure 57: Different types of support arrangements to achieve the optimum structure with keeping the limit of maximum allowable deflection limit.....	99
Figure 58: SAP model analysis of most optimum arrangement of formwork.....	100
Figure 59: Formwork arrangement to typical wall segment – PLAN VIEW	102

Figure 60: Formwork arrangement to typical wall segment – FRONT ELEVATION	103
Figure 61: Formwork arrangement to typical wall segment - Step: 01	103
Figure 62: Formwork arrangement to typical wall segment - Step: 02	104
Figure 63: Formwork arrangement to typical wall segment – SIDE ELEVATION .	104
Figure 64: Formwork arrangement of end plates – PLAN VIEW	105
Figure 65: Construction Joints between wall segments – PLAN VIEW	105
Figure 66: Corner formwork – PLAN VIEW	106
Figure 67: Corner Formwork – Outer View	106
Figure 68: Corner Formwork - Inner view	107
Figure 69: Formwork at window opening - PLAN VIEW	108
Figure 70: Formwork at window opening - ELEVATION	108
Figure 71: Formwork at window opening- Step: 01	109
Figure 72: Formwork at window opening- Step: 02.....	109
Figure 73: Formwork at door opening - PLAN VIEW	110
Figure 74: Formwork at door opening - ELEVATION	110
Figure 75: Formwork at door opening- Step: 01	111
Figure 76: Formwork at door opening- Step: 02	111
Figure 77: Fabricated modular formwork system - ex: Corner formwork	112
Figure 78: Particle size distribution of virgin soil	114
Figure 79: Cored locations along the MC wall	116
Figure 80: MC core samples	117
Figure 81: Obtaining MC core samples	117
Figure 82: Checking the compressive strength of MC sample	117
Figure 83: Applied capping on both side of MC sample	117
Figure 84: Behavior of the compressive strength variation along the height of the Mud-Concrete load bearing wall	119
Figure 85: Apparatus arrangement of measuring horizontal and vertical drying shrinkage	126
Figure 86: Reference images of measuring the shrinkage strain on Mud-Concrete wall	126
Figure 87: Apparatus arrangement to measure horizontal drying shrinkage.....	129
Figure 88: Reference images of measuring the horizontal shrinkage strain of MC rectangular sections with different curing periods.....	129
Figure 89: Behaviour of compressive strength of Mud-Concrete material with different curing periods.....	130
Figure 90: Average vertical and horizontal drying shrinkage strain of in-situ cast Mud-Concrete load-bearing walls.....	131
Figure 91: Horizontal shrinkage strain of Mud-Concrete with different curing periods	132
Figure 92: Selected joints types to check the structural behaviour.....	135
Figure 93: Conducting the load-testing.....	136
Figure 94: Conducting the load-testing.....	136
Figure 95: Observing the pattern of crack development between joints	137
Figure 96: Crack development pattern between tested joint types	137
Figure 97: Compressive strength vs. Deflection – Between different joint types	138
Figure 98: The schematic representation of time lag (\emptyset) and decrement factor (f) ..	141

