



HAL
open science

A comparative study of the effects of particle grading and compaction effort on the strength and stiffness of earth building materials at different humidity levels

A. Cuccurullo, D. Gallipoli, A.W. Bruno, C. Augarde, P. Hughes, Christian La Borderie

► To cite this version:

A. Cuccurullo, D. Gallipoli, A.W. Bruno, C. Augarde, P. Hughes, et al.. A comparative study of the effects of particle grading and compaction effort on the strength and stiffness of earth building materials at different humidity levels. *Construction and Building Materials*, 2021, 306, pp.124770. 10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2021.124770 . hal-03392200

HAL Id: hal-03392200

<https://univ-pau.hal.science/hal-03392200>

Submitted on 16 Oct 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

A comparative study of the effects of particle grading and compaction effort on the strength and stiffness of earth building materials at different humidity levels

A. Cuccurullo¹, D. Gallipoli², A. W. Bruno³, C. Augarde⁴, P. Hughes⁴, C. La Borderie¹

¹*Laboratoire SIAME, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, France*

²*Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile, Chimica e Ambientale, Università degli Studi di Genova, Italy*

³*School of Engineering, Newcastle University, United Kingdom*

⁴*Department of Engineering, Durham University, United Kingdom*

ABSTRACT: This paper presents an investigation of the mechanical properties of three different earth building materials manufactured by compacting two soils with distinct particle size distributions under two markedly different efforts. Multiple samples of each material have been equalised either inside a climatic chamber at different humidity levels or oven-dried, before being subjected to shearing inside a triaxial cell to measure the corresponding levels of strength and stiffness. Triaxial shearing has been performed under different levels of radial stress to investigate the effect of material confinement inside thick walls. Consistent with previous research, the study has indicated that strength and stiffness increase as ambient humidity reduces and degree of saturation decreases, though the actual variation of these properties strongly depends on the dry density and clay content of the material. Most importantly, particle grading has emerged as a key material parameter, whose impact on earth building has often been overlooked. Particle grading appears to influence strength and stiffness even more than compaction effort, dry density and average particle size, which are usually quoted as the most important variables for the design of earth building materials.

Keywords: Suction; Hypercompaction; Strength; Particle size distribution; Earth construction

1. INTRODUCTION

The expression “raw earth” or “unstabilised earth” indicates a building material consisting of a compacted mix of soil and water, which is put in place with the least possible transformation [1]. Compared to standard engineering materials, raw earth can lead to a reduction in both carbon emissions and energy consumption not only during construction but also during service life of buildings [2,3]. The hydrophilic nature of raw earth explains the ability of this material to regulate humidity and temperature inside dwellings, thus increasing the comfort of occupants without requiring energy-intensive air conditioning installations [4]. Unfortunately, despite these advantages, the deployment of raw earth into construction practice has so far been very limited due to insufficient knowledge of important aspects of material design. For example, there is still considerable lack of information about the influence of index properties on the strength, stiffness and hygro-thermal inertia of earth materials at different humidity levels.

The engineering behaviour of earth building materials is strongly influenced by pore water content, which is in turn linked to the relative humidity of the surrounding air. A decrease of ambient humidity produces an increase of capillary suction with a corresponding decrease of pore water saturation, and vice versa. Climatic conditions change significantly with geographical location and seasonal variations of ambient conditions can be significant, yet relatively few studies have investigated the impact of relative humidity on the strength and stiffness of earth building materials [1,5-10]. These studies have indicated that both strength and stiffness increase non-linearly as suction increases and degree of saturation reduces, levelling off at very high suctions. This behaviour is consistent with the simple capillarity model of Fisher [11], which predicts that the stabilising effect of a water meniscus at the contact between soil particles grows with increasing suction tending towards an asymptote. An increase of humidity also leads to more ductile behaviour while a decrease of humidity generates a relatively brittle response, especially at high clay contents.

49
50 Jaquin et al. [1] were among the first to investigate the interaction between earth building materials and
51 the surrounding atmosphere. They performed unconfined compression tests on air-dried samples at
52 different water contents showing that strength and stiffness increase as water content decreases from
53 10.2 % to 5.5 %. This range of water content is, however, still higher than the typical value of 1-2 %
54 measured inside earth building materials in field conditions [12]. Bui et al. [6] measured the unconfined
55 compressive strength of earth materials with distinct particle gradings over a water content range from
56 11% to 1-2 %. These two limits correspond to the typical water contents of earth materials after
57 manufacture and after field equalisation, respectively. Also in this case, the mechanical properties of the
58 material deteriorated as water content increased and suction reduced. The study also highlighted that a
59 small increase of moisture content from a typical field level of 1-2 % to about 4% (caused, for example,
60 by intense rainfall or a marked change of ambient humidity) did not induce a significant drop of strength.

61
62 The impact of particle grading and clay content on material performance has been mostly overlooked
63 by past research. Current earth building guidelines recommend specific classes of soils, whose particle
64 size distribution and clay content must fit within admissible bands, but the effect of grading and clay
65 content on the strength and durability of the material remains unclear [13]. Earlier studies [13-16] have
66 suggested that soils with clay contents from as low as 5% to as high as 30% are acceptable for earth
67 building, though there is still no consensus on clear selection criteria.

