

EXPERIMENTAL PRODUCTION OF SUSTAINABLE LIGHTWEIGHT CONCRETE FOR STRUCTURAL USES.

¹ Alonge O. Richard , ² Mahyuddin Ramli and ³ khaled M. al shareem.

¹ Postgraduate PhD. Student, School of Housing, Building and Planning, USM, Penang Malaysia.

² Profess. School of Housing, Building and Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia.

³ Postgraduate PhD. Student, School of Housing, Building and Planning, USM, Penang Malaysia.

Abstract.

Lightweight foamed concrete is recently acceptable for use in low strength capacity for building and civil construction purposes as a result of its peculiar features such as low thermal conductivity, low self weight and self compacting features hence its high workability. But its major demerits is its difficulty of high strength development when compared with normal concrete. The maximum strength achieved so far is less than 25N/mm² even at higher density of between 1500kg/m³ and 1800kg/m³. Strength development of foamed concrete depends largely on some factors which are the constituents of the base mix, the density of foam and the water cement ratio of the base mix. This paper study the base mix parameters to produce a sustainable foamed concrete by substituting cement which is a source of carbon dioxide, a green house emission elements, with a cementitious material, fly ash within a range of 10% up to 50% and water cement ratio 0.35 was used. With a target density of 1600kg/m³, it was concluded that a low strength sustainable foamed concrete structural panel could only be produced with 10% replacement of cement.

Keywords- Concrete, Sustainable concrete, Lightweight foamed concrete, Compressive strength, Fly ash.

1.0. Introduction.

The incessant release of anthropogenic greenhouse gases has been causing climate changes over some years now and this fact has been established through research studies that there is global growth of Carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere. Studies have shown that production of Portland cement alone accounted for approximately 5%-7% of the total global Carbon dioxide emissions through various human activities. A further study shows that a tone of concrete produced carbon dioxide of between 0.05 to 0.13 tonnes approximately ninety-five percent of the total estimated carbon dioxide emissions derived from production of concrete [1]. [2], considered buildings as one of the largest end consumer of energy. It was established that building sector accounts for 25 to 40% of final energy demand.

Concrete is considered worldwide as the most important building material and also the most common materials used in the construction of building or civil engineering structures. The reason behind this are not farfetched; if concrete is properly and adequately designed and produced, it possess some valuable

conductive and economic features through its properties chemically, physically and mechanically, hence its popularity in the world, its durability and adaptability is worldwide friendly. As a result of its environmental impact also, it remain one of the most costly materials of construction. Concrete is moldable, affordable highly resistance to fire attack, easy to work with and readily available. It can be worked upon to meet up with any specifications or requirements easily modifiable hence term engineering materials.

Ordinary concrete has been found to contains about 12% cement and 80% aggregates by mass,[3]. Furthermore,[1], explained that mining large quantities or raw materials for the production of cement such as limestone and clay and fuel such as coal often results in extensive deforestation or denudation and top soil loss. All these need of vast quantity of natural resources to produce estimated billions of tons of concrete each year resulted in great impact on the immediate environment. Apart from the estimated 5% - 7% of the global loading of carbon dioxide (CO₂) into the air annually, cement industry through the production of Portland cement is also considered to be energy intensive. Likewise, quite a large quantity of water is required for the production of concrete, this is considered burdensome considering the availability of good fresh water suitable for concrete production, [4]. The continuous use of natural aggregate and the use of cement in the production of concrete conventionally have negative effect on the environment. This effect on the habitat is the extraction of aggregates from pits and quarries results in the destruction of the natural habitats of many organisms and in the disturbance of pre-existing stream flow and water resources [5]. With all these deficiency of the contemporary concrete, there is needs for the production of concrete that will be more environmental friendly hence this laboratory experiment.

Sustainable concrete is a concrete that is more friendly to the environment, that maintain a state or nature as it is without compromising the unborn generation potentials. It's a concrete that possess some if not all the green building index parameters such as energy efficiency, indoor environmental quality, sustainable site planning and management, water efficiency, innovation and materials and resources. At least, four out of these parameters must be met by supposed sustainable concrete. The actual reason for the production of green concrete is that we need to live most lightly on the earth surface as much as possible. Green concrete targets on increasing the resource use of energy efficiency, water and materials efficiency and at the same time reducing the impact of these various activities on human health well being and the environment.

