#### CHAPTER V

#### EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION

5.1 Nature of Apparatus The Blaine air permeability apparatus consists essentially of a means of drawing a definite quantity of air through a prepared bed of soil of definite porosity. The number and size of the pores in a prepared bed of definite porosity is a function of the size of the particles and determines the rate of air flow through the bed. The apparatus, illustrated in Fig. 1, 2, 3 consist specifically of the parts described in the following

Permeability Cell The permeability cell consists of a 1.27+0.10 c.m. rigid cylinder inside diamter, constructed of glass (or noncorroding metal). The top of the cell is at right angles to the principal axis of the cell. The bottom of the cell forms an airtight connection with the top of the manometer. A ledge 1/2 to 1 m.m. in width is an integral part of the cell or firmly fixed in the cell of 6.0 c.m., 6.5 c.m., 7.5 c.m. for clay size, silt size and sand size respectively, from the top of the cell to support the perforated metal disk.

Disk The disk is constructed of brass and is 0.9+0.1 m.m. in thickness, perforated with 30 to 40 holes 1 m.m. in diameter equally distributed over its area. The disk is to fit the inside of the cell snugly.

Plunger The plunger fits into the cell with a clearance of not more than 0.1 m.m. The bottom of the plunger is at right angles to the principal axis. An air vent is provided. either in the center or on one side of plunger. The top of the plunger is provided with a collar in such a way that when the plunger is placed in the cell and the collar brought in contact with the top of the cell, the distance between the bottom of the plunger and the top of the perforated disk will be 1.0+0.1 c.m. for clay size, 1.5+0.1 c.m. for silt size, 2.5+0.1 c.m. for sand size.

Filter Paper The filter paper is medium retentive, corresponding to type 1, grade B, as prescribed in Federal Specification for Paper; Filtering (U.U. P-236). The filter paper disks are circular, with smooth edges, and have the same diameter as the inside of the cell.

Manometer Three U-tube manometers are constructed according to the design indicated in Fig.1, 2, 3, with the use of nominal 0.4, 0.8, 2.0 c.m. inside diameter for clay size, silt size and sand size respectively, standard wall and galss tubing. The top of one arm of the manometer forms an airtight connection with the permeability cell. The manometer arm connected to the permeability cell has a line etched around the tube at 12.5 to 14.5 c.m. below the top of the side outlet and at distances of 1.5 c.m., 7.0 c.m., and 11.0 c.m. above that line. A side outlet is  $\vec{\psi}$ r0 c.m., and 11.0 c.m. above that line. A side outlet is provided at 25.0 to 30.5 c.m. above the bottom of the manometer for use in the evacuation of the manometer arm connected to the permeability cell. A positive airtight valve

or clamp is provided on the side outlet not more than 5 c.m. from the manometer arm. The manometer is mounted firmly and in such a manner that the arms are horizontal.

Manometer Liquid The manometer is filled to the mid point with a nonvolatiže, nonhygroscopic liquid of low viscosity and density, such as dibutylphtalate.

Timer The timer is accurate to 0.5 second for time intervals up to 60 seconds, and to 1 percent for time intervals over 60 seconds. 5.2 Calibration of Apparatus

The calibration of the air permeability apparatus was made with the use of the current lot of National Bureau of Standard cement sample No. 114. The standard sample was at room temperature when tested. The bulk volume of the compacted bed was determined by the mercury displacement method as follows:

Placed two filter paper disks in the permeability cell, pressing down the edges with a rod slightly smaller than the cell diameter until the filter disks were flat on the perforated brass disk; then filled the cell with mercury, removing any air bubbles adhering to the wall of the cell. Levelling the mercury with the top of the cell by means of a small glass plate. Removed the mercury from the cell, weighed, and recorded the weight of the mercury. Removed one of the filter disks from the cell. Using a trial quantity of sample, compressed the sample with one filter disk above and one below the sample. Filled the space remaining in the top of the cell with mercury, removing entrapped air, and levelling off the top as before. Removed the murcury from the cell, weighed and recorded the weight of mercury. The bulk volume occupied by the

cement was calculated to the nearest 0.005 cu.cm. as follows:

$$
-\frac{W_{A}-W_{B}}{D} \qquad (10)
$$

Where

-V

WR

 $\texttt{w}_\texttt{B}$ 

bulk volume of sample in cubic centimeters grams of mercury required to fill cell, no sample being in cell

grams of mercury required to fill the portion of the cell not occupied by the prepared bed of sample in the cell, and

density of mercury at temperature of test in grams per cubic centimeters (See Table I)