68
69 Beckett and Augarde [5] were among the few authors who investigated the effect of clay content on the
70 strength of earth building materials showing that, regardless of humidity and temperature, a clay content
71 near the recommended minimum corresponds to the highest material strength. They argued that this was
72 due to the larger water retention capacity of clays, whose small pore network can hold moisture in bulk,
73 rather than pendular, form over a very wide suction range [17]. This is also consistent with a large base
74 of geotechnical research, which has demonstrated that finer soils exhibit higher water contents than
75 coarser soils at any suction level [18]. A relatively high clay content therefore increases the moisture
76 content of the earth material, which undermines strength and stiffness especially in humid environments.
77 In another study, Xu et al. [10] amended a natural soil with different proportions of fine sand to produce
78 three different earth building materials with clay contents of 35%, 26%, and 17%, respectively. They
79 performed a series of triaxial tests on all three materials equalised at different humidity levels observing
80 a strong dependency of the mechanical properties on both ambient humidity and clay content. Strength
81 and stiffness decreased with an increase in relative humidity but the magnitude of this reduction
82 depended on clay content. In contradiction with Beckett and Augarde [5], they observed that shear
83 strength tended to increase with growing clay content under fixed levels of relative humidity and
84 confining pressure. The magnitude of this increase tended to be smaller when humidity was larger due
85 to the softening action of water. Other studies by Delinière et al. [19], Kouakou and Morel [20] and
86 Taylor et al. [21] have also provided experimental evidence in agreement with the conclusions of Xu et
87 al. [10]. Finally, Hamard et al. [22] reported that an increase in clay content does not always result in an
88 increase of shear strength and that there is an optimum amount of clay that corresponds to a maximum
89 value of shear strength. Beyond this optimum, a further increase of clay content leads to large material
90 shrinkage and a reduction of shear strength. It must, however, be noted that the study by Hamard et al.
91 [22] focused on ready-mixed clay plasters rather than compacted earth.

92
93 Past studies have also shown that denser earth exhibits larger values of stiffness and strength [9,23-26].
94 Bruno et al. [27] found that dry density increases less than linearly with growing compaction effort
95 whereas strength and stiffness increase more than linearly with growing dry density. The strength of
96 highly compacted earth is generally in the range 4.2-10 MPa [27], which is comparable to the strength
97 of chemically stabilised earth materials [28-31]. Particle grading may therefore play an important role
98 in the design of earth building materials as it governs the ability of the soil grains to assemble into a
99 denser structure when compacted under a given effort.


100
101 This paper explores the above issues by presenting an experimental investigation of the simultaneous
102 effects of particle grading, dry density and ambient humidity on the mechanical behaviour of
103 unstabilised earth building materials. Unlike previous laboratory studies, which have been mostly

104 restricted to unconfined compression tests, this paper focuses on the measurement of stiffness and
 105 strength inside a triaxial cell under variable levels of radial confinement.
 106

107 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

108 2.1. EARTH CHARACTERISATION

109 The base soil used in the present work has been provided by the brickwork factory Bouisset from the
 110 region of Toulouse (France). Figure 1 shows the particle size distribution of this base soil [32] together
 111 with the recommended lower and upper limits according to current guidelines for the manufacture of
 112 compressed earth bricks [33-35].




113
 114 Figure 1: Particle size distribution of the base soil in relation to existing recommendations for the manufacture of
 115 compressed earth bricks by AFNOR [33]; CRATerre-EAG [34] and MOPT [35] (after Cuccurullo et al. [32]).

116 The main properties of the base soil, including the Atterberg limits of the fine fraction (i.e. the fraction
 117 smaller than 0.400 mm), were determined in a previous publication [32] and are summarised in Table
 118 1. Past studies [36] have also indicated a predominantly kaolinitic clay fraction with a limited tendency
 119 to swell/shrink upon wetting/drying, which is advantageous for earth building. Figure 2 shows the
 120 plasticity properties of the soil with reference to the Casagrande chart, which classifies this material as
 121 a low plasticity clay [32]. Figure 2 also indicates that the soil fits inside the recommended plasticity
 122 region for the manufacture of compressed earth bricks according to AFNOR [33]; CRATerre-EAG [34]
 123 and Houben and Guillaud [37].

124

125 Table 1: Main properties of the base soil (from Cuccurullo et al. [32]).


Particle size distribution		Atterberg limits	
Gravel content (> 2 mm, %)	0	Plastic limit w_p (%)	18.7
Sand content (\leq 2 mm, %)	31	Liquid limit w_L (%)	29.0
Silt content (\leq 63 μ m, %)	35	Plasticity index I_p (%)	10.3
Clay content (\leq 2 μ m, %)	34	Mineralogical composition	
Clay activity A (-)	0.30	Goethite, Muscovite, Orthose, Kaolinite, Quartz, Calcite	
Specific gravity G_s (-)	2.65		



127

128 Figure 2: Plasticity properties of the base soil in relation to existing recommendations for the manufacture of
 129 compressed earth bricks by AFNOR [33]; CRATerre-EAG [34] and Houben and Guillaud [37] (from Cuccurullo
 130 et al. [38]).

131 The base soil was then blended with 68% of silica sand (by overall dry mass) to obtain a second earth
 132 mix with a clay content equal to the recommended minimum [32]. Figure 3 shows the particle size
 133 distribution of the added sand, whose grading is monodispersed with particle dimensions between 0.06
 134 and 2 mm.



135

136 Figure 3: Particle size distribution of added sand in relation to existing recommendations for the manufacture of
 137 compressed earth bricks by AFNOR [33]; CRATerre-EAG [34] and MOPT [35] (after Cuccurullo et al. [32]).