Lightweight concrete is a material with low mechanical properties compared to contemporary normal weight concrete and it was described by [6,7] as a cementitious materials that contains a minimum of 20% by volume of mechanically entrained foam in the mortar slurry in which air pores are entrapped in the matrix by means of a suitable foaming agent. Foamed concrete can be manufactured by adding a foaming agent to a cement based mortar. The foaming agent can be applied and the foam formed through a gentle but thorough mixing or the foaming agent can be aerated before being added to the mixture (i.e. prefoaming). A laboratory test conducted on lightweight foamed concrete's long and short term properties revealed that the material could be used for structural elements [8]. The beneficial features among others include low thermal conductivity, which is lesser than 0.5W/mk, low self weight hence lightweight which is of the range of between 400kg/m³ and 1800kg/m³. In term of sustainability features, it's energy efficient in production and use. The water efficiency is high compared to normal weight concrete, it is a new innovation and it does not cause environmental degradation because there is no use of aggregates.

Cementitious material includes among others hydraulic cements and some pozzolans that complement hydraulic cement behavior or in some instances act same way as hydraulic cement.

Fly ash is considered to be one of the most widely used cementitious materials and used in about 50% of ready mixed concrete. Generally, complimentary cementitious material contributes to both fresh and hardened properties of concrete since their basic chemical components are similar. Fly ash as one of the cementitious materials can affect concrete as follows, less water to achieve workability, it may delay the setting time, and strength may be depressed during the early days but later increase because of fly ash reaction rates are initially slower but continue longer. It also reduces heat of hydration of concrete, permeability is reduced and resistance to chloride ion penetration is improved. Fly ash can be class C or Class F depending on their microstructures. Class F fly ash is generally used in concrete mix at the dosage of 15% to 25% by mass of the cementitious material while class C fly ash is generally used at the dosages of 15% to 40% dosage depending on the desired effects on the concrete.[9]. In the same vein, fly ash according to [10-13] have been used in various ranges of 30-70% content of cements weight substitute.

2.0. Benefits of research.

The Universal goals based on agenda 21 established in RIO summit in Brazil is a path to follow in all industries to make the earth surface free of green house gas emission in which Carbon dioxide, a constituent of popular hydraulic cement, Portland cement, is a major causes. Using cementitious materials as a partial substitute of the most used and popular cement is quite challenging to achieve a good and acceptable strength as compared to the concrete produced with the popular cement. This research study shall by no means be a beacon of references for any concrete with high substitute of normal cement hence sustainable concrete. This in turn, shall help the environment at large in the reduction of carbon dioxide.

3.0. Materials and Mix proportion.

3.1. Materials.

The cement used in this research study was ordinary Portland cement type I conforming to ASTM C150[14] sourced locally and supplied by Tasek Corporation Berhad, the class C fly ash was supplied by a local supplier, Fosroc Sdn. Bhd. And conformed to ASTM C618 [15] Fine aggregates was sourced and supplied locally in Penang state of Malaysia. The fine aggregate was of 300microns and of specific gravity 2.52[16]. Portable water supplied by Penang state water board was used. No chemical additive was used in this experiment. The foam was produced using a protein based foam agent in ratio of 1:35 dilution in water and a Portal PM-1 foam generator available at HBP Laboratory of Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia, was used to generate the foam to a density of 80kg/m³. Table 1 and 2 shows the details of the constituents of the materials used in this experiment.

112 Table 1 Physical property of cement, sand and fly ash.

Types of materials	Density in kg/mm ³	Specific surface area(m ² /kg)
Portland cement(type1)ASTM 150.[14]	C 3.15	300
Fly ash(powder form)	2.3	500
Fine sand(natural)	2.1	Fineness modulus: 1.65.