The weight of the standard sample used for the calibration test was that required to produce a bed of cement having a porosity of 0.500+0.005, and was calculated as follows:

 $W = PQ(1 - R)$ 

 $(11)$ 

grams of sample required specific gravity of sample (=3.15 for standard sample)

bulk volume of bed of sample in cubic centimeters

desired porosity of bed of sample (0.500+0.005 for standard cement sample)

#### 5.3 Préparation of Standard Sample

where

The contents of a vial of the standard cement sample were enclosed in a 4-0z. jar and shaken vigorously for 2 minute to fluff the cement and break up lumps or agglomerates.

### 5.4 Preparation of Bed of Sample

The perforated disk was seated on the ledge in the permeability cell. A filter paper disk was placed on the brass disk and the edges pressed down with a rod slightly smaller than the cell diameter. A quantity of sample determined in section 5.2 and weighed to the nearest 0.01 gm. was to be placed in the cell. The side of the cell was tapped lightly in order to level the bed of sample. A filter paper disk was placed on top of the sample and the sample compressed with the plunger until the plunger collar was in contact with the top of the cell. The plunger was removed slowly and the permeability test was started.

#### 5.5 Permeability Test

The permeability cell was attached to the manometer tube, making certain that an airtight connection was obtained.

The air in one arm of the manometer u-tube was slowly evacuated until the liquid reaches the top mark, and the valve was closed tightly. The timer was started as the bottom of the meniscus of the manometer liquid reached the second (next to the top) mark and was stopped as the bottom of the meniscus of liquid reached the third (next to the bottom) mark. The time interval measured was noted and recorded in seconds. The temperature of test was noted and recorded in degrees Centigrade.

### 5.6 Permeability Test for Soil Sample

The permeability test for soil sample was made in accordance with the method described in 5.5, except that the definite porosity is not known and the trial values were used to find the minimum possible porosity. Each sample was tested many times to meet this requirement and the time of flow determinations were recorded for calculating the specific surface. Calculation of specific surface value was made according to the following formulas:

$$
s = \frac{s_{s} \int_{s} (1 - E_{s}) \sqrt{E}}{\int (1 - E) \sqrt{E_{s}^{3}} \sqrt{E_{s}}}
$$
 (7)

when the temperature of the test of the test sample was within  $\pm 3^{\circ}$ c. of the temperature of calibration test of the standard finess sample, and if the temperature of tests was outside of this range the following equation was used

$$
S = S_{s} \int_{s} (1 - E_{s}) \sqrt{\eta_{s}} \sqrt{E^{3} \sqrt{\epsilon}}
$$
\n
$$
\int (1 - E) \sqrt{E_{s}^{3}} \sqrt{\tau_{s}} \sqrt{\eta}
$$
\n(8)

The apparatus shall be recalibrated in the following cases.

1) At periodic intervals to correct for possible wear on plunger or permeability cell.

> If any loss in manometer fluid occurs, and  $2)$

If a change was made in the type or quality of the filter 3) paper used for thettests.

Symbols

 $S_{\rm g}$ 

դ

 $\eta_{\mathbf{S}}$ 

F.

specific surface in sq. cm. per gram of the test S. sample,

specific surface in sq.c.m. per gram of the standard sample used in calibration of the apparatus, measured time interval, in seconds, of manometer drop for test sample

measured time interval in seconds of manometer drop for standard sample used in calibration of the apparatus

viscosity of air in poises at the temperature of test of the test sample

viscosity of air in poises at the temperature of test of the standard sample used in calibration of the apparatus

porosity of prepared bed of test sample porosity of prepared bed of standard sample used in calibration of apparatus specific gravity of test sample, and specific gravity of standard sample used in calibration of apparatus (=3.15)







# Table I Density of Mercury, Viscosity of Air (n), and

 $\mathbf{\hat{30}}$ 

 $\sqrt{n}$  at Given Temperature.