138 Table 2 summarizes the composition of the two earth building materials considered in this study, i.e.
 139 earth mix 1, which is the base soil, and earth mix 2, which is the blend of base soil and silica sand. Figure
 140 4 shows the particle size distributions of these two mixes in relation to the recommended limits for the
 141 manufacture of compressed earth bricks [33-35]. Inspection of Figure 4 indicates that earth mix 1
 142 exhibits a well-graded particle distribution, which is slightly finer than the upper limit and a clay content
 143 coinciding with the maximum recommended value. Conversely, earth mix 2 exhibits a poorly-graded
 144 particle size distribution, which cuts through the admissible band with a clay content corresponding to
 145 the minimum recommended value. The particle size distribution of earth mix 2 falls entirely inside the
 146 recommended grading band while that of earth mix 1 is slightly outside. The deviation of earth mix 1
 147 from current guidelines is, however, not significant and both mixes are assumed to be compliant with
 148 existing recommendations.

149

150 Table 2: Composition of the two earth materials tested in the present work (after Cuccurullo et al. [32]).

Material	Base soil percentage [%]	Added sand percentage [%]	Clay content [%]
Earth mix 1 (base soil)	100	0	≈32
Earth mix 2	32	68	≈10

151



152


153 Figure 4: Particle size distribution of earth mixes in relation to existing recommendations for the manufacture of
 154 compressed earth bricks by AFNOR [33]; CRATerre-EAG [34] and MOPT [35] (after Cuccurullo et al. [32]).

155 **2.2 EARTH COMPACTION**

156 Figure 5 presents the standard Proctor compaction curve of earth mix 1, which was determined by
 157 Cuccurullo et al. [38] in compliance with the French norm NF P94-093 [39]. For ease of interpretation,
 158 Figure 5 also shows the equisaturation lines, which converge towards the “no porosity” point
 159 corresponding to a water content of zero and a dry density equal to that of the soil particles. Inspection
 160 of Figure 5 indicates a maximum dry density of 1.97 g/cm³, which corresponds to an optimum water
 161 content of 12.4%.

162 Figure 6 shows instead the hypercompaction curves for earth mixes 1 and 2, which were obtained by
 163 applying a large static vertical pressure of 100 MPa [32] to the sample inside a 50 mm diameter
 164 cylindrical mould using a load-controlled Zwick/Roell Amsler HB250 press with a capacity of 250 kN.
 165 The earth was compacted by two cylindrical pistons acting at the top and bottom as this increased the
 166 uniformity of compaction stress, and hence material fabric, across the sample height compared to the
 167 case of single compression where the load is applied on only one side. This is because, during double
 168 compression, the friction between the earth and the mould creates two opposite gradients of the
 169 compaction stress extending from each sample extremity to the middle section. Conversely, during
 170 single compression, the friction generates only one gradient of compaction stress extending between the
 171 two extremities of the sample. Additional details of the hypercompaction procedure are available in
 172 Cuccurullo et al. [32] and Bruno [27].


173 Inspection of Figure 6 shows that the finer and well graded earth mix 1 exhibits considerably higher
 174 values of dry density compared to the coarser and poorly graded earth mix 2. The optimum water content
 175 is 4.88 % for earth mix 1 and 6.50 % for earth mix 2, while the maximum dry densities are 2.31 g/cm³
 176 and 2.12 g/cm³, respectively. Comparison of Figures 5 and 6 also indicates that the hypercompaction
 177 procedure results in a significantly denser material with a considerably lower value of the optimum
 178 water content compared to standard Proctor compaction.



179

180

Figure 5: Standard Proctor compaction curve for earth mix 1 (after Cuccurullo et al. [38]).



181

182

183

Figure 6: Hypercompaction curves, corresponding to the application of a static pressure of 100 MPa, for earth mixes 1 and 2 (after Cuccurullo et al. [32]).

184 2.3 TRIAXIAL TESTING PROGRAM

185 Triaxial samples of 50 mm diameter and 100 mm height were manufactured by one-dimensional static
 186 compaction under either an equivalent Proctor load (Proctor compacted samples) or a pressure of 100
 187 MPa (hypercompacted samples).

188

189 Proctor compacted samples of earth mix 1 were fabricated by sieving the dry material through a 2 mm
 190 mesh and subsequently mixing it with the optimum water content of 12.4 % (see Figure 5). The moist
 191 soil was then statically compacted in 10 layers to attain the maximum Proctor dry density (see Figure
 192 5), taking care to scarify the surface of each layer before adding the next one. The hypercompacted
 193 samples of earth mixes 1 and 2 were instead fabricated at their respective optimum water contents, i.e.
 194 4.88 % and 6.50 % (see Figure 6), following the procedure described in the previous section.

195

196 Twelve samples of each of the three materials (i.e. Proctor compacted earth mix 1, hypercompacted
 197 earth mix 1 and hypercompacted earth mix 2) were manufactured and divided into four sets of three
 198 samples. One set was oven-dried for three days at a temperature of 105 °C while the other three sets
 199 were equalised inside a climatic chamber at humidity levels of 25%, 62% and 95%, respectively, and
 200 constant temperature of 25 °C. The samples in the climatic chamber were weighed every day until
 201 equalisation, which was assumed to be complete when the sample mass changed less than 0.1 % over at
 202 least one week (this took generally 15 days). After equalisation, the average mass W and volume V of

203 each set of three samples was measured. The total suction, ψ was also determined from the imposed
204 values of temperature, T and relative humidity, RH according to Kelvin's law as:

$$205 \quad \psi = - \frac{RT}{V_m} \ln(RH) \quad (1)$$

206 where R is the gas constant and V_m is the molar volume of water.