113

114 Table 2.

115 Chemical composition of cement and fly ash

Oxide in %	cement	Fly ash.
Silicon oxide,	20.55	59.00
Aluminium oxide	4.78	19.58
Ferrous oxide	3.64	7.23
Calcium oxide	63.94	0.54
Magnesium oxide	1.50	4.64
Sulphur oxide	2.77	0.69
Sodium oxide	0.25	0.48
Potassium oxide	0.77	5.95
Chloride oxide	0.0350	0.0114
Loss on ignition	1.24	0.49
Insoluble residue	1.36	-
Free calcium oxide	1.25	-
Specific gravity (g/cm ³)	3.16	2.06

116 3.2. Mix proportion.

117 The mix proportion guideline of ASTM C796 [17] was followed in the laboratory mixing. It is peculiar
 118 to cement slurry that was used and modified to suit the production of the foam concrete used for this study
 119 with a targeted 1600kg/m³ density.

120

The mixing procedure commences with the cleaning of the laboratory mixer and the excess water was drained, one third of the calculated mixing water was added, then the fine sand followed by the cement. The materials was allowed to mix for almost 3minutes, then the fly ash and the remaining water was added, this was allowed to blend together till appreciable slurry was achieved. The density of the base mix was then taken in accordance to [18] and the slump was also measured as described by [19-20]. The preformed foam was then added to the base mix through the nozzle of the foam generator according to the calculated amount at the flow rate per seconds. The density of the foam concrete produced was then checked against the target density, 1600kg/m³ This is the process that was observed for all the mix proportion used in this study but with the fly ash as substitute of cement content at 10, 20, 30 and 50% and the slump target of 200mm and water cement ratio of 0.35, So as to achieve the objective of this study.

The mixed foam concrete was then casted into cube moulds of 100mm x 100mm sizes and proper molding was achieve by gently tapping the sides of the molds with a rubber hammer and not with a hard object that can cause agitation to the concrete in the mould, this is in accordance to the recommendation of [21]. The samples were mixed under the ambient temperature of between 27±3 °c and 29±3°c for the days of the mixing of the samples.

After each mix, the samples were transferred to the laboratory curing space and covered with black plastic sheets to prevent direct exposure to wind and climatic conditions especially evaporation process. The specimen remained under same condition till 24hours later when the specimens were demoulded and the fresh density of concrete was measured, each sample marked before separated and transferred to the place where to be cured using three different curing systems, which are water curing, moist curing and air curing. Two samples each for each day of the three types of curing system. This was done so that proper and adequate comparison can be achieved for accurate or near accurate result. So in all, nine samples were casted for each day's testing , 7, 14 and 28 days making a total of 27 cube samples per experiment each parameter of 10% - 50% fly ash substitute for cement .

All the samples remained under same curing condition till dates of testing except the water and moisture cured that was removes and placed in an oven for 24hrs before testing. The density was checked before placing in an oven and after placing in an oven. A typical mixing proportion used was highlighted in table 3

Table 3. Show the mix proportion.

Sample id.	Sand kg	Cement kg	Water kg	Fly-ash kg	Foam %	Target density	Actual density	Slump mm
C1600-NF	58.44	29.22	13.15	-	22.94	1600	1680	200
C1600-FA10	54.84	24.68	9.60	2.74	25.11	1600	1670	200
C1600-FA20	54.84	21.94	12.16	5.48	25.11	1600	1670	200
C1600-FA30	59.82	20.94	14.27	8.99	24.09	1600	1670	200
C1600-FA50	58.44	14.61	13.85	14.61	22.22	1600	1680	200

4.0. Laboratory tests methods

Each test result is represented by three cube samples 100mm and all tested to determine their density and compressive strength at various ages of 7,14 and 28 after water, moisture and air curing. After demoulding samples were placed in their respective curing position till the test dates except that of the water and moisture curing that was removed a day before test and kept in the oven 24hrs before the test. All specimens were tested at saturated surface dry condition and carried out according to [22] and the compressive strength of all the samples were tested immediately after the determination of the density according to [23] for each stage.