# Blaine's Air Permeability Apparatus Calibration

with Standard Cement Sample  $(S_s = 3380 \cdot \frac{cm^3}{gm})$ 



Calibrating with 00.40 c.m. Glass Tube

Calibrating with 00.80 c.m. Glass Tube

Test No.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Average
Weight of Cement(gm)	2.980	2.980.	2.980	2.980	2.980	2.980
Volume of $Cement$ $(cm)$	1.891	1.891	1.891	1.891	1.891	1.891
Porosity $E_{\mathbf{S}}$	0.4997	0.4997	0.4997	0.4997	0.4997	0.4997
Temperature $\overline{T}$ ( $\overline{c}$ )	27.8	.27.8	27.50	27.80	27.80	27.74
Time t (Sec.)	100.0	100.3	99.1	98.6	97.8	99.16

Test No.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Average
Weight of Cement (gm)	4.585	4.585	4.585	4.585	4.585	4.585
Volume of Cement (cm)	2.911	2.911	2.911	2.911	2.911	2.911
Porosity E £.	0.500	0.500	0.500 <sup>°</sup>	0.500	0.500	0.500
Tempera- ture T S $\bullet$ ( $^{\circ}$ c)	28.0	'28.0'	28.3	28.2	$-28.3$	28.26
Time t <sub>s</sub>	991.3	1053.1	1011.4 1014.6 1022.3			018.54

Calibrating with 02.0 c.m.Glass Tube

Result from Testing 00.40 c.m. Glass Tube

Sample P.354 ( $G = 2.739$ )



Sample 5992 (2.671)

Test No.	1	$\overline{2}$	3	4	5
Moist Wt. (gm.)	1.10	1.40	1.60	1.70	1.80
$\frac{Ww}{2}$ 100 W moist	6.10	6.10	6.10	6.10	6.10
Dry Wt. (gm.)	1.0329	1.3146	1.5024	1.5963	1.6902
Volume /cm3	1.199	1.199	1.205	1.207	1.213
Porosity	0.6775	0.5895	0.5332	0.5049	0.4783
Temperature 30.2 $T(^0c)$		30.2	30.7	30.9	31.4
Time t (Sec.)	7.0	46.0	82.74	261.82	417.9

Result from Testing 00.40 c.m. Glass Tube (Continued)

Sample No. 2  $(G=2.615)$ 



Sample No. 3 (G=2.595)



Result from Testing 00.40 c.m. Glass Tube (Continued)

# Sample No. 5  $(G=2.645)$



### Computating the Result

 $P_e$ 354 Sample



### Sample 5992



Computating the Result (Continued)



38

Sample  $P_f^{886}$ 



# Computating the Result (Continued).

# Sample No. 2



#### Sample No. 3



#### Sample No. 5



Result from Testing 00.80 c.m. Glass Tube



Sample No.2 Reddish Brown Silty Sand (G=2.615)

Sample No. 3

Test No.	1	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{3}$	$\frac{1}{4}$
Moist Wt (gm.)	3.0	3.10	3.15	3.20
Wwx100 W moist	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.32
Dry Wt. (gm.)	2.9604		3.05908 3.10842	3.15776
Volume (c.m)	1.930	1.930	1.930	1.930
Porosity	0.4089		0.3892 0.3794	0.3695
Tempera- ture $T({}^0c)$	30.0	30.0	29.0	29.0
Time t (Sec.)	65.74	85.70	105.02	125.15

Result from Testing 00.80 c.m. Glass Tube (Continued)



Sample No. 5 Light Reddish Brown Silty Sand (G=2.615)

Sample No. 1 StReddish Brown Very 2Fine Sand (G= 2.662)



Result from Testing 00.80 c.m. Glass Tube (Continued)

Sample No. 4

Test No. 1		$\overline{2}$	$\mathbf{3}$
Moist Wt. (gm.)	3.10	3.20	3.30
Wwx100 W moist	1.63	1.63	1.63
Dry Wt. (g;m.)	3.04947	3.14784	3.24621
Volume, (c.m.)	1.9038	1.9401	1.9778
Porosity	0.3965	0.3887	0.3816
Tempera- ture $T(^0c)$	29.0	29.0	29.0
Time (Sec.)	10.3	13.8	15.1

 $42$ 

 $\sqrt{1}$ 

### Computating the Result





Sample No.