207
208 At the end of each triaxial test, three earth fragments of about 50 grams were taken at the top, middle
209 and bottom of the sample to determine the corresponding water contents according to the French norm
210 NF P 94-050 [40]. The average water content w was then calculated from these three measurements for
211 each of the three samples equalised at the same humidity level. All measurements were generally very
212 similar, thus confirming the uniformity of moisture content across the samples. By assuming no variation
213 of moisture content during the triaxial tests, the average values of bulk density ρ_b , dry density ρ_d , void
214 ratio e , degree of saturation S_r and porosity n at the start of the tests were calculated from the volume V ,
215 mass W and water content w (taking a specific gravity G_s equal to the value reported in Table 1) as:

$$216 \quad \rho_b = \frac{W}{V} \quad (2)$$

$$217 \quad \rho_d = \frac{\rho_b}{(1+w)} \quad (3)$$

$$218 \quad n = 1 - \frac{\rho_d}{\rho_w G_s} \quad (4)$$

$$219 \quad S_r = \frac{w \rho_d}{n \rho_w} \quad (5)$$

220 Table 3 summarises the average properties at the start of the triaxial tests for each set of three samples
221 equalised at the same humidity level or oven-dried. Recall that pore moisture is assumed to remain
222 unchanged during the triaxial tests and, therefore, the values of water content in Table 3 are the same at
223 the start and the end of the triaxial tests. Due to experimental problems, reliable measurements of water
224 content could not be obtained for the hypercompacted samples of earth mix 2 equalised at the humidity
225 levels of 62% and 95%, which explains the gaps in Table 3. The value of total suction of the oven-dry
226 material is also absent from Table 3 as it could not be calculated from Equation 1 due to absence of
227 information about the ambient humidity inside the furnace.

228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240

241
242

Table 3: Average samples properties at the start of the triaxial test, i.e. after equalisation at different humidity levels or oven-drying.

Relative humidity, RH [%]	Bulk density, ρ_b [g/cm ³]	Water content, w [%]	Dry density, ρ_d [g/cm ³]	Porosity, n [%]	Degree of saturation, S_r [%]	Total suction, ψ [MPa]
Hypercompacted earth mix 1						
Oven-dry	2.28	0	2.28	14.1	0	-
RH = 25 %	2.31	0.68	2.29	13.4	11.7	190
RH = 62 %	2.33	2.24	2.28	13.9	36.7	65
RH = 95 %	2.38	4.61	2.28	14.0	74.9	7
Hypercompacted earth mix 2						
Oven-dry	2.12	0	2.12	20.1	0	-
RH = 25 %	2.12	0.36	2.11	20.3	3.78	190
RH = 62 %	2.15	-	-	-	-	65
RH = 95 %	2.13	-	-	-	-	7
Proctor compacted earth mix 1						
Oven-dry	1.95	0	1.95	26.3	0	-
RH = 25 %	1.99	0.88	1.97	25.6	6.76	190
RH = 62 %	1.98	2.43	1.93	27.1	17.3	65
RH = 95 %	2.09	4.91	1.99	24.9	39.3	7

243 Inspection of Table 3 indicates that the equalisation of earth mix 1 at distinct humidity levels produces
 244 distinct degrees of saturation and that the difference between degrees of saturation is more marked for
 245 the hypercompacted samples than for Proctor compacted ones. This also suggests that the sensitivity of
 246 degree of saturation to ambient humidity is higher for earth building materials than standard geotechnical
 247 fills due to the higher density of the former materials compared to the latter ones. Note also that these
 248 differences of degree of saturation correspond to distinct magnitudes of inter-particle capillary bonding
 249 and, therefore, distinct levels of strength and stiffness as discussed later in the paper.

250 The equalised or oven-dried samples were sheared inside a triaxial cell with an axial displacement rate
 251 of 0.06 mm/min. Throughout the triaxial tests, the back-pressure line was open to the atmosphere to
 252 allow the drainage of pore air from the unsaturated samples. The flow of vapour through the back-
 253 pressure line was, however, considered negligible and the sample water content was therefore assumed
 254 constant. Shearing was continued until failure, which generally took between 23 and 35 minutes
 255 depending on the test. For each humidity level, three samples were sheared under different radial stresses
 256 of 0 kPa, 300 kPa and 600 kPa, respectively, to explore the effect of earth confinement inside thick
 257 walls.

258
 259 Test results were subsequently processed to determine the initial Young's modulus and the peak strength
 260 for each confining pressure and humidity level. In particular, the initial Young's modulus was measured
 261 as the slope of the stress-strain curve over the low-pressure range, i.e. up to 20% of the peak strength,
 262 where the material response is reasonably linear.


263

264 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION


265 Figure 7 shows the stress-strain curves measured during the triaxial tests of the hypercompacted samples
266 of earth mix 1 equalised at distinct humidity levels. For each humidity level, three curves are reported
267 corresponding to distinct degrees of lateral confinement. Inspection of Figure 7 indicates that, at a given
268 humidity level, the peak strength increases by a margin of between 30% and 50% as the radial stress
269 increases from zero to 600 kPa, which highlights the beneficial effect of lateral confinement on material
270 strength.

271 Moreover, at a given confining pressure, the peak stress increases as the ambient humidity decreases,
272 which provides further evidence of the inverse relationship between strength and degree of saturation
273 due to the progressive formation of capillary menisci at particle contacts during desaturation. These
274 capillary water menisci bond earth grains together and therefore enhance the strength of the material
275 [5,41]. The largest levels of strength, from 15 MPa to more than 20 MPa, were measured on dry samples
276 which should by definition contain no capillary water at all. These samples should, therefore, be no
277 different from water saturated ones and should thus exhibit the lowest values of strength instead of the
278 highest ones. This apparent contradiction is due to the conventional assumption of oven-dryness as the
279 reference material state corresponding to complete absence of pore water. In reality, even inside oven-
280 dry samples there is a residual presence of adsorbed water subjected to extremely high tensile stresses,
281 which firmly bonds earth particles together.

