

1  
2  
3  
4 Title: Fundamental basis of single-point liquid limit  
5  
6 measurement approaches  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 **Technical Paper**  
13

14  
15  
16 Submitted to *Applied Clay Science*  
17

18  
19 Dr S. K. Haigh, MEng MA PhD *Cantab.*  
20 University Senior Lecturer in Geotechnical Engineering  
21 Department of Engineering  
22 University of Cambridge  
23 United Kingdom  
24  
25 [skh20@cam.ac.uk](mailto:skh20@cam.ac.uk)  
26  
27

28  
29  
30 Dr P. J. Vardanega, BE MEngSc *Qld.UT* PhD *Cantab.*, MIEAust M.ASCE  
31 Lecturer in Civil Engineering  
32 Department of Civil Engineering  
33 Faculty of Engineering  
34 University of Bristol  
35 United Kingdom  
36  
37 [p.j.vardanega@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:p.j.vardanega@bristol.ac.uk)  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 **No. of words** 3311  
50

51  
52  
53 Date version drafted: **9<sup>th</sup> October 2014**  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61

1  
2  
3  
4 **ABSTRACT**  
5  
6  
7

8 The liquid limit is defined as the point at which a clay's behaviour changes from  
9 liquid to plastic. This transition is in reality gradual, rather than sudden. The definition  
10 of when this transition has been crossed must therefore be determined based on some  
11 arbitrary criterion. The percussion cup method of determining liquid limit in the  
12 manner suggested by Atterberg and subsequently standardised by Casagrande  
13 determines liquid limit as the water content at which 25 standard blows are required to  
14 cause closure of a standard groove. In order to speed up the determination of the  
15 liquid limit, a single-point method is defined in ASTM D4318, and in many other  
16 codes, to interpret liquid limit from groove closure at a different numbers of blows by  
17 assuming a relationship between water content and the number of blows required for  
18 groove closure. These methods differ considerably between different codes of practice  
19 currently in use worldwide. This paper examines the procedures for single-point  
20 determination of the liquid limit and offers some fundamental explanations that  
21 underpin the applicability of these procedures. This paper demonstrates that the  
22 variation in single-point liquid limit procedures suggested by various codes of  
23 practice can be attributed to the variability of liquid limit devices, rather than to  
24 variation in the soils being tested.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **NOTATION**  
5

6 *Roman*  
7

8  $a$  curve fitting parameter  
9  
10  $b$  curve fitting parameter  
11  
12  $c_u$  undrained shear strength  
13  
14  $c_u/\rho$  specific soil strength  
15  
16  $(c_u/\rho)_{LL}$  specific soil strength at liquid limit  
17  
18  $FI$  flow index  
19  
20  $G_s$  specific gravity  
21  
22  $I_L$  liquidity index  
23  
24  $I_P$  plasticity index  
25  
26  $n$  curve fitting parameter  
27  
28  $N$  number of blows during the Casagrande Liquid Limit Test  
29  
30  $PI_{cone}$  plasticity index determined using the fall cone liquid limit and the  
31  
32 thread rolling test  
33  
34  $w$  water content  
35  
36  $w_L$  liquid limit (Casagrande)  
37  
38  $w_{L\_cone}$  liquid limit (Fall Cone)  
39  
40

41 *Greek*  
42

43  
44  
45  $\alpha$  fitting parameter  
46  
47  $\tan\beta$  slope of the flow line  
48  
49  
50  $\rho$  density of soil  
51  
52  $\rho_w$  density of water  
53

54 *Statistical terms*  
55

56  $R^2$  coefficient of determination  
57  
58  $n$  number of data points used to generate a regression  
59  
60  $SE$  standard error of a regression  
61

1  
2  
3  
4 **1 INTRODUCTION**

5  
6 2 The consistency limits first defined by Atterberg (1911a and 1911b) describe the behaviour  
7  
8 3 of clays with varying water content, and as such play a vital role in the use of clays in both  
9  
10 4 geotechnical and industrial applications (e.g. Andrade et al. 2011). The plastic limit of clays is  
11  
12 5 the water content at which the transition from ductile to brittle behaviour suddenly occurs, as  
13  
14 6 discussed by Haigh et al. (2013), Haigh et al. (2014) and Barnes (2013). The liquid limit is  
15  
16 7 defined as the water content when a clay’s behaviour changes from liquid to plastic this  
17  
18 8 transitions is gradual rather than sudden. The definition of the transition boundary is thus  
19  
20 9 inherently arbitrary. Warkentin (1961) postulated that the liquid limit (tested using the  
21  
22 10 Casagrande apparatus) was controlled by interparticle forces – this thesis was further  
23  
24 11 examined by Nagaraj and Jayadeva (1981) who suggested that liquid limit was associated  
25  
26 12 with a certain spacing between clay platelets and thus with surface areas of particles.  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 13 A clay’s liquid limit can be determined using either fall-cone or percussion methods. The  
32  
33 14 percussion cup method of determining the liquid limit has its origins in the work of Atterberg  
34  
35 15 (1911a, 1911b) and was standardised by Casagrande (1932). The standard test involves  
36  
37 16 manipulating the water-content of a soil specimen such that 25 blows are required for closure  
38  
39 17 of a standard groove over a length of 13 mm. As it is difficult to achieve groove-closure at  
40  
41 18 exactly 25 blows, data from several tests are plotted on axes of water content versus the  
42  
43 19 logarithm of the number of blows and a straight-line, termed the flow-line, is fitted to the  
44  
45 20 data. The liquid limit is taken to be the water-content at which this line crosses 25 blows.  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 21 The fall-cone test for liquid limit involves manipulating the water-content of a clay  
51  
52 22 specimen such that an 80g, 30° cone placed with its tip on the surface of the clay will fall 20  
53  
54 23 mm before coming to rest – this test can also be used to estimate undrained shear strength of  
55  
56 24 clays (e.g. Hansbo, 1957 and Yukselen-Aksoy, 2010). In this procedure data from several  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 25 tests is typically plotted on axes of water content versus the logarithm of penetration and a  
5  
6 26 straight line is fitted to the data.