Е



Sample No. 5

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	$(8) = (4) \times (5)$ x(6)x(7)
Test No	Porosity Time E	(Sec.)	$n_{\rm s}$ $\mathfrak{n}$	$K = \int_S (1 - E_s) S_s$ $\int \sqrt{\mathbf{g}^3} \sqrt{\mathbf{t}}_s$	$ f(E)=\frac{E^3}{2}$ . $\sqrt{(1-E)^2}$	NE	Specific Sur- face $S_{\ldots}$ (c.m. $^2/$ $gm.$ )
	0.4252	44.54	1	578.233	0.482	6.674	1860.099
$\overline{\mathbf{2}}$	0.4060	74.40		578.233	0.436	8.626	2174.697
3.	0.3868	86.12		578.233	0.392	9.280	2103.473
4	0.3773	106.40	$\mathbf{1}$	578.233	0.372	10.315	2218.784
5 <sup>′</sup>	0.3677	115.32	1	578.233	0.353	10.739	2192.004

Sample No.  $\mathbf{1}$ 

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	$(4)$ x $(5)$ $(8) = x(6)x(7)$
	Test No. Porosity Time	t (Sec.)	$\frac{\eta_{\rm s}}{2}$	$K = \frac{\int_{S} (1-E_{s})S_{s}}{\sqrt{3}\sqrt{2}} [f(E)] = \sqrt{\frac{E^{3}}{(1-E)^{2}}}$ $\sqrt{\mathbf{E}_\mathrm{s}^3/\mathbf{E}_\mathrm{s}}$		$\sqrt{\frac{t}{}}$	Specific Sur- face S 2 (c.m. / Sec.)
	0.3982	5.20		568.024	0.418	2.280	541.350
$\mathbf{2}$	0.3781	6.66		568.024	0.374	2.581	548.310
3	0.3581	8.50		568.024	0.334	2.915	553.033

### Computating the Result

Sample No. 4





Result from Testing 02.0 c.m. Glass Tube

 $46$ 

Sample No. 2



Sample No. 3

Test No.		$\overline{\mathbf{2}}$
Moist Wt (gm.)	4.70	4.80
<b>Wwx100</b> W moist	1.32	1.32
Dry Wt. (gm.)	4.63796	4.73664
Volume, (c.m.)	2.911	2.911
Porosity E	0.3860	0.3730
Tempera- ture $T({}^{\circ}c)$	30.3	30.5
Time t (Sec.)	996.13	1156.0

Result from Testing Ø2.0 c.m. Glass Tube (Continued)

Test No.	1	$\overline{2}$
Moist Wt (gm.)	4.80	4.90
<b>Wwx100</b> W moist	1.17	1.17
Dry Wt. (gm.)	4.74384	4.84267
Volume (c.m.)	2.8809	2.911
Porosity E	0.3775	0.3711
Temperat ture T(02) 30.3		28.9
Time t (Sec.)	996.24	1106.2

Sample No. 5

Sample No. 1

Test No.		$\overline{2}$	3	4	5
Moist Wt. (gm.)	4.70	4.80	4.90	5.00	5.10
Ww x100 W moist	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14
Dry Wt. $(g_m.)$	4.69342	4.79328	4.89314	4.993	5.09286
Volume <sub>3</sub> (c.m.)	2.8299	2.8728	2.8728	2.8787	2.8839
Porosity	0.3770	0.3732	0.3602	0.3484	0.3366
Temperat ture $T^{\prime}$ c)	30.4	30.4	30.4	30.4	30.9
Time (Sec.)	76.80	86.02	98.02	115.20	135.60

Result from Testing 02.0 c.m. Glass Tube (Continued)



# Sample No. 4 Light Grey Very Fine Sand

Sample No. 7

Very Fine Sand Passing No. 80 Sieve - No. 400 Sieve



# Computating the Result

Sample No. 2



#### Sample No.  $\mathbf{3}$



Sample No. 5



Computating the Result (Continued)



 $\overline{1}$  $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$ 

c.  $\overline{\phantom{0}}$ 

Sample No. 4



Computating the Result (Continued)