282 Inspection of Figure 7 also indicates that the material response changes from fragile to ductile as
283 humidity increases, with the highest level of brittleness observed on the oven-dry samples. Therefore,
284 an increase of ambient humidity produces a reduction of shear strength while enhancing the ability of
285 the material to undergo plastic deformation before failure.




286




287

288




289




290 Figure 7: Results from triaxial tests on the hypercompacted earth mix 1 at different confining pressures and
291 distinct humidity levels: oven-dry (a), 25 % (b), 62 % (c), 95 % (d).

292 Figure 8 presents the stress-strain curves measured during the triaxial tests of the hypercompacted
293 samples of earth mix 2 showing, once again, that peak strength increases as relative humidity decreases
294 at all confining pressures. As in the case of earth mix 1 (Figure 7), the highest strength levels were
295 measured on the oven-dry samples with a maximum of about 6 MPa, which is, however, significantly
296 lower than the corresponding strength of earth mix 1. Inspection of Figure 8 also confirms that, as
297 relative humidity grows, the behaviour changes from fragile to ductile, thus increasing the ability of the
298 material to deform plastically before failure. The beneficial effect of lateral confinement is more marked
299 than in the previous case, with an up to six-fold increase of strength as the radial stress grows from zero
300 to 600 kPa at constant humidity.


301 The comparison of the triaxial responses of earth mix 2 (Figure 8) and earth mix 1 (Figure 7) indicates
302 that strength and brittleness are significantly lower in the former case compared to the latter one, despite
303 the two mixes are both hypercompacted and exhibit particle size distributions that are both admissible
304 according to existing guidelines (Figure 4). The main difference between these two mixes consists in
305 the dispersion of grain sizes, which corresponds to a well-graded fine material in the case of earth mix
306 1 and a poorly-graded coarse material in the case of earth mix 2. This diversity of grading is also
307 reflected in the significantly different levels of dry density for the same compaction effort and water
308 content (Figure 6). Distinct materials inside the admissible grading band of Figure 4 can therefore
309 generate very different mechanical responses even when compacted under similar conditions. In
310 particular, the results from this study indicate that a fine well-graded earth generates higher strength
311 levels than a coarse poorly-graded earth under similar compaction conditions. Thus, the role of particle
312 grading may outstrip that of average particle size, which means that coarser materials will not always
313 generate higher strength levels.




314



315



316




317


318 Figure 8: Results from triaxial tests on the hypercompact earth mix 2 at different confining pressures and
 319 distinct humidity levels: dry (a), 25 % (b), 62 % (c), 95 % (d).

320 Figure 9 shows the stress-strain curves of the triaxial tests on the Proctor samples of earth mix 1 from
 321 which the same conclusions as before can be drawn regarding the qualitative effect of ambient humidity
 322 on material strength. Inspection of Figure 9 also indicates an up to three-fold increase of strength with
 323 growing radial stress from 0 to 600 kPa at constant humidity, which represents an intermediate response
 324 compared to the previous two materials. Most importantly, the strength levels measured on the Proctor
 325 compacted samples of earth mix 1 are generally higher than those recorded on the hypercompact
 326 samples of earth mix 2 (Figure 8), despite the former samples exhibit a markedly lower density than the
 327 latter ones. An earth material of relatively low density with a well-graded particle size distribution can
 328 therefore exhibit higher strength levels than those of a considerably denser material with a poorly-graded
 329 distribution. This confirms the key role of particle grading in enhancing material strength, a role which
 330 is more significant than that of material density. This important conclusion has not found adequate space
 331 in previous studies, which have instead focused on compaction effort as the main means of improving
 332 material strength.


333 Finally, a comparison between test results on Proctor compacted (Figure 9) and hypercompact (Figure
 334 7) samples of earth mix 1 shows that strength levels are significantly higher in the latter case than in the
 335 former one. This is expected as, for a given particle size distribution, a stronger compaction effort
 336 generates a larger material density and, hence, higher strength levels. Proctor compacted samples show,
 337 however, greater ductility compared to hypercompact ones, which is consistent with previous
 338 observations of increasing ductility with decreasing strength, especially at high humidity levels.




339



340




341



342


343 Figure 9: Results from triaxial tests on the Proctor compacted earth mix 1 at different confining pressures and
 344 distinct humidity levels: dry (a), 25 % (b), 62 % (c), 95 % (d).

345 Figure 10 summarizes the evolution of strength (i.e. the peak axial stress) with relative humidity for the
 346 three materials subjected to confining pressures of 0 kPa, 300 kPa and 600 kPa. For earth mix 1,
 347 hypercompaction increases the sensitivity of material strength to humidity variations compared to
 348 Proctor compaction. This result is consistent with previous data in Table 3 showing that hypercompacted
 349 samples, equalised at different humidity levels, exhibit greater differences of degree of saturation than
 350 Proctor compacted ones. As the degree of saturation is inversely related to the inter-particle capillary
 351 bonding, a larger variation of degree of saturation with changing humidity should correspond to a larger
 352 variation of strength.




353

(a)



354

(b)



355

(c)

356 Figure 10: Evolution of strength (i.e. peak axial stress) with relative humidity at different confining pressures:
 357 unconfined (a), 300 kPa (b) and 600 kPa (c).

