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ABSTRACT

The presence of marine clay underlying foundation has been responsible for failure in several geotechnical structures and chemical stabilisation is the usual practice to improve the strength of soils. Recently, non-traditional additives are extensively used to solve this problem and their effects on geotechnical properties of soils have been reported by many researchers. However, publications on the fundamental microstructural behaviour of non-traditional additives in treating marine clay soils and their influence on the engineering behaviour are limited. Therefore, this research aimed at determining the stabilisation mechanism and the performance of marine clay soil mixed with two types of non-traditional additives, namely calcium-based powder stabiliser (SH-85) and sodium silicate-based liquid stabilizer (TX-85). Microstructural study from different spectroscopic and microscopic techniques such as X-ray Diffractometry (XRD), Energy-Dispersive X-ray Spectrometry (EDAX), Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM), Thermal Gravimetric Analysis (TGA) and pore size distribution had been conducted to elucidate the stabilisation mechanism. Unconfined compressive test, oedometer consolidation test and consolidated undrained triaxial compression test were conducted to assess the engineering properties of the stabilised soil. In addition, strip footing model tests were conducted to determine the performance of stabilised clay soils and the results were compared with simulation using PLAXIS 2D finite element. The laboratory tests showed that the addition of 12% SH-85 at early 7 days curing period had increased the compressive strength of treated marine clay by about 42 times while the addition of 6% TX-85 with similar curing period had increased the compressive strength of treated marine clay by about 3.6 times. The results of the microstructural tests indicated the formation of new gel products in the mixtures, which were identified as calcium silicate hydrate (CSH) and sodium aluminosilicate hydrate (NASH) for soils treated with SH-85 and TX-85, respectively. SEM images illustrated the formation of new cementitious compounds (CSH and NASH) which were shown within the pore spaces, resulting in the reduction of radius of pore spaces. In comparison to the untreated soil, the results of the physical model tests showed that the bearing capacity of strip footing on the treated soil at 7 days curing period increased significantly while the settlement reduced. In short, the selected additive had successfully increased the strength of marine clay at early period, thus the usage of selected non-traditional additives was considered as cost effective for geotechnical project.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Research

Marine clay, which has low strength and high compressibility, is located in many coastal and offshore areas around the world. It is weak in nature due to the presence of swelling clay minerals like montmorillonite, vermiculite, and chlorite, hence causing a problematic foundation for structures to be built on it (Bjerrum, 1973). The physical and engineering behaviours of soil, such as marine clay, depend on the exchangeable cations, mineralogical composition, and pore water system chemistry (Egashira and Ohtsubo 1982; Ohtsubo et al., 1985).

In the Ninth Malaysia Plan (2006-2010), Iskandar Malaysia was launched as one of the high-impact development projects (Ministry of Information Malaysia, 2008). Nusajaya, a 4% land area within Iskandar Malaysia, is the focal point of the whole development projects within that region. Both public and private sectors are required to build more buildings and roads, but the weak marine clay deposits in various sites surrounding Nusajaya need to either be replaced or improved. Therefore, various ground improvement methods have been introduced and tested in research and in practice. However, their respective suitability are considered to be project-specific, which depend on the cost, existing soil's characteristics, and the stabilisers potential impacts or effectiveness for the proposed application. In such cases, appropriate soil property modification measures are typically taken into consideration. Hence, it is
necessary to improve the engineering behaviour of marine clays using appropriate ground improvement techniques.

Geotechnical engineers borrow the knowledge of geologists and soil scientists to seek appropriate method to enhance clay behaviour. Most of the basic ideas related to the enhancement of clay behaviour using stabiliser had been published since 1960 (Petry and Little, 2002). The soil stabilisation is a method which involves mixing natural soils with chemical stabilisers to increase the properties of the soil particularly in strength and decrease moisture content of soil. This method of stabilising or treating soil is an important and widely used method throughout the world. In the stabilisation process, stabiliser agent acts as filler in the pore spaces or reinforcing the bindings between the particles. The stabiliser is categorised as traditional, such as lime, cement and fly ash, as well as non-traditional stabiliser such as, acids, salts, enzymes, polymer, resin, and sulfonated oils (Harris et al., 2006; Tingle et al., 2007). Despite the fact that stabilisation of soil using traditional stabiliser such as cement and lime is well established (Yilmaz and Civelekoglu, 2009), there is a need of alternative technologies to be applied which are more environmentally friendly, sustainable, and economical.

In recent years, an increasing number of non-traditional stabilisers have been developed for soil stabilisation purposes. According to Tingle et al. (2007), the variety of stabilisers (powder and liquid form) are becoming popular due to their relatively low cost, ease of application, and short curing period. The effectiveness of non-traditional stabiliser to increase the properties of clay soils, particularly in strength, has been reported by many researchers such as Suganya et al. (2016), Onyejekwe et al. (2016), Phetchuay et al. (2016), Zhang et al. (2015) and Yi et al. (2015).