7  
8 27 In order to improve the speed at which these tests can be carried out, single point methods  
9  
10 28 have been proposed for both percussive (Waterways Experiment Station, 1949) and fall-cone  
11  
12 29 tests (Clayton and Jukes 1978) to allow the liquid limit to be inferred from a test in which the  
13  
14 30 clay sample was not at the liquid limit water content.

15  
16  
17 31 This paper will demonstrate that these single-point methods, while originally determined  
18  
19 32 empirically, can be derived from fundamental mechanical principles. Further it will be shown  
20  
21 33 that the variations in these methods prescribed by international design codes relate to  
22  
23 34 differences in the equipment in use worldwide, rather than to differences between the soils  
24  
25 35 tested.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 37 **DEVELOPMENT OF SINGLE POINT LIQUID LIMIT PROCEDURES**

32  
33 38 The single point method for percussive liquid limit was first proposed by the US Army  
34  
35 39 Waterways Experiment Station (1949). This test allowed the liquid limit to be inferred from a  
36  
37 40 test in which the number of blows for closure of the groove was between 10 and 35 (this  
38  
39 41 range is assumed to be the extent to which one can safely rely on the interpolation function  
40  
41 42 used to determine the water content at 25 blows). The method utilised the observation that the  
42  
43 43 slope of the flow-line on log-log axes ( $\tan \beta$ ) for a sample of 767 soils from the Mississippi  
44  
45 44 valley was approximately constant. This observation could then be used to project from a  
46  
47 45 measured data-point to the water content at which 25 blows would be needed for groove  
48  
49 46 closure; the liquid limit. This procedure was defined such that:

50  
51  
52  
53  
54 47 
$$\log\left(\frac{w}{w_L}\right) = -\tan \beta \log\left(\frac{N}{25}\right) \quad (1)$$
  
55  
56

57 48 which can be rearranged to show that:

58  
59  
60 49 
$$w_L = w \left(\frac{N}{25}\right)^{\tan \beta} \quad (2)$$
  
61  
62

1  
2  
3  
4 50 The average value of  $\tan \beta$  for the soils tested was found to be 0.121, (Waterways  
5  
6 51 Experiment Station, 1949). This relationship subsequently became the single-point liquid  
7  
8 52 limit method implemented as ‘Method B’ in ASTM D4318 (2010). Equation (2) was also  
9  
10 53 reported to be an acceptable match for 676 soils from the Buenos Aires region of Argentina  
11  
12 54 (Trevisán, 1960). Table 1 shows various reported values of  $\tan \beta$  based on seven databases of  
13  
14 55 liquid limit tests for which this analysis has been reported.

15  
16  
17 56 These geographically diverse observations confirm the general trend of flow lines having  
18  
19 57 slopes of approximately 0.1 with a standard deviation of the order of 0.03, but do show  
20  
21 58 substantial differences in different regions. This has since resulted in ASTM D4318 (2010)  
22  
23 59 using a value of  $\tan \beta$  of 0.121 following Waterways Experiment Station (1949), BS 1377-  
24  
25 60 1990 using a value of 0.092 following Norman (1959) and AS1289 (2009) using a value of  
26  
27 61 0.091. The Indian standard IS2720 (1985) uses a slightly different formula that was proposed  
28  
29 62 by Nagaraj and Jayadeva (1981):  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 63 
$$w_L = \frac{w}{1.3215 - 0.23 \log(N)} \quad (3)$$
  
35  
36

37 64 The effect of these different corrections on the liquid limit measured can be seen in Figure  
38  
39 65 1. It can be seen that while the lines differ marginally in shape, there is little significant  
40  
41 66 difference between the formulae suggested by BS1377-1990 and IS2720-1985. The IS2720-  
42  
43 67 1985 formula can be shown to be functionally equivalent to the use of a value of  $\tan \beta$  of  
44  
45 68 0.101.  
46  
47