358 The effect of degree of saturation on the mechanical properties of each material can be synthetically
 359 described by comparing their strength and stiffness envelopes at distinct humidity levels.

360 The strength envelopes at constant humidity are obtained by plotting the values of peak deviator stress
 361 q measured from the three triaxial tests under different radial stresses against the corresponding values
 362 of mean stress p . These experimental data are then interpolated by the following linear equation:


363
$$q = C + M p \tag{7}$$

364 where the coefficients C and M are respectively the intercept and slope of the strength envelope at each
 365 humidity level. The above coefficients can also be converted into the corresponding values of cohesion
 366 c and friction angle φ by means of the following equations:


$$367 \quad M = \frac{6 \sin \varphi}{3 - \sin \varphi} \quad (8)$$

$$368 \quad C = \frac{6 c \cos \varphi}{3 - \sin \varphi} \quad (9)$$


369 Figures 11, 12 and 13 show the strength envelopes of the hypercompacted earth mix 1, hypercompacted
 370 earth mix 2 and Proctor compacted earth mix 1, respectively. Similarly, Tables 4, 5 and 6 summarise
 371 the strength parameters of the hypercompacted earth mix 1, hypercompacted earth mix 2 and Proctor
 372 compacted earth mix 1, respectively.



373
 374 Figure 11: Strength envelopes of hypercompacted earth mix 1 at different humidity levels.



375
 376 Figure 12: Strength envelopes of hypercompacted earth mix 2 at different humidity levels.



377

378

Figure 13: Strength envelopes of Proctor compacted earth mix 1 at different humidity levels.

379

Table 4: Strength parameters of hypercompacted earth mix 1 at different humidity levels.

	M [-]	φ [°]	C [MPa]	c [MPa]
OVEN-DRY	2.31	56.6	3.53	2.31
RH = 25 %	1.74	42.3	4.20	2.20
RH = 62 %	1.12	28.2	4.77	2.28
RH = 95 %	1.24	30.8	3.15	1.52

380

381

Table 5: Strength parameters of hypercompacted earth mix 2 at different humidity levels.

	M [-]	φ [°]	C [MPa]	c [MPa]
OVEN-DRY	1.96	47.4	0.60	0.33
RH = 25 %	1.88	45.7	0.38	0.21
RH = 62 %	1.80	43.9	0.32	0.18
RH = 95 %	1.70	41.4	0.34	0.17

382

383

Table 6: Strength parameters of Proctor compacted earth mix 1 at different humidity levels.

	M [-]	φ [°]	C [MPa]	c [MPa]
OVEN-DRY	1.72	41.9	1.94	1.01
RH = 25 %	1.53	37.5	1.46	0.73
RH = 62 %	1.41	34.9	1.22	0.60
RH = 95 %	1.53	37.6	0.56	0.29


384

385 Inspection of Figures 11-13 and Tables 4-6 indicates that an increase of ambient humidity produces a
 386 decrease of friction angle that is more marked in the hypercompacted samples than in the Proctor
 387 compacted ones. Among the hypercompacted samples, the decrease is most evident for earth mix 1 as,
 388 in this case, the value of the friction angle decreases from 56.6° to 30.8° as the humidity level increases
 389 from oven-dry conditions to 95% (Table 4). As for the Proctor compacted samples of earth mix 1, the

390 friction angle changes relatively little with ambient humidity as shown by the approximately parallel
 391 strength envelopes of Figure 13.


392 Conversely, a variation of ambient humidity produces a change of cohesion that, in relative terms, is
 393 more modest for the hypercompacted samples (Tables 4 and 5) than for the Proctor compacted ones
 394 (Table 6). This is graphically shown in Figures 11 and 12 where the strength envelopes of the
 395 hypercompacted materials tend to converge towards a narrow area as the mean stress reduces towards
 396 zero. The trend is clearest for the hypercompacted earth mix 1, whose cohesion is approximately
 397 constant at all humidity levels (Table 4) - except for a deviation at a humidity of 95 % when a larger
 398 scatter of data is also observed.

399 Figures 14, 15 and 16 show the stiffness envelopes of the hypercompacted earth mix 1, hypercompacted
 400 earth mix 2 and Proctor compacted earth mix 1, respectively. These envelopes are obtained by plotting
 401 the values of the initial Young's modulus E , measured from the three triaxial tests under different
 402 confinement levels, against the corresponding values of radial stress σ at each humidity level. Inspection
 403 of Figures 14, 15 and 16 indicates that, as already observed for the strength, an increase of ambient
 404 humidity produces a decrease of stiffness. The effect of confinement on stiffness is less evident
 405 compared to strength as the Young's modulus remains relatively constant with growing radial stress at
 406 constant humidity. Only in the case of the oven-dry samples there is a clear increase of stiffness with
 407 growing radial confinement. In general, stiffness measurements present a larger scatter and a more
 408 uncertain trend compared to strength measurements, which reflects the relatively high inaccuracies
 409 associated to the determination of the initial Young's modulus.




410

411 Figure 14: Stiffness envelopes of hypercompacted earth mix 1 at different RH humidity levels.



412

413 Figure 15: Stiffness envelopes of hypercompacted earth mix 2 at different RH humidity levels.



414

415 Figure 16: Stiffness envelopes of Proctor compacted earth mix 1 at different humidity levels.

416 **4 CONCLUSIONS**

417 The mechanical properties of compacted soils strongly depend on dry density and this emphasizes the
 418 specific nature of earth building materials, which are generally much denser than standard geotechnical
 419 fills. This paper has presented an experimental investigation of the simultaneous effects of dry density,
 420 ambient humidity and particle grading on the mechanical behaviour of three earth building materials
 421 manufactured from soils with markedly distinct particle size distributions and compacted under
 422 significantly different efforts.