Sample No. 7



(Reddish Brown Silty Sand) No. 2



Average Dia =  $\frac{6}{S_v}$ 118,952.76 m.m.  $^{2}/gm$ . Specific Surface of Soil  $\Sigma(8)$  $= 0.0193$  m.m.  $\Sigma(4)$ 1189.53 c.m.  $^{2}/gm$ .  $= 19.3 \mu$ or  $=$ 

No. 3 - Light Grey Silty Sand

 $G = 2.595$ 

 $r_w = 10^{-3}$  gm./m.m.<sup>3</sup> ; Av. Dia.  $0.00964$  m.m.  $6/S_v$ 



 $\alpha$ 

 $2397.9178 \times 10^3$  $-2397.9178 \times 10^{2}$  $\frac{m.m}{gm}$ .

 $= 2397.9178$ 

 $rac{\text{c.m.}}{\text{gm.}}^2$ 

ပ္ပ

 $(8)/\sum(4)$ Specific Surface of Soil =



2224.2645

om.

#### Light Grey Very Fine Sand Passing No. 80 No.  $\overline{4}$

(Spherical Assumption)  $G = 2.654$ ;



Specific Surface  $\frac{\sum(8)}{W_t}$  $\equiv$ 

 $S_{\mathbf{v}}$ 

Av.Dia.

33.7  $\mu$ 

671.134x10<sup>2</sup> m.m.<sup>2</sup><br>gm.

671.134  $\frac{c.m.^2}{gm.}$ 

or

No. 4 Light Grey Very Fine Sand Passing No. 80 Sieve

835.777

 $\frac{\text{cm}}{\text{gm}}$ .

(Cubical Assumption)  $G = 2.654$ 



835.777x10<sup>2</sup>

 $m.m.$ 

gm.

 $.$  or

Specific Surface  $=$  $(8)$ 

 $W_t$ 

Reddish Brown Very Fine Sand  $No. 1$ 

ينج

(Spherical Assumption)

Passing No. 80 Sieve

 $(G = 2.662)$ 



 $457.629x10^2$  $\overline{\mathbf{2}}$ 457.629 Specific Surface =  $\Sigma(8)$  $rac{\text{c.m.}}{\text{gm.}}$  $m.m.$ or  $W_t$ gm. Av. Dia.  $rac{6}{s_v}$ 

#### Reddish Brown Very Fine Sand No. 1

Passing No. 80 Sieve

#### (Cubical Assumption)  $G = 2.662$  $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$



 $\frac{\Sigma(8)}{W_{t}}$ Specific Surface =

 $0.30x$ 

gm.

 $\frac{5}{8}$ 

Very Fine Sand No. 7

(Passing No. 80 - Retaining No Sieve)

 $G = 2.654$ 



 $\sum_{\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{t}}}$ 379.006  $\times 10^2$  $m.m.<sup>2</sup>$ Specific Surface =  $c.m.<sup>2</sup>$ 379.006  $=$ or a  $gm.$ gm.

**Note** Based on cubical assumption

ပ္ယ

No.7 Very Fine Sand

(Passing No. 80 - Retaining No. 400 Sieve)

#### 2.654 G  $\equiv$



Specific Surface =  $\Sigma(9)$  = .305.914x10<sup>2</sup> m.m.<sup>2</sup> or 305.914 c.m.<sup>2</sup>  $\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{t}}$  . gm. gm.

 $0.0739$  m.m. or 73.9  $\mu$  $Av. Dia = 6$  $\overline{s}_{\mathrm{v}}$ 

Based on Spherical assumption Note

es



# Testing with 00.40 c.m. Glass Tube



Comparision of Air-Permeability Method and Sedimentation Method for Determination of Specific Surface of Soils



Testing with  $\emptyset$ 0.80 c.m. Glass Tube

 $\frac{6}{5}$ 

Testing with  $\emptyset$ 0.80 c.m. Glass Tube (Continued)





 $\mathcal{L}$ 

 $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{N}$ 

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

74,34

**65** 

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\sum_{i=1}^n$ 

 $\mathbf{S}$ 

# Testing with 02.0 c.m. Glass Tube (Continued)



6ć

# Testing with Ø2.0 c.m. Glass Tube (Continued)



Specific Surface value from the minimum porosity. Note  $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}$ 