48 69 There are two plausible explanations for the difference in value of  $\tan \beta$  between the United  
49  
50 70 States and the United Kingdom (or in a comparison of data from any other two countries);  
51  
52 71 differences in soils or differences in testing equipment (the type of Casagrande device used).  
53  
54 72 If the single-point method is to be used in countries whose soils have not been so thoroughly  
55  
56 73 analysed, the influence of these two aspects is important in determining an appropriate value  
57  
58 74 of  $\tan \beta$ .  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 75 This paper draws on recently published work on both the mechanics of the Casagrande  
5  
6 76 liquid limit test (Haigh, 2012) and the variation of soil strength between the liquid and plastic  
7  
8 77 limits (O’Kelly, 2013 and Vardanega and Haigh, 2014) to demonstrate the origins of the  
9  
10 78 relationships used in the single-point liquid limit method and to show that it is the  
11  
12 79 characteristics of the equipment used that should determine which value of  $\tan \beta$  is  
13  
14 80 appropriate, rather than the origin of the soil samples. The *single point method* remains a  
15  
16 81 viable method for liquid limit determination, permitted in many codes of practice worldwide,  
17  
18 82 and is therefore worthy of further examination.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 83

## 25 84 ANALYSIS

26  
27 85 Haigh (2012) carried out a Newmarkian sliding block analysis (Newmark, 1965) of the  
28  
29 86 percussion cup test, using the vertical acceleration pulse measured on the cup during its  
30  
31 87 impact with the base of the liquid limit device to drive a slope-failure within the soil. He  
32  
33 88 demonstrated that the liquid limit of soil, as measured with ASTM standard percussion cup  
34  
35 89 apparatus, corresponds to a ratio of undrained shear strength to soil density of approximately  
36  
37 90  $1 \text{ m}^2\text{s}^{-2}$ . Haigh (2012) also demonstrated, by utilisation of this analysis, the dependence of the  
38  
39 91 number of blows required to cause groove closure on the specific strength of the soil, as  
40  
41 92 shown in Figure 2.  
42  
43  
44

45 93 In order to use this analytically calculated curve in the analysis presented here, a power-law  
46  
47 94 relationship of the form:

$$49 \quad 95 \quad N = a + b \left( \frac{c_u}{\rho} \right)^n \quad (4)$$

50  
51  
52  
53 96 is fitted to the specific strength curve between 10 and 35 blows, as shown in Figure 2. Giving  
54  
55 97 the experimental curve for an ASTM device (Haigh, 2012):

$$58 \quad 98 \quad N = 6.22 + 21.43 \left( \frac{c_u}{\rho} \right)^{1.893} \quad (5)$$

1  
2  
3  
4 99 Casagrande (1958) recognised the variability between different liquid limit devices and made  
5  
6 100 efforts to further standardise construction of the devices. Two categories of device still exist,  
7  
8 101 however, those with hard plastic bases as specified by ASTM D4318 (2010), and those with  
9  
10 102 softer rubber bases as specified by BS1377 (1990), IS9259 (1979) and AS1289 (2009). The  
11  
12 103 reasons for this distinction appear to be historical rather than based on any scientific decision.

14  
15 104 The base characteristics prescribed by the aforementioned codes are shown in Table 1. The  
16  
17 105 hardness of the base alters the characteristics of the shock loading on the clay slopes during  
18  
19 106 the liquid limit test and hence the movement of the soil that will occur during one blow for  
20  
21 107 any given soil specific strength. By measuring the vertical acceleration measured on impact  
22  
23 108 with the base and following the analysis procedure outlined by Haigh (2012), the relationship  
24  
25 109 between number of blows for groove closure and specific strength can be derived for each  
26  
27 110 particular Casagrande apparatus. Table 2 shows the best-fit parameters for new apparatus  
28  
29 111 manufactured by ELE International conforming to the ASTM and British Standards and for  
30  
31 112 Indian Standard apparatus tested at the *Indian Institute of Science (Bangalore)* - the  
32  
33 113 parameters derived for the three devices tested differ considerably.

34  
35 114 The single-point liquid limit method (defined by equation 2) implies that a unique  
36  
37 115 relationship exists between the water content of a soil normalised by that at its liquid limit and  
38  
39 116 the number of blows required to cause the groove to close in the liquid limit test. Following  
40  
41 117 Haigh (2012), this implies relationships between the normalised water content and both the  
42  
43 118 strength and density of the soil.

44  
45 119 The relationship between the water content of the soil and its density in a saturated state can  
46  
47 120 be found from:

48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54 121 
$$\rho = \frac{G_s(1+w)}{1+wG_s} \rho_w \quad (6)$$
  
55  
56

57 122 As specific gravity is reasonably constant for the majority of soils at around  $2.65 \pm 0.2$ , the  
58  
59 123 relationship between water content and density is also approximately identical for all soils.



1  
2  
3  
4 124 The variation of undrained strength with water content has been estimated using a variety of  
5  
6 125 relationships, usually assuming either a linear relationship between the logarithm of undrained  
7  
8 126 strength and liquidity index, (e.g. Wroth and Wood, 1978) or a power law relationship  
9  
10 127 between undrained strength and liquidity index (e.g. Feng, 2001, Yilmaz, 2009 and Zentar et  
11  
12 128 al. 2009).