423

424 From this investigation, particle grading has emerged as a key parameter, whose influence on the
 425 mechanical performance of earth building materials has often been overlooked but it appears even more
 426 important than that of dry density or average particle size. This study has, for example, shown that the
 427 strength and stiffness of a Proctor compacted well-graded fine earth can be considerably higher than
 428 those of a hypercompacted poorly-graded coarse earth, despite the density of the former material is much
 429 lower than that of the latter one. This result is even more surprising if one considers that both those
 430 earths exhibit index properties (i.e. particle size distribution and plasticity characteristics) that comply
 431 with current earth building recommendations. The observed differences of strength and stiffness must
 432 therefore be entirely ascribed to disparities of particle grading. This finding should prompt further
 433 research on the optimisation of earth mixes for building applications together with a revision of current
 434 guidelines for the selection of suitable materials.

435

436 In line with previous investigations, the present study has also found that: a) material ductility grows
 437 with decreasing strength and increasing ambient humidity, b) mechanical characteristics tend to improve
 438 with growing dry density and c) growing levels of ambient humidity produce an increase of degree of
 439 saturation with a consequent deterioration of strength and stiffness.

440

441 Finally, shear strength increases significantly as the confining stress grows at all humidity levels, which
 442 highlights the beneficial effect of the lateral confinement inside thick walls. Conversely, material
 443 stiffness remains generally constant as lateral confinement increases at any level of ambient humidity.
 444 The magnitude of the increase of shear strength with lateral confinement depends on both particle
 445 grading and material density. In this work, it has been found that the beneficial effect of lateral
 446 confinement becomes more evident as dry density decrease and particle grading becomes poorer.

447

448 **5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

449 The authors wish to acknowledge the support of the European Commission via the Marie Skłodowska-
 450 Curie Innovative Training Networks (ITN-ETN) project TERRE 'Training Engineers and Researchers
 451 to Rethink geotechnical Engineering for a low carbon future' (H2020-MSCA-ITN-2015-675762).

452 **6 REFERENCES**

- 453 [1] P. A. Jaquin, C. E. Augarde, D. Gallipoli, & D. G. Toll, The strength of unstabilised rammed earth materials,
454 *Geotech.* 59 (5) (2009) 487-490.
- 455 [2] D. Gallipoli, A. W. Bruno, C. Perlot, & J. Mendes, A geotechnical perspective of raw earth building, *Acta*
456 *Geotech.* 12 (3) (2017) 463-478.
- 457 [3] J. C. Morel, A. Pkla, & P. Walker, Compressive strength testing of compressed earth blocks, *Constr Build*
458 *Mater.* 21 (2) (2007) 303-309.
- 459 [4] F. Pacheco-Torgal, & S. Jalali, Earth construction: Lessons from the past for future eco-efficient construction,
460 *Constr Build Mater.* 29 (2012) 512-519.
- 461 [5] C. T. S. Beckett, & C. E. Augarde, The effect of humidity and temperature on the compressive strength of
462 rammed earth, in: *Proc 2nd Euro Conf on Unsaturated Soils.* (2012) 287-292.
- 463 [6] Q. B. Bui, J. C. Morel, S. Hans, & P. Walker, Effect of moisture content on the mechanical characteristics of
464 rammed earth, *Constr Build Mater.* 54 (2014)163-169.
- 465 [7] P. Gerard, M. Mahdad, A. R. McCormack, & B. François, A unified failure criterion for unstabilized rammed
466 earth materials upon varying relative humidity conditions, *Constr Build Mater.* 95 (2015) 437-447.
- 467 [8] F. Champiré, A. Fabbri, J. C. Morel, H. Wong, & F. McGregor, Impact of relative humidity on the mechanical
468 behavior of compacted earth as a building material, *Constr Build Mater.* 110 (2016) 70-78.
- 469 [9] A. W. Bruno, D. Gallipoli, C. Perlot, & J. Mendes, Mechanical behaviour of hypercompacted earth for building
470 construction, *Mater Struct.* 50 (2) (2017)160.
- 471 [10] L. Xu, K. K. Wong, A. Fabbri, F. Champiré, & D. Branque, Loading-unloading shear behavior of rammed
472 earth upon varying clay content and relative humidity conditions. *Soils Found.* 58 (4) (2018) 1001-1015.
- 473 [11] R. A. Fisher, On the capillary forces in an ideal soil; correction of formulae given by WB Haines, *J Agric Sci.*
474 16 (3) (1926) 492-505.
- 475 [12] Q. B. Bui, J. C. Morel, S. Hans, et al, Compression behaviour of non-industrial materials in civil engineering
476 by three scale experiments: the case of rammed earth, *Mater Struct.* 42 (2009).
- 477 [13] V. Maniatidis, & P. Walker, A review of rammed earth construction. Innovation Project “Developing Rammed
478 Earth for UK Housing”, Natural Building Technology Group, Department of Architecture & Civil
479 Engineering, University of Bath (2003).
- 480 [14] P. Walker, R. Keable, J. Martin, & V. Maniatidis, *Rammed earth: design and construction guidelines* (2005).
- 481 [15] M. C. J. Delgado, & I. C. Guerrero, The selection of soils for unstabilised earth building: A normative review,
482 *Constr Build Mater.* 21 (2) (2007) 237-251.
- 483 [16] D. Ciancio, P. Jaquin, & P. Walker, Advances on the assessment of soil suitability for rammed earth, *Constr*
484 *Buil Mater.* 42 (2013) 40-47.
- 485 [17] P.A. Jaquin, C. E. Augarde, & L. Legrand, Unsaturated characteristics of rammed earth, in: *Proc 1st Euro Conf*
486 *on Unsaturated Soils* (2008) 417-422.
- 487 [18] W. J. Likos, & N. Lu, Hysteresis of capillary stress in unsaturated granular soil, *J Eng Mech.* 130 (6) (2004)
488 646-655.
- 489 [19] R. Delinière, J. E. Aubert, F. Rojat, & M. Gasc-Barbier, Physical, mineralogical and mechanical
490 characterization of ready-mixed clay plaster, *Build Environ.* 80 (2014) 11-17.
- 491 [20] C. H. Kouakou, & J. C. Morel, Strength and elasto-plastic properties of non-industrial building materials
492 manufactured with clay as a natural binder, *Appl Clay Sci.* 44 (1-2) (2009) 27-34.
- 493 [21] B. Taylor, S. Vardy, & C. MacDougall, Compressive strength testing of earthen plasters for straw bale wall
494 application, in: *Advances in Engineering Structures, Mechanics & Construction.* (2009) 175-183.
- 495 [22] E. Hamard, J. C. Morel, F. Salgado, A. Marcom, & N. Meunier, A procedure to assess the suitability of plaster
496 to protect vernacular earthen architecture, *J Cult Herit.* 14 (2) (2013)109-115.
- 497 [23] M. F. Attom, The effect of compactive energy level on some soil properties, *Appl Clay Sci.* 12 (1) (1997) 61-
498 72.
- 499 [24] A. W. Bruno, D. Gallipoli, C. Perlot, & J. Mendes, Effect of very high compaction pressures on the physical
500 and mechanical properties of earthen materials, in: *E3S Web of conferences*, EDP Sciences, 9 (2016) 14004.
- 501 [25] C. H. Kouakou, & J. C. Morel, Strength and elasto-plastic properties of nonindustrial building materials
502 manufactured with clay as a natural binder, *Appl Clay Sci.* 44 (1) (2009) 27-34.
- 503 [26] M. Olivier, & A. Mesbah, Le matériau terre: Essai de compactage statique pour la fabrication de briques de
504 terre compressées, *Bull Liaison Labo Ponts et Chaussées.* 146 (1986) 37-43.
- 505 [27] A. W. Bruno, *Hygro-mechanical characterisation of hypercompacted earth for sustainable construction.* PhD
506 Thesis. 2016.