FIG.4





 $\overline{a}$ 



 $\mathbf{v}$ 

 $\rightarrow$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{1}}$ 

 $\rightarrow$ 

 $\sqrt{1}$ 













### Discussion

In the first series of experiments, the very fine soil samples were tested with the developed apparatus 0.4 c.m. in diameter and the space in cell 1.0 c.m. for sample length. The results from the experiment in term of the specific surface are very different from the typical value (1969) of the clay minerals. The main reason may be the compacted bed of clay minerals have the very small pores diameter and the flow of gas pass through these pores do not follow the Poiseulle's law. Because it has been realized that, with compacted beds of very fine particle and gases near atmospheric pressure or with coarse particles and gases at reduced pressures, the size of the pore or void spaces becomes small in comparison with the mean free path of the molecules of the gas which may be caused to flow through the bed. When this condition previals in capillary tubes the rate of gas flow is greater than that given by Poiseuille's law. This is attributed to 'slippage' at the capillary walls. If the mean free path is much greater than the capillary diameter, viscosity plays no part in flow, since molecules collide only with capillary wails, and not with one another. Such 'free molecule' or Knudsen flow is a process of diffusion. The comparison of air-permeability results and the typical value for determination of specific surface is shown in Table 2. In this Table the sample  $P_a354$  (Kaolinite) and  $P_f886$  (Kaolinite with some quartz) give the ratio  $\frac{S_c}{S}$  about three for the closest agreement with the typical value but sample No. 5992 and sample No. 674 give much larger ratio of c. This may be caused by the constituent

of a mixture which were more different in size and also the percentages of the very small particle was much more than the bigger one. The arrangement of the structure of the mixture should be looser. than the arrangement of each size of particle by itself alone. Therefore, the permeability of the mixture should be higher and the specific surface values obtained, should be lower. In the second series of experiments, the fine soil samples in range of silt size were tested with the developed apparatus 0.80 c.m. inside diameter glass tubing and the sample length in permeability cell of 1.50 c.m.. In this range, it was found that the ratio celld not vary in wide range and the average value of this ratio was about 1.03. The corresponding result in this range was due to the similarity of the soil sample shape. The range of pore shapes of this type of soil was such that the shape factor (C) was reasonably constant, and that the tortuosity was also not very susceptible to variations in pore geometry. Another effective factor was that the uniformity of pore size was implied, if a pore space was represented by a bundle of capillaries of widely varying radius, the mean hydraulic radius was not the correct mean value for permeability  $S(1 - E)$ calculation; and the Kozeny equation was then no longer valid. The difference of the calculated value and the experimental value should be very large. In the last series of experiments, the coarse grained soil samples in ranges of sand size were tested with the developed apparatus 2.0 c.m. inside diamter glass tubing and the space in permeability cell of 2.50 c.m. was provided for the sample. The results of the sedimentation and sieve analyses in the present

work had been calculated, using both Andreasen cube and the spherical dimensions. In the Andreasen method the particle was expressed as the length of the side of the cube of the same volume as the Stoke's law sphere. The Andreasen dimension was 0.8061 times the spherical dimension. The assumption of the calculating result was that the mean particle diameter of 'd/2' was assigned to the small proportion of particles below 'd'. From an examination of the results. there was a close agreement of the value obtained by the airpermeability and the sedimentation methods when the latter were calculated by the cubical dimension. The mean ratio a was about 1.24 and this value showed the surface factor of sand which was different from silt. For light grey very fine sand passing No. 80 sieve and retaining No. 400 sieve the result from the experiment was less close agreement with the result from sieve analysis because of the uncertainty of percentage retained of the soil fraction on the sieve having the smaller aperture than the sieve No. 200. The results of the testing by three size of apparatus with the same. soil samples, the surface area values obtained were shown to be independent of the dimensions of the u-tube manometer. The time of flow rate should be considered to prevent the prevailing of the turbulent flow. Carman  $P_1^7$ ,  $C_0^6$  (1938) had shown that for values of greater than 2.0 the Kozeny-Carman equation did not  $A \overline{u}$   $(1-E)\rho_s$ hold owing to turbulent flow and that for extremely low values of this ratio the permeability-porosity relation was not true. The flow rates used in all the tests should be within the limits 1-3x10 for