15 129 Vardanega and Haigh (2014) have shown through the analysis of a large database collected  
16  
17 130 fall-cone data on a diverse database of over 100 soils that a log-linear relationship between  
18  
19 131 strength and liquidity index provides an acceptable match to the data for liquidity indices  
20  
21 132 between 0.2 and 1.1 (in the same paper a power law is shown to be also a plausible fit to the  
22  
23 133 dataset and the following analysis could be repeated assuming such a relation that would  
24  
25 134 make use of the logarithmic liquidity index proposed by Koumoto and Houlsby, 2001 and  
26  
27 135 used in Vardanega and Haigh, 2014). The slope of the relationship is, however, shown to be  
28  
29 136 significantly less than that suggested by (Wroth and Wood, 1978); the strength variation with  
30  
31 137 water content being shown to be approximated by:

$$36 \quad 138 \quad c_u = 1700 \times 35^{\left[\frac{w_{L,cone}-w}{PI_{cone}}\right]} \quad c_u \text{ in Pa} \quad 0.2 < I_L < 1.1 \quad (7)$$

39 139 Similar values for the variation of strength with water content around liquid limit can be  
40  
41 140 derived from the fall-cone single-point liquid limit procedure outlined by Clayton and Jukes  
42  
43 141 (1978).

46 142 As previously mentioned, the variation of the number of blows to cause the groove to close  
47  
48 143 in the liquid limit test with water content is often characterised by the slope of the flow line  
49  
50 144  $\tan \beta$ . The relationship between this slope and the variations of both the soil specific strength  
51  
52 145 with water content and the number of blows for groove closure with specific strength can be  
53  
54 146 determined by multiplication of the derivatives, as shown in equation 8.

$$58 \quad 147 \quad \tan \beta = -\frac{\partial \log_{10} w}{\partial \log_{10} N} = -\frac{\partial \log_{10} w}{\partial w} \frac{\partial N}{\partial \log_{10} N} \frac{\partial w}{\partial \frac{c_u}{\rho}} \frac{\partial \frac{c_u}{\rho}}{\partial N} \quad (8)$$

1  
2  
3  
4 148 The derivatives required by equation 8 can be calculated by differentiating equations 6 and 7  
5  
6 149 to yield:

$$150 \quad \frac{\partial c_u}{\partial w} = \frac{\rho \frac{\partial c_u}{\partial w} - c_u \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial w}}{\rho^2} = -\frac{c_u}{\rho} \left[ \frac{\ln(35)}{PI_{cone}} + \frac{1-G_s}{(1+wG_s)(1+w)} \right] \quad (9)$$

11  
12 151 And by differentiating equation 4 to yield:

$$152 \quad \frac{\partial N}{\partial \frac{c_u}{\rho}} = bn \left( \frac{c_u}{\rho} \right)^{n-1} \quad (10)$$

17  
18 153 Evaluating  $\tan \beta$  at Casagrande's liquid limit  $w_L$  thus yields:

$$154 \quad \tan \beta = \frac{25}{(25-a) n w_L \left[ \frac{\ln(35)}{PI_{cone}} + \frac{(1-G_s)}{(1+w_L G_s)(1+w_L)} \right]} \quad (11)$$

23  
24 155 The first additive term in the denominator will always dominate, hence:

$$156 \quad \tan \beta \approx \frac{25}{b n \left( \frac{c_u}{\rho} \right)_{LL}^n \ln(35)} \frac{PI_{cone}}{w_L} = \zeta \frac{PI_{cone}}{w_L} \quad (12)$$

29  
30 157 Substituting in the values from table 2:

$$158 \quad \tan \beta_{ASTM} \approx 0.198 \frac{PI_{cone}}{w_L} \quad \tan \beta_{BS} \approx 0.161 \frac{PI_{cone}}{w_L} \quad \tan \beta_{IS} \approx 0.102 \frac{PI_{cone}}{w_L} \quad (13)$$

35 159 Equation 13 is inconsistent, in that it combines the plasticity index found using the cone  
36 method for liquid limit determination with the liquid limit water content for the Casagrande  
37 cup method. In order to remove this inconsistency and to eliminate the need for the  
38 simplification of equation 11 to equation 12,  $\tan \beta$  was evaluated numerically for plastic  
39 limits between 10% and 100% and cone plasticity indices between 10% and 300%. For each  
40 combination of parameters, the strength variation around liquid limit was assumed to be given  
41 by equation 7 and the density variation by equation 6. The number of blows to failure for a  
42 variety of water contents could then be determined based on equation 4 with appropriate  
43 parameters from table 1, and the flow index, Casagrande liquid limit and plasticity index  
44 could then be determined. Equation 12 can thus be modified to be consistent in only using  
45 Casagrande values of plasticity index and liquid limit to yield:  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

$$\tan \beta = \alpha \frac{PI}{w_L} \quad (14)$$

Figure 3 shows the calculated values of  $\alpha$  (as defined by equation 14) for different Casagrande-style equipment. It can be seen that  $\alpha$  is equal to  $0.22 \pm 0.02$  for ASTM equipment,  $0.14 \pm 0.01$  for British Standards equipment and  $0.09 \pm 0.01$  for Indian Standard equipment. These numbers compare favourably with the values given in equation 13. As  $\alpha$  is a function of plasticity index as well as liquid limit, the relationship between  $\alpha$  and liquid limit was evaluated for soils lying on both the Casagrande A-Line (equation 15) and the U-Line (ASTM, 2006) (equation 16), considered the upper limit of the relation developed by Casagrande (1947). The origin of the U-line defined by equation 16 is discussed by Howard (1984). The resultant lines (on Figure 3) are essentially coincident. Plasticity index therefore has only a minor influence on the results for a sensible range of  $I_p$  values.