Lim et al. (2013), for example, reported the increased of unconfined compressive strength of low plasticity clay treated with biomass silica (non-traditional stabiliser) up to 36 times the untreated value. Using the same non-traditional stabiliser, Latifi et al. (2016) reported the increased strength of residual soil (high plasticity silt) up to 7 times the untreated value. Nevertheless, the lack of knowledge in selecting and using chemical additives to treat soils has induced the damage of losing millions of dollars (Wiggins et al., 1978). Hence, suitable use of stabiliser is important to maximize the optimum use of stabiliser agent and to save cost.
1.2 Problem Statement

In recent years, an increasing number of non-traditional stabiliser have been developed for soil stabilisation purposes. The non-traditional stabiliser has been developed and marketed to meet the need of alternative technologies which are more economical, sustainable, and environmentally friendly. However, the effects of these stabilisers are still vague and yet to be understood. Besides that, the non-traditional stabilisers, in the form of powder or liquid, are becoming popular due to their relatively low cost, ease of application, and short curing period. In spite of the benefits of non-traditional stabiliser as a chemical agent, the engineers seldom use these product due to the variation of chemical data, process explanation, and engineering data. Besides that, the performance of a non-traditional stabiliser is rather difficult to evaluate due to the chemical formulas are often changing based on the market tendency and the exact chemical composition are not disclosed due to the commercial stabilisation product.

In this sense, understanding the mechanism of stabilisation process is very important. Thus, basic stabilisation mechanism should be studied to set these products according to different categories, depending on their primary chemical components and proposed enhancement properties. Considering the above current issues, it is concluded that there is a need to study the physico-chemical and microstructural behaviour of non-traditional stabiliser treated marine clay and use them to explain some aspects of the observed engineering behaviour in a well-controlled laboratory condition before extending it to the field condition. In this thesis, an attempt has been made to evaluate the stabilisation mechanism of treated marine clay soil with selected non-traditional stabilisers.
1.3 Research Aims and Objectives

This research aims to determine the stabilisation mechanism and performance of marine clay soils treated with non-traditional stabilisers, namely the SH-85 and TX-85. Hence, the main objectives of this research are as follows:

i. To determine the changes in the engineering properties of treated marine clay with various percentages of selected stabilisers at different curing periods;

ii. To determine the changes on the physico-chemical and microstructural behaviour of treated marine clay;

iii. To evaluate the influence of pyhsicochemical and microstructural changes of treated marine clay soil on engineering properties; and

iv. To determine the performance of strip footing on treated marine clay soils based on laboratory physical model tests and computer simulation.

1.4 Scope of Study

The soft marine clay soil used in this study was collected from the construction site in Nusajaya where the soils were excavated at the Southern coast Johor, Malaysia. The non-traditional stabilisers used in this study were obtained from a local company called Probase Sdn. Bhd. which is located in Johor.

To understand the changes on physico-chemical and microstructural behaviour of treated marine clay soils, X-Ray diffraction (XRD), energy dispersive x-ray spectrometry (EDAX), scanning electron microscopy (SEM), particle size analysis, thermal gravimetric analysis (TGA), and pH measurement were conducted. Meanwhile, for the engineering behaviour, Atterbeg’s limits, unconfined compressive strength (UCS), oedometer consolidation, and consolidated undrained (CU) triaxial test were conducted.
The testing sample were prepared and cured in a similar manner described in the British Standard (BS 1924: Part 2: 1990). The percentages of the chemical used in the mixture of soil sample were 3%, 6%, 9%, 12%, and 15% cured at 3, 7, 14, 28, 90 and 180 days curing periods. Due to the high quantity of sample and high cost of microstructure test, test was limited to the sample that showed the highest degree of improvement. The 12% of SH-85 stabiliser and 6% of TX-85 stabiliser was chosen as the optimum percentage through the analysis of the results obtained.

Laboratory physical model tests were conducted on the untreated and treated soil (cured at 7 days) as foundation for strip footing. The model tests were carried out by applying loads to the strip footing placed until failure occurred to the footing. The settlement of the footing and the bearing capacity were monitored during loading tests to ascertain the performance of the treated soil as foundation. The commercial 2D finite element software called “PLAXIS” was used in numerical simulation to evaluate and compare the results obtained from laboratory physical model tests. The Mohr-Coulomb soil model under undrained condition was used in the simulation work.

1.5 Significance of Study

In regard to the importance of the study, the mechanism of the stabilisation of marine clay soils with non-traditional stabiliser had been established. The significance of the study includes the following:

i. Understanding the mechanism of the stabilisation process through the results from macro and micro-structural study;

ii. New finding from the changes of the minerology and physical of treated marine clay soils can be used for further study;

iii. The performance of strip footing foundation on treated soil could be used to produce practicing engineers in using non-traditional stabilisers to stabilise marine clay soils.
1.6 Outline of the Thesis

This thesis consists of six chapters. The first chapter gives a brief overall introduction of the entire research work done, followed by its problem statement and research objectives, as well as scope of study and significance of study.

Chapter 2 is devoted to a literature review on the chemical stabilisation by the traditional and non-traditional stabilisers. Also, the fundamentals of clay mineral are presented to understand the soil-chemical reactions. Moreover, previous research on the physical and numerical simulations of strip footing foundation are also discussed.

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology of study, detail of test apparatus, sample preparation, and procedure of testing. Furthermore, the characterization study of stabilised soil was done using spectroscopic and microscopic techniques previously published in papers and as standards. The descriptions of physical and numerical simulation test procedure are also explained at the end of this chapter.

The test results and discussions of the comprehensive testing program are presented in Chapter 4. In Chapter 4, the physico-chemical, as well as microstructural behaviour, together with an integration of the basic engineering properties of treated marine clays and the strength and compressibility behaviour of treated marine clays, are explained and clarified with the knowledge of induced microstructure. In addition, the descriptions of the physical and numerical simulation tests are also presented and discussed.

Finally, Chapter 5 concludes the findings and provides some recommendations for future studies.
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