Figure 99: Construction of small scale model house to get on site temperature values	143
Figure 100: Thermal data measured using GL 820 Midi - data logger and thermo-couples	144
Figure 101: DesignBuilder model of the mini scaled –house made at site.....	145
Figure 102: Inside and outside temperature of North oriented wall	145
Figure 103: Inside and outside temperature of South oriented wall	146
Figure 104: Inside and outside temperature of East oriented wall.....	146
Figure 105: Inside and outside temperature of West oriented wal	147
Figure 106: Matching the curves of actual data and calibrated data through Design Builder software.....	148
Figure 107: Surface temperature variations according to different thickness in Mud-Concrete wall	149
Figure 108: Decrement factor Vs. Mud-Concrete wall thickness.....	150
Figure 109: Time lag Vs. Thickness of Mud-Concrete wall	150
Figure 110: Selected case for calculate the load acting on the MC wall	151
Figure 111: Responded sample % for the questionnaire	153
Figure 112: Preferences of wall thickness according to different aspects effects on the construction process.....	153
Figure 113: Preferences of selecting wall thickness according different professions which are relating to construction industry.....	153
Figure 114: Manufacturing framework of in-situ cast MC wall (Seven stages).....	158
Figure 115: a)-Step one; Formwork (F) assembling for 16’-0” length and 4’-0” height. b) - Step two; bottom formwork disassembling and assembling the top formwork. 02 nos. of labour (L) required for formwork assembling and 02 labour (L) was required for mixing and pouring the MC mix.	159
Figure 116: Modelled the basic house design on Design Builder software to calculate the cooling loads with different walling materials.....	161
Figure 117: Selected basic house model - PLAN	162
Figure 118: Total initial construction cost vs. walling cost.....	162
Figure 119: Cooling load calculation for 60 year	163
Figure 120: Life cycle cost of different walling materials (for 60 years) NPV as of 1st Jan 2017	164
Figure 121: Energy content of building hundred square feet wall from different walling materials.....	166
Figure 122: Comparison of the energy content of different materials (calculating energy source and energy type)	167

List of Tables

Table 1: Adobe: Understanding the research gap	12
Table 2: Cob - Understanding the research gap.....	13
Table 3: Wattle and daub - Understanding the research gap	13
Table 4: Cordwood or stone - Understanding the research gap.....	14
Table 5: Earthen Bag - Understanding the research gap.....	14
Table 6: Strawbale - Understanding the research gap	15
Table 7: CSEB - Understanding the research gap	15
Table 8: Rammed Earth - Understanding the research gap	16
Table 9: MCB - Understanding the research gap.....	17
Table 10: Typical minimum performance specifications for rammed earth walls	18
Table 11: Soil classification and mix design of MCB technology	19
Table 12: Aggregate proportions in existing soil samples.....	28
Table 13: Developing the existing soil according to the identified mix design of Mud- Concrete Block.....	29
Table 14: Compressive strength values of cylinders and blocks specimens after 28 days	29
Table 15: Added water % to achieve the workability of Mud-Concrete	31
Table 16: Particle size distribution chart according to Unified soil classification system	34
Table 17: Soil classification in MCB technology	34
Table 18: Identified gravel ranges in the selected soil.....	35
Table 19: Aggregate composition of MCB.....	36
Table 20: Added aggregate portions to develop the soil according to the MCB mix proportions	36
Table 21: Prepared soil types	37
Table 22: Liquid and plastic limit.....	38
Table 23: Results of average wet and dry compressive strength of 150x150x150mm cast blocks with prepared different soil samples	39
Table 24: Needed minimum mass of portion according to the nominal diameter of largest particle size (mm).....	43
Table 25: Average percentage of existing particle size distribution of soil.....	43
Table 26: Cast samples to check the optimum gravel: sand ratio.....	44
Table 27: Detail portions of cast samples to check the optimum gravel: sand ratio ...	44
Table 28: Detail proportions of used cement stabilizer% and water % for Mix design	46
Table 29: Dry & Wet compressive strength results for different gravel: sand ratios ..	47
Table 30: Average particle size distribution of selected soil	50
Table 31: Physical properties of selected gravelly laterite soil for testing purposes ...	51
Table 32: Added aggregate proportions to develop the existing soil according to the identified mix designs	52
Table 33: Developed mix design for each sample varying the cement %	53
Table 34: W1 dry strength (for 18 blocks) - Example of developing soil for best mix design	53