$$I_p = 0.73(w_L - 0.20) \quad (15)$$

$$I_p = 0.90(w_L - 0.08) \quad (16)$$

Equation 14 with ASTM parameters was applied to the soils in the database of Vardanega and Haigh (2014) resulting in a prediction of  $\tan \beta$  having an average value of 0.127 and a standard deviation of 0.026. This value is similar to the results from Eden (1959) and the Waterways Experimental Station (1949). Using the parameters found for British Standard equipment, a prediction of  $\tan \beta$  having an average value of 0.081 and a standard deviation of 0.021 results. This is similar to the reported observations of Mohan and Goel (1958), Norman (1959) and Jain and Patwardhan (1960). These values are calculated assuming a constant value of  $G_s$  for all soils of 2.65. The analysis can be shown to be insensitive to specific gravity,  $\tan \beta$  only changing by 0.002 if the extremes of plausible values of  $G_s$  for clays are used.

It can be seen from equation 12 that a relationship exists between the slope of the flow line and the ratio between plasticity index and liquid limit. The plastic limit could hence

1  
2  
3  
4 195 conceivably be estimated from the measured liquid limit data by extrapolation. Sridharan et  
5  
6 196 al. (1999) defined the slope of results from a Casagrande liquid limit test using a flow index

7  
8  
9 197 *FI* defined by:

10  
11 198 
$$FI = -\frac{\partial w}{\partial \log_{10} N} \quad (17)$$
  
12  
13

14 199 They then showed that a regression to a dataset gave a good correlation ( $R^2=0.88$ ,  $n=55$ ,  
15  
16 200  $SE=1.8\%$ ) between flow index and plasticity index of the form:

17  
18 201 
$$PI = 4.12FI \quad (18)$$
  
19

20 202 Data from Jain and Patwardhan (1960) can also be analysed within this framework to give a  
21  
22 203 relationship between flow and plasticity indices with all test carried out by the same  
23  
24 204 laboratory. This gives a substantially different but still significant ( $R^2=0.52$ ,  $n=32$ ,  $SE=0.69\%$ )  
25  
26 205 correlation:

27  
28  
29  
30 206 
$$PI = 1.96FI \quad (19)$$
  
31

32 207 The substantial difference between equations 18 and 19 calls into question the validity of any  
33  
34 208 unique correlation between plasticity index and flow index, despite each of the correlations  
35  
36 209 being significant for the data used to derive it. Soil characteristics are unlikely to be the key  
37  
38 210 source of variability, rather it appears that the precise characteristics of the equipment used to  
39  
40 211 carry out the testing have a large impact on the ratio of plasticity and flow indices.

41  
42  
43 212 It can be seen from Figure 4 that for each of the three sets of equipment tested, the ratio of  
44  
45 213 plasticity index to flow index is approximately constant for liquid limits between 20% and  
46  
47 214 400%, but that there are large differences between the three devices; ASTM equipment giving  
48  
49 215 a ratio of approximately 2, British Standard equipment 3.1 and Indian Standard equipment  
50  
51 216 4.7. This latter value approximates the value of 4.12 given in equation 18 and derived by  
52  
53 217 Sridharan et al. (1999) using the precise Indian Standard equipment tested for this research.  
54  
55 218 As described earlier, Jain and Patwardhan (1960) observed a different correlation between  
56  
57 219 plasticity and flow indices, but the ratio observed in their data (1.96) also falls within the  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 220 range that would be predicted for the three sets of equipment tested here, being consistent  
5  
6 221 with the use of ASTM equipment.

7  
8 222 The plasticity and flow indices for the 55 soils for which Casagrande liquid limits were  
9  
10 223 presented by Sridharan et al. (1999) are shown in Figure 5 together with the predicted  
11  
12 224 relationships using the three Casagrande cups tested here. Using the derived parameters for  
13  
14 225 the equipment used to measure the plasticity and flow indices, (i.e. that at IISc Bangalore), a  
15  
16 226 good prediction of the data can be obtained, though there is significant scatter about the trend.  
17  
18 227 Predictions of the value of flow index based on liquid limit were also made as part of a single-  
19  
20 228 point liquid limit procedure developed by Fang (1960). The method involved predicting the  
21  
22 229 slope of the flow line for a given soil and then extrapolating this flow line to the water content  
23  
24 230 at 25 blows to give the liquid limit. In order to predict the slope of the flow-line, Fang  
25  
26 231 correlated data on 469 soil tests carried out during the AASHO (American Association of  
27  
28 232 State Highway Officials) road test (Burggraf and McKendrick, 1956) and by the Washington  
29  
30 233 State Highway Department to predict that the flow index could be approximated by:

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 234  $FI = 0.36(w_L - 0.08)$  (20)  
37

38 235 Utilising the analysis presented here, (assuming ASTM apparatus) this can be compared to the  
39  
40 236 predicted values of flow index for soils falling on the A and U lines, as shown in Figure 6. It  
41  
42 237 can be seen that the average values of flow index measured by Fang fall in exactly the region  
43  
44 238 expected, being appropriate for soils lying above the A-line and below the U-line. The power  
45  
46 239 law expressions of the single-point liquid limit test (equation 2) can also be presented on this  
47  
48 240 figure. ASTM method B, using a value of  $\tan \beta$  of 0.121 can be shown to give:

49  
50  
51  
52 241  $FI = \tan \beta \ln(10) w_L = 0.279w_L$  (21)  
53

54 242 This is broadly consistent with the analysis presented here, being applicable for soils lying  
55  
56 243 close to the A-line for soils having liquid limits between 20 and 120%.

57  
58  
59 244

1  
2  
3  
4 245 **SUMMARY**

5  
6 246 The following summary points can be made:

7  
8 247 (a) The liquid limit of soils as measured by the Casagrande apparatus was shown by Haigh  
9  
10 248 (2012) to be an assessment of specific strength. Utilising this analysis along with trends of  
11  
12 249 changing soil strength with water content ( $I_L$ ), as outlined by Vardanega and Haigh (2014)  
13  
14 250 allows an understanding of the mechanics underpinning the single-point liquid limit tests  
15  
16 251 proposed by several authors and implemented as part of ASTM D4318-10 and BS1377-1990  
17  
18 252 amongst other design codes.

19  
20  
21  
22 253 (b) The difference between the implementation of the single point liquid limit method by  
23  
24 254 the two codes (ASTM and BS1377) has been shown to be predominantly a function of the  
25  
26 255 differences in equipment specified (i.e. hard or soft base Casagrande devices) rather than  
27  
28 256 being due to the nature of the soils in the two countries. It is suggested that those countries  
29  
30 257 utilising hard-based Casagrande equipment (e.g. USA) should use a value of  $\tan \beta$  of 0.121,  
31  
32 258 and those using soft-base equipment (e.g. UK, India & Australia) a value of 0.092, regardless  
33  
34 259 of the origin of the soils being tested.

35  
36  
37  
38 260 (c) While the relationship between the plasticity index and flow index, as previously  
39  
40 261 described by Sridharan et al. (1999), has a fundamental basis in the mechanics of the test,  
41  
42 262 potentially allowing a liquid limit test to be used to estimate the plastic limit of a soil, this  
43  
44 263 would however have substantial uncertainties, both due to the scatter seen in the data for a  
45  
46 264 single set of equipment and due to the variable nature of liquid limit test devices in operation  
47  
48 265 worldwide.

49  
50  
51 266

52  
53 267

54  
55 268

56  
57 269

1  
2  
3  
4 270 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

5  
6 271 The authors would like to thank Professor S. P.G Madabhushi and Professor A. Sridharan  
7  
8 272 for their assistance in acquiring data from the liquid limit apparatus at Indian Institute of  
9  
10 273 Science, Bangalore.

11  
12  
13 274

14  
15 275 **REFERENCES**

16  
17 276 Andrade, F. A., Al-Qureshi, H. A. and Hotza, D. (2011). Measuring the plasticity of clays: A  
18  
19 277 Review. *Applied Clay Science*, **51**: 1-7.

20  
21 278 ASTM (2010). Standard test methods for liquid limit, plastic limit, and plasticity index of  
22  
23 279 soils. ASTM International, ASTM D4318-10

24  
25 280 ASTM (2006). Standard Provision for Classification of Soils for Engineering Purposes  
26  
27 281 (Unified Soil Classification System). ASTM International, ASTM D2487-06.

28  
29 282 Atterberg, A. (1911a). Lerornas förhållande till vatten, deras plasticitetsgränser och  
30  
31 283 plasticitetsgrader. *Kungliga Lantbruksakademiens Handlingar och Tidskrift*, **50(2)**: 132-  
32  
33 284 158. (In Swedish)

34  
35 285 Atterberg, A. (1911b). Die Plastizität der Tone. *Internationale Mitteilungen der Bodenkunde*,  
36  
37 286 **1**: 4-37 (In German).

38  
39 287 Australian Standard AS1289 (2009). *Methods of testing soils for engineering purposes*,  
40  
41 288 Standards Australia, Sydney.

42  
43 289 Barnes, G. E. (2013). An apparatus for the determination of the workability and plastic limit  
44  
45 290 of clays. *Applied Clay Science*, **80-81**: 281–290

46  
47 291 British Standard BS1377 (1990). *Methods of Test for Soils for Civil Engineering Purposes*,  
48  
49 292 British Standards Institution, London.