 $\leftarrow$ 

the ratio V

A  $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$  (1-E) $\beta$ s<sub>w</sub> where  $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$  is the kinematic viscosity of fluid in stokes. The advantages of varied size of the u-tube manometer is as follows: when the coarse grained soil is tested, the bigger size would give enough time for the operator to measured the time of the falling of manometer liquid with more accuracy and the time is saved when the fine grained soil is tested with the smaller size of apparatus. The plotting of specific surface value versus porosity in Fig.  $(0, 1)$  ,  $(2, 13)$ , shows a distinct scatter about a mean value of S<sub>y</sub> at each porosity. The value over a limited porosity range gives the impression that  $S_{\mathbf{w}}$  is independent of porosity. This range may reasonably regard as the normal range of porosities. It might also be expected that as the porosity approaches the normal range the pore texture becomes more uniform, and therefore the values of the calculated specific surface tend to close to constant. Some soil samples No. 3, 674, and 5992 show no tendency for specific surface to become constant at low porosities. This may be due to the soil particles. Carman and Malherbe (1950) has explained that harder particles either show a slower rate of change of specific surface throughout, or approach a slower rate of change in the 'normal' range, but softer particles show the change much more rapidly with porosity over the whole porosity range. The reason for the rapid increase in S<sub>y</sub> at low porosities is not self-evident. It was thought at first that the soil particles were crushed into smaller fragments, thus producing a real increase in S<sub>w</sub>. In any case it seems reasonable to assume that porosities below the normal range can only be produced by an abnormal porous texture, so that values of

S<sub>y</sub> below the normal range as well as above it, are suspect. For uniform equi-dimensional particles the 'normal' porosity range is

= 0.4-0.5 and for non-uniform particles, it can be less and for acicular, platy or skeletal particles it can be considerably higher hhan this range.

Care should be exercised during the experimental stage on the followings:

 $1)$ Weighing the sample when use the manometer of 0.40 c.m. and 0.80 c.m. diameter since the difference of weight +0.10 gram may cause the considerable difference of specific surface.

 $2)$ The accuracy in determining the bulk volume which will be varied with the weight of the sample. The precision of the volume +0.01 cu.c.m. may cause the difference of specific surface about  $+0.5 \%$ .

 $3)$ The mode of compaction may give the variation of the testing time. The segregation of the fine particle from the coarse particle introduces the possibility of causing uneven compression. This would give a lower permeability than an evenly compressed sample.

€

4) The poopsity of the sample may have significant effect on the specific surface. Hence, the porosity of the sample should be calculated not only from the accurate value of weight and volume but also it is necessary to use an accurate value of the specific gravity of the particles.

Determination of the surface area of a particle requires the study of processes of different kinds; in choosing a particular method of measurement. Consideration should be given to the nature of the process being studied and it relation to the various methods of measurement available. For example, where the process is essen-

tially one of surface behavior as in wetting or adsorption, then an adsorption method of measuring the surface area of the solid bears the closest relation to the practical conditions under investigation. Where purely physical interaction of the solid particles are being considered, as in the case of rheological studies of mixtures of highly viscous liquid and mineral particles, then the air-permeability method is probably of more value than most other methods. It is assumed in the air-permeability method that the bed of particle behaves as a bundle of capillaries. Consequently, only the surface of the continuous paths through the material will contribute to the measured specific surface area. This area is not the same as that measured by adsorbing a gas on to the surface of the particles where all the surface accessible to gas molecules of the type used will contribute. There will therefore be a general trend for results obtained from the adsorption of nitrogen to be larger than those obtained by a permeability method. This differences may be accentuated if the particle has an appreciable 'internal' surface due to cracks, internal peres and other irregularities. In addition, the permeability methods may not measure the full 'external' surface of the particle because of the formation of blind pores during compaction of the bed. In very fine particles a further complication arises since, as has been shown by Carman P.C.<sup>19</sup> (1950), it is very difficult to compact a fine particles to give a bed of low void-fraction; with the more porous type of bed, there may be serious lack of uniformity in the compacted bed. And in all cases the area measured by the gas adsorption method was larger than the air-permeability method.