Table 35: The Dry compressive strength of Mud-Concrete in 14 & 28 days of the age of Mud-Concrete in different gravel ranges and different water percentages in the dry mix	55
Table 36: Water percentage in dry mix - Blocks cast to check the wet compressive strength.....	56
Table 37: Water percentage in dry mix - Blocks cast to check the dry compressive strength.....	56
Table 38: Wet compressive strength with different cement percentages	56
Table 39: Dry compressive strength with different cement percentages	58
Table 40: 4% Cement- Dry compressive strength	60
Table 41: 4% Cement- Wet compressive strength.....	61
Table 42: 6% Cement- Dry compressive strength	62
Table 43: 6% Cement- Wet compressive strength.....	63
Table 44: 8% Cement - Dry compressive strength	64
Table 45: 8% Cement - Wet compressive strength.....	65
Table 46: 10% Cement - Dry compressive strength	66
Table 47: 10% Cement - Wet compressive strength.....	67
Table 48: Tested data of wet compressive strength	68
Table 49: Tested data of dry compressive strength	69
Table 50: Wet compressive strength for 20% water from dry mix – y1.....	69
Table 51: Dry compressive strength for 20% water from dry mix – y1	69
Table 52: Needed soil quantities for three MCW rectangular specimens and developing the soil according to the best mix of MCW	72
Table 53: Erosion values per minutes and photographic records of specimens before and after the test	74
Table 54: Literature Summary of MBV testing in earth-based walling materials.....	76
Table 55: Properties of existing soil	78
Table 56: Developing existing soil according to the needed MC specimen mix with 4% and 8% cement.....	79
Table 57: Properties of tested Mud-Concrete Samples, cement blocks and bricks.....	85
Table 58: Water Vapour Permeability values of tested samples	85
Table 59: MBV practical values of tested samples.....	85
Table 60: MBV ideal values of tested samples.....	91
Table 61: Summary of MBV practical vs. MBV ideal	91
Table 62: Physical properties of selected virgin soil	115
Table 63: Needed soil quantities for one wall segment and developing the soil according the best mix of Mud-Concrete wall	115
Table 64: Correction factors for L/D Values	116
Table 65: Obtained compressive strength values for cored samples taken from different heights through Mud-Concrete load bearing wall.....	119
Table 66: Average dry compressive strength values of moulded samples and comparison of average values of cored samples.....	120
Table 67: Method of developing the available soil samples according to the achieved best mix (ex: C-0 sample).....	123
Table 68: Needed soil quantities for one wall segment and developing the soil according to the best mix of Mud-Concrete wall.....	124

Table 69: Method of developing soil according to the allowable weight limit of concrete mixture.....	125
Table 70: Average value calculations of vertical and horizontal shrinkage	127
Table 71: Needed soil quantities to cast three nos. of rectangular block sections of Mud-Concrete and developing the soil according to the best mix of Mud-Concrete wall.....	128
Table 72: Needed soil quantities for one wall segment and developing the soil according to the best mix of Mud-Concrete wall.....	134
Table 73: Average compressive strength results obtained from load testing	139
Table 74: Decrement factor and the time lag of 200mm thickness, Mud-Concrete wall	147
Table 75: Thermo-Physical properties of the Mud-Concrete wall	148
Table 76: Load of MC wall: 01 vs wall thickness	152
Table 77: U-values of different walling materials	156
Table 78: Work study to calculate the Mud-Concrete walling cost per sq.ft	160
Table 79: Calculating initial cost and resale value of different walling materials.....	163
Table 80: Life cycle costing of 60 years in different walling materials	163
Table 81: Energy consumed to build a hundred square feet MCW – an example of EE measuring method.....	165
Table 82: Energy consumption of machines.....	166

List of abbreviations

Symbol	Description
CB	Cement Block
CSCB	Compressed Stabilized Earth Block
C_u	Coefficient of uniformity
C_k	Coefficient of gradation OR Coefficient of curvature
EE	Embodied Energy
GSD	Grain Size Distribution
LCC	Life cycle costing
MC	Mud-Concrete
MCB	Mud-Concrete Block
MCW	Self-compacting in-situ cast Mud-Concrete load-bearing wall
MBV	Moisture Buffering Value
MBV_{practical}	Practical Moisture Buffering Value
MBV_{ideal}	Ideal Moisture Buffering Value
RE	Rammed Earth
USCS	Unified Soil classification system