- 507 [28]P. Walker, & T. Stace, Properties of some cement stabilised compressed earth blocks and mortars, *Mater*
508 *Struct*, 30 (9) (1997) 545-551.
- 509 [29]J. C. Morel, A. Pkla, & P. Walker, Compressive strength testing of compressed earth blocks, *Constr Buil*
510 *Mater*. 21 (2) (2007) 303-309.
- 511 [30]S. Deboucha, & R. Hashim, A review on bricks and stabilized compressed earth blocks, *Sci Res Essays*. 6(3)
512 (2011) 499-506.
- 513 [31]A. S. Muntohar, Engineering characteristics of the compressed-stabilized earth brick, *Constr Buil Mater*. 25
514 (11) (2011) 4215-4220.
- 515 [32]A. Cuccurullo, D. Gallipoli, A. W. Bruno, C. Augarde, P. Hughes, & C. La Borderie, Influence of particle
516 grading on the hygromechanical properties of hypercompacted earth, *J Buil Path Rehab*. 5(1) (2020) 1-9.
- 517 [33]AFNOR. XP P13-901; Compressed earth blocks for walls and partitions: definitions – Specifications – Test
518 methods – Delivery acceptance conditions (2001).
- 519 [34]CRATerre-EAG, CDI, Compressed earth blocks: Standards – Technology series No.11. Brussels: CDI (1998).
- 520 [35]MOPT, Bases Para el Diseño y Construcción con Tapial. Madrid, Spain: Centro de Publicaciones, Secretaría
521 General Técnica, Ministerio de Obras Públicas y Transportes (1992).
- 522 [36]TERCRUSO, Caractérisation des briques de terre crue de Midi-Pyrénées (2013).
523 http://www.cercad.fr/IMG/pdf/tercruso±rapport_final_lmdc2013-04-r120.pdf
- 524 [37]H. Houben, & H. Guillaud, Earth construction - A comprehensive guide, Second Edition. Intermediate
525 Technology Publications (1996).
- 526 [38]A. Cuccurullo, D. Gallipoli, A. W. Bruno, C. La Borderie, C. Augarde, & P. Hughes, The effect of ambient
527 humidity on the stiffness and strength of a hyper-compacted silty clay for earth building, in: *Proc 7th Int Conf*
528 *on Unsaturated Soils* (2018).
- 529 [39]AFNOR, NF P94-093; Soils: investigation and testing-Determination of the compaction reference values of a
530 soil type-Standard proctor test-Modified proctor test." Paris, France: Association Française de Normalisation,
531 18, (1999).
- 532 [40]AFNOR. XP P 94-041; Soils: investigation and testing – Granulometric description – Wet sieving method,
533 (1995).
- 534 [41]S. D. N. Lourenço, D. Gallipoli, C. E. Augarde, D. G. Toll, P. C. Fisher, & A. Congreve, Formation and
535 evolution of water menisci in unsaturated granular media, *Geotech*. 62 (3) (2012) 193-199.