50  
51 293 Burggraf F. and McKendrick W. B. (1956). Large-scale highway research - AASHO road  
52  
53 294 test. *Civil Engineering*, **60(12)**: 799–804.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 295 Casagrande, A. (1932). Research on the Atterberg Limits of Soils. *Public Roads*, **13(8)**: 121-  
5  
6 296 136.  
7  
8 297 Casagrande, A. (1947). Classification and identification of soils. *Proceedings of the American*  
9  
10 298 *Society of Civil Engineers*, **73(6)**: 783-810.  
11  
12 299 Casagrande A (1958). Notes on the design of the liquid limit device. *Géotechnique* **8(2)**: 84-  
13  
14 300 91.  
15  
16 301 Clayton, C. R. and Jukes, A. W. (1978). A one point cone penetrometer liquid limit test?  
17  
18 302 *Géotechnique*, **28(4)**: 469-472.  
19  
20 303 Eden, W. J. (1955). Trial of one-point liquid limit method. *Proceedings of Ninth Canadian*  
21  
22 304 *Soil Mechanics Conference*. Ottawa, December 15<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> 1955 (National Research  
23  
24 305 Council for Canada), Appendix A.  
25  
26 306 Eden, W. J. (1959). Use of a one-point liquid limit procedure. *ASTM Special Technical*  
27  
28 307 *Publication*, **254**: 168-176  
29  
30 308 Fang, H. Y. (1960). Rapid determination of liquid limit of soils by flow index method.  
31  
32 309 *Highway Research Board Bulletin*, **254**: 30-35  
33  
34 310 Feng, T. (2001). A linear log d – log w model for the determination of consistency limits of  
35  
36 311 soils. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, **38(6)**: 1335-1342.  
37  
38 312 Haigh, S. K. (2012). Mechanics of the Casagrande liquid limit test. *Canadian Geotechnical*  
39  
40 313 *Journal*, **49 (9)**: 1015-1023. Corrigenda, **49 (9)**: 1116 and **49 (11)**: 1329.  
41  
42 314 Haigh, S. K., Vardanega, P. J., and Bolton, M. D. (2013). The plastic limit of clays.  
43  
44 315 *Géotechnique*, **63(6)**: 435-440.  
45  
46 316 Haigh, S. K., Vardanega, P. J., Bolton, M. D. & Barnes, G. E. (2014). Discussion of "The  
47  
48 317 plastic limit of clays". *Géotechnique*, **64(7)**: 584-586.  
49  
50 318 Hansbo, S. (1957). A new approach to the determination of the shear strength of clay by the  
51  
52 319 fall cone test. *Swedish Geotechnical Institute Proceedings*, **14**: 5-47.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



- 1  
2  
3  
4 320 Howard, A. K. (1984). The revised ASTM Standard on the Unified Classification System.  
5  
6 321 *Geotechnical Testing Journal ASTM*, **7(4)**: 216-222.  
7  
8 322 Indian Standard IS2720 (1985). *Method of test for soils*. Indian Standards Institution, New  
9  
10 323 Delhi.  
11  
12 324 Indian Standard IS9259 (1979). *Liquid limit apparatus for soils*. Indian Standards Institution,  
13  
14 325 New Delhi.  
15  
16 326 Jain, L.C. and Patwardhan, N.K. (1960). Physical properties of soils from the Ganges valley.  
17  
18 327 *Journal of Scientific and Industrial Research (India)*, **19A(4)**: 162-167.  
19  
20 328 Kim, J. B. (1973). A study on the general and one point method of test for liquid limit  
21  
22 329 procedure. *Journal of the Korean Society of Agricultural Engineers*, **15(4)**: 3153-3159.  
23  
24 330 Koumoto, T., and Houlsby, G. T. 2001. Theory and practice of the fall cone test.  
25  
26 331 *Géotechnique*, **51(8)**: 701–712.  
27  
28 332 Mohan, D. and Goel, R. K. (1958). Rapid methods for determining the liquid limit of soils.  
29  
30 333 *Journal of Scientific and Industrial Research (India)*, **17A(12)**: 498-501.  
31  
32 334 Mohan, D. (1959). Discussion of “The one-point method of determining the value of the  
33  
34 335 liquid limit of a soil”. *Géotechnique*, **9(3)**: 143.  
35  
36 336 Nagaraj, T. S., and Jayadeva, M. S. (1981). Re-examination of one-point methods of liquid  
37  
38 337 limit determination. *Géotechnique*, **31(3)**: 413–425  
39  
40 338 Newmark, N. M. (1965). Effects of earthquakes on dams and embankments. *Géotechnique*,  
41  
42 339 **15(2)**: 139-160.  
43  
44 340 Norman, L. E. J. (1959). The one-point method of determining the value of the Liquid Limit  
45  
46 341 of a soil. *Géotechnique*, **9(1)**: 1-8.  
47  
48 342 O’Kelly, B. C. (2013). Atterberg Limits & Remoulded Shear Strength – water content  
49  
50 343 relationships. *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, **36(6)**: 939-947.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

344 Olmstead, F. R. and Johnston, C. M. (1954). Rapid methods for determining liquid limits of  
345 soils. *Highway Research Board Bulletin* **95**, Washington D. C. (National Research  
346 Council Division of Engineering and Industrial Research), pp. 27-35, Discussion, pp. 35-  
347 37.