5.0. Result discussion.

5.1. Saturated Surface dry density.

Table 4 shows the result of the saturated dry density for all the samples and the compressive strengths. The result of the saturated density shows that the density of all samples containing fly ash reduced significantly compared to that of control samples without fly ash (C1600-NF). And when compared those that contain fly ash it could be observed that at 28days, the density was increasing relatively to the percentage of the fly ash content, the more the fly ash volume, the higher the saturated density. In all this result shows that the presence of fly ash reduces the overall density of the samples and this occurs increasingly over days. This is shown in fig. 1 graphically.

Sample Id.	Density(kg/m) 7days	Density(kg/m) 14days	Density(kg/m) 28days	Compressive strength(Mpa) 7days	Compressive strength(Mpa) 14days	Compressive strength(Mpa) 28days
C1600 -NF	1721	1730	1740	9.5	11.0	11.5
C1600 -FA10	1688	1704	1712	8.6	8.8	10.5
C1600 -FA20	1673	1735	1739	8.4	8.8	9.0
C1600 -FA30	1712	1722	1735	7.5	8.0	8.2
C1600 -FA50	1616	1643	1659	3.2	4.3	4.8

Note: This represent the mean results of the three curing system used for the study.

5.2. Compressive strength.

As shown in table 4, there is progressive increase of the compressive strength of all the samples as the days increases but when the compressive strength of all samples that contain fly ash are compared to that of control samples without fly ash, it could be observed that it was higher. This can likely be as a result of the homogenous nature of foamed concrete and the density of the fine sand that is higher than that of fly ash.

More so, it was established through studies that by [24] that the appropriate days of testing foam concrete with high fly ash content should be minimum of 56days. And also the microstructure feature of fly ash is another factor that can affect the strength of the samples. Meanwhile, the samples without fly ash has the highest compressive strength of 11.5Mpa at 28days, this is far lower compared to the compressive strength

of normal concrete of minimum 25Mpa at 28days. Among the samples with fly ash content as reflected by Fig 2, the sample with fly ash content of 10%, C1600-FA10 has the highest compressive strength and about 14.3% higher than that of samples with 20% fly ash volumes. The samples with 20% fly ash volume also has the compressive strength that is higher than that of 30% volume of fly ash, while the samples with 50% volume has the lowest compressive strength with only 4.8Mpa. Fig 2. It was observed that the higher the contents of the fly ash in the samples the lower the compressive strength. This goes to indicate that there is a limited limit to which hydraulic cement can be substituted in foam concrete so that the compressive strength will not be affected. With this indication, then it will be suggested that a certain limit of probably 20% substitute should be adopted for foamed concrete that is to achieve structural strength. It can also be deduced that, a sustainable foamed concrete with a maximum 20% substitute of hydraulic cement can be achieved. This can go a long way to reduce the carbon dioxide content of foamed concrete hence sustainable. As study by [25] shows that every ton of cement produced leads to about 0.9tons of carbon dioxide and a typical cubic yard(0.7643m^3) of concrete contains about 10% by weight of cement. With this expression, a sustainable concrete as produced will by no means reduce some certain percentage of carbon dioxide with substitution of cement by certain percentage of supplementary cementitious material as fly ash




Fig. 1 Shows the density at various test age.




Fig. 2 shows the compressive strength of samples at test age.

6.0. Conclusion

The result of this experimental study of sustainable lightweight foamed concrete production with various volume of fly ash as substitute of cement reveals the following.

- The saturated surface dry density results shows that the presence of fly ash reduce the saturated dry density of samples compared to the control samples.
- The Compressive strength was also reducing relatively to the volume of fly ash present in the samples. The higher the fly ash volume, the lower the compressive strength.
- That the production of sustainable concrete is possible with the substitution of the volume of hydraulic cements hence reduce carbon dioxide emission.