348 Roje-Bonacci, T. (2004). Liquid limit determination of the high plastic clays by one-point  
349 method. *Proceedings of the Slovenian Geotechnical Society Conference*, 9-11 June 2004.

350 Sridharan, A., Nagaraj, H. B. and Prakash, K. (1999). Determination of the plasticity index  
351 from flow index. *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, **22(2)**: 169-175.

352 Trevisán, S. J. (1960). Correspondence. *Géotechnique*, **10(1)**: 36

353 Vardanega, P. J. and Haigh, S. K. (2014). The undrained strength-liquidity index relationship.  
354 *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, **51(9)**: 1073-1086.

355 Warkentin, B. P. (1961) Interpretation of the Upper Plastic Limit of Clays. *Nature*, **190**: 287-  
356 288.

357 Waterways Experiment Station (1949). Simplification of the Liquid Limit Test Procedure.  
358 Technical Memorandum No. 3-286, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways  
359 Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss.

360 Wroth, C. P. and Wood, D. M. (1978). The correlation of some index properties with some  
361 basic engineering properties of soils. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, **15(2)**: 137-145.

362 Yilmaz, I. (2009). Swell potential and shear strength estimation of clays. *Applied Clay*  
363 *Science*, **46**: 376-384.

364 Yukselen-Aksoy, Y. (2010). Characterization of two natural zeolites for geotechnical and  
365 geoenvironmental applications. *Applied Clay Science*, **50**: 130-136.

366 Zentar, R., Abriak, N. E. and Dubois, V. (2009). Effects of salts and organic matter on  
367 Atterberg Limits of dredged marine sediments. *Applied Clay Science*, **42**: 391-397.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

369 **Figure Captions**

370

371 **Figure 1: International variations in single-point liquid limit formulae**

372 **Figure 2: Relationship between number of blows for groove closure and specific strength**

373 **Figure 3: Variation of  $\alpha$  with Casagrande Liquid Limit**

374 **Figure 4: Predicted ratio of plasticity index and flow index**

375 **Figure 5: Plasticity Index (*PI*) predicted from Flow Index (*FI*)**

376 **Figure 6: Predicted and measured relationships between the Flow Index (*FI*) and the  
377 Liquid Limit ( $w_L$ )**

378

379

Highlights:

- 1) Atterberg's liquid limit can be measured rapidly using 1-point methods but these vary worldwide.
- 2) This paper demonstrates that different methods are a result purely of different equipment, not of soil types
- 3) The analysis presented shows why a value of  $\tan \beta = 0.121$  can be used for hard-base equipment and  $\tan \beta = 0.092$  for soft-base equipment.

**Table 1: Published databases with average  $\tan\beta$  values stated**

| <b>Publication</b>                     | <b>Soil Tested</b> | <b>Average<br/><math>\tan\beta</math><br/>value<br/>reported</b> | <b>Description of soils tested</b>              |
|--|--------------------|--|---|
| Waterways Experiment Station (1949)    | 767 US soils       | 0.121  | Recent, Pleistocene, Tertiary and glacial till. |
| Olmstead and Johnston (1954)           | 759 US soils       | 0.135  | 15% < $w_L$ < 100%+                             |
| Eden (1955, 1959)                      | 484 Canadian soils | 0.100  | -   |
| Mohan and Goel (1958);<br>Mohan (1959) | 250 Indian soils   | 0.068  | Black Cotton soil                               |
| Jain and Patwardhan (1960)             | 32 Indian soils    | 0.085  | Gangetic alluvium                               |
| Norman (1959)                          | 455 British soils  | 0.092  | 15% < $w_L$ < 170%+                             |
| Kim (1973)                             | 1017 Korean soils  | 0.118  | -   |
| Roje-Bonacci (2004)                    | 88 Croatian soils  | 0.063  | High-plasticity clays                           |

**Table 2: Parameters for liquid limit apparatus tested**

|                                    | ASTM D4318<br>(2010) | BS1377:2 (1990) | IS9259 (1979)<br>Indian Institute of Science<br>(IISc) (Bangalore) |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|--|
| <i>a</i>                           | 6.22                 | 5.40            | 5.40   |
| <i>b</i>                           | 21.43                | 173.3           | 374.4  |
| <i>n</i>                           | 1.893                | 2.226           | 3.510  |
| $\frac{c_u}{\rho}$ at liquid limit | 0.932                | 0.376           | 0.432  |
| Prescribed base<br>harness         | 80-90 Shore D        | 84-94 IRHD      | 86-90 IRHD   |
| Estimated<br>Young's Modulus       | 260-446 MPa          | 11.5-28 MPa     | 13-18.5 MPa  |
| Prescribed<br>Resilience           | 77-90%               | 20-35%          | 30-40%   |

Figure 1  
[Click here to download Figure: fig1.eps](#)





Figure 2  
[Click here to download Figure: fig2.eps](#)





**Figure 3**  
[Click here to download Figure: fig3-new.eps](#)




Figure 4  
[Click here to download Figure: fig4.eps](#)




Figure 5

[Click here to download Figure: fig5-new.eps](#)





Figure 6  
[Click here to download Figure: fig6-new.eps](#)