219 REFERENCES.

- 220 1. Mehta, P.K., *Reducing the environmental impact of concrete*. Concrete international, 2001.
221 23(10): p. 61-66.
- 222 2. Gore, C., *Globalization, the international poverty trap and chronic poverty in the least*
223 *developed countries*. 2003.
- 224 3. Neville, A.M., *Properties of concrete*. 1995.
- 225 4. Alonge O. R. and R.B. Mahyuddin., *A Qualitative Study of Green Building Indexes Rating of*
226 *Lightweight Foam Concrete*. Journal of Sustainable Development, 2011. 4(5): pp188.
- 227 5. Winfield, M. and A. Taylor, *Replacing the load: The need for an aggregates conservation*
228 *strategy for Ontario, Report published by Pembina Institute for Appropriate Development*.
229 2005, ISBN 0-921719-71-X.
- 230 6. Dhira, R., M. Jones, and L. Nicol, *Development of Structural Grade Foamed Concrete*. Final
231 Report, DETR Research Contract, 1999. 39(3): p. 385.
- 232 7. Mellin, P., *Development of Structural Grade Foamed Concrete*. 1999, MSc dissertation, 1999,
233 University of Dundee.
- 234 8. Kearsley, E., *Just foamed concrete—an overview*. Specialist techniques and materials for
235 construction. London: Thomas Telford, 1999: p. 227-37
- 236 9. ACI Committee 232, use of fly ash in concrete, American concrete Institute, Farmington Hills,
237 MI, USA, 2004.
- 238 10. Jones, M. and A. McCarthy, *Utilising unprocessed low-lime coal fly ash in foamed concrete*.
239 Fuel, 2005. 84(11): p. 1398-1409.
- 240 11. Kearsley, E. and P. Wainwright, *The effect of high fly ash content on the compressive strength of*
241 *foamed concrete*. Cement and concrete research, 2001. 31(1): p. 105-112.
- 242 12. Jones, M. and A. McCarthy, *Utilising unprocessed low-lime coal fly ash in foamed concrete*.
243 Fuel, 2005. 84(11): p. 1398-1409.
- 244 13. Jones, M.R., M.J. McCarthy, and A. McCarthy. *Moving fly ash utilization in concrete forward:*
245 *A UK Perspective*. 2003.
- 246 14. ASTM C150. Standard specification for Portland cement, annual book of ASTM International,
247 West Conshohocken, PA, 2001. DOI: 10.1520/C0150_C0150M-11.www.astm.org.
- 248 15. ASTM C618-08a. Standard specification for fly ash and raw or calcinated natural pozzolana for
249 use as a mineral admixture in Portland cement concrete, ASTM International, West
250 Conshohocken, PA,(1989).DOI: 10.1520/C0618-08A.www.astm.org.
- 251 16. Sach, J. and H. Seifert. *Foamed concrete technology: Possibilities for thermal insulation at high*
252 *temperatures*. in *CFI. Ceramic forum international*. 1999: Göller.
- 253 17. ASTM C796-97. Standard test method for foaming agents for use in producing cellular concrete
254 using preformed foam, ASTM International, West
255 Conshohocken,PA,1989,DOI:10.1520/C0033-03.www.astm.org.
- 256 18. BS EN 12350 Part I. Testing fresh concrete sampling. British Standards Institution,
257 London.(2000).
- 258 19. Brady, K., G. Watts, and M. Jones, *Specification for foamed concrete*. Highways Agency and
259 TRL Application Guide AG, 2001. 39.
- 260 20. Nambiar, E.K.K. and K. Ramamurthy, *Models for strength prediction of foam concrete*.
261 Materials and structures, 2008. 41(2): p. 247-254.

- 262 21. ASTM C796-97. (1989), Standard test method for foaming agents for use in producing cellular
263 concrete using preformed foam, ASTM International, West
264 Conshohocken, PA, 1989, DOI: 10.1520/C0033-03. www.astm.org.
- 265 22. British Standards Institution. "British standard testing **concrete**. Part 114: **Methods**
266 for **determination of density of hardened concrete**." BS 1881: Part 114: 1983, London.
267 British Standards Institution. (1983c)
- 268 23. ASTM, *Standard test method for foaming agents for use in producing cellular concrete using*
269 *preformed foam*, in *ASTM C 796-97*. 1997: Philadelphia.
- 270 24. Jones, M. and A. McCarthy, *Preliminary views on the potential of foamed concrete as a*
271 *structural material*. Magazine of concrete research, 2005. **57**(1): p. 21-32.
- 272 25. Obla, K.H., *What is Green Concrete?* The Indian Concrete Journal, 2009. **24**: p. 26-28.