



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ALGORITHM TO DETERMINE  
AXIAL CAPACITY OF PILES FROM SPT N-VALUES**

**JASMIN A/L AMBROSE**

**FK 2000 56**

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ALGORITHM TO DETERMINE  
AXIAL CAPACITY OF PILES FROM SPT N-VALUES**

**By**

**JASMIN A/L AMBROSE**

**Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirement for the  
Degree of Master of Science in the Faculty of Engineering  
Universiti Putra Malaysia**

**November 2000**



To God, Appa, Amma, Anan, Tangai, and Abhe.



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in  
fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ALGORITHM TO DETERMINE  
AXIAL CAPACITY OF PILES FROM SPT N-VALUES**

**By**

**JASMIN AMBROSE**

**November 2000**

**Chairman: Dr. Rosely Ab.Malik**

**Faculty: Engineering**

An algorithm was developed to determine axial capacity of piles in sand and clay. The standard static formulae to determine pile capacity in clay were selected ( $\alpha$ -API,  $\lambda$ , SEMP and RAND) and the calculated capacities were calibrated using measured results to produce prediction formulae. For capacity prediction in sand, comparison of results using other methods (Davisson and Chin's formulae) were selected and re-calibrated according to the iterative technique (IT). The combined calibrated formulae (The Algorithm) were later tested using five static loading test results. The comparison between measured and predicted capacities was conducted using standard deviation values to determine the amount of error in the prediction.

Final analysis showed that a combination of capacity prediction formulae calibrated from Davisson's failure criterion for piles in



sand and America Petroleum Institute formula for piles in clay, [D]+[API], compared to measured capacity from Butler & Hoy failure criterion was the most consistent algorithm. Another comparison between measured capacity from Pile Dynamic Analyzer (PDA), predicted capacity using [D]+[API] and calculated capacities from iterative technique for piles in sand and clay [IT]+[IT] was conducted. Results indicate that [IT]+[IT] is more consistent with PDA analyzer results than [D]+[API] results.

In the search to determine a consistent yet suitable and advanced method of determining pile capacity, an iterative technique was also developed whereby IT has long been used in numerical analysis for microcomputers (engineering software). The developed IT was used for all cases of algorithm testing. It is speculated that better correlation values can be obtained if more loading test data are available during the course of this study.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia  
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Master Sains

**MEMBENTUK SUATU ALGORITMA UNTUK MENENTUKAN BEBANAN  
CERUCUK MENEGAK MENGGUNAKAN NILAI SPT-N**

Oleh

**JASMIN AMBROSE**

**November 2000**

**Pengerusi: Dr. Rosely Ab.Malik**

**Fakulti: Kejuruteraan**

Suatu algoritma telah diwujudkan untuk menentukan beban menegak cerucuk tertanam dalam tanah pasir dan tanah liat. Formula static yang biasa digunakan untuk menentukan beban menegak yang telah dipilih ( $\alpha$ -API,  $\lambda$ , SEMP dan RAND) dan beban menegak yang dikira telah dibetulkan menggunakan data dari beban menegak yang diukur untuk menentukan formula menganggar beban menegak. Untuk menentukan beban menegak cerucuk didalam pasir, data yang telah dibetulkan oleh penulis lain telah dianalisa semula mengikut kaedah iterasi, IT. Kombinasi formula yang telah diubahsuai telah diuji menggunakan data lima ujian bebanan statik. Perbandingan telah dijalankan untuk menentukan tahap deviasi formula yang dibetulkan daripada nilai yang diukur.

Analisa terhadap data menggunakan formula yang dihasilkan dari criteria kegagalan Davisson untuk cerucuk dalam tanah pasir dan

formula yang dihasilkan oleh American Petroleum Institute untuk cerucuk dalam tanah liat, [D]+[API], dibandingkan dengan data ujian menggunakan criteria kegagalan Butler & Hoy menunjukkan bahawa kedua-dua kombinasi perbandingan ini adalah yang paling sesuai untuk ujian bebanan statik. Kajian juga dijalankan terhadap data bebanan menegak dari alat PDA dengan bebanan menegak daripada [D]+[API] dan [IT]+[IT]. Didapati bahawa [IT]+[IT] adalah lebih sesuai digunakan untuk menganggar bebanan menegak yang dibandingkan dengan bebanan menegak PDA.

Adalah dijangka bahawa keupayaan menegak cerucuk dapat diramal dengan lebih baik jika lebih banyak data ujian cerucuk dapat dikumpulkan dalam jangkamasa kajian ini dijalankan.



## AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Rosely Ab.Malik for constantly guiding me throughout the course of study. His guidance and rationalization during the whole research was an important element in completion of this thesis. I am also grateful for the level of tolerance and understanding that he had displayed while I was completing this write-up. I would also like to thank En. Husaini Omar who always gave me advice, motivation and support to complete my studies. To En. Shukri and En. Azlan who first started my interest in the field of Geotechnical engineering, your efforts are deeply appreciated. Finally my appreciation is also extended to En. Zainuddin, Dr. Mahgoub, En. Razali, and Chong Kau Ping for making my studies here a worthwhile and interesting one.

I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to the Ministry of Science Technology and Environment and the cooperation by the staff of GeoEnTech Sdn. Bhd. who made this study possible.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION.....	ii
ABSTRACT .....	iii
ABSTRAK .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
APPROVAL SHEETS.....	viii
DECLARATION FORM.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xvii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xviii
LIST OF NOTATIONS.....	xx
<b>CHAPTER 1            INTRODUCTION</b>	
1            Introduction.....	1
1.1          Objectives.....	3
1.2          Scope and Limitation.....	4
1.3          Background.....	6
1.4          Summary.....	8
<b>CHAPTER 2            LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	
2            Categories of Analysis and Design.....	9
2.1          Formulation of a New Method of Analysis.....	10
2.2          Formulae Involved for Calculated Pile Capacities in Clay.....	14
2.2.1        Semple & Rigden Method.....	15
2.2.2 $\alpha$ – Method (RP 2A) .....	17
2.2.3        Randolph Method.....	18



2.2.4	$\lambda$ – Method.....	21
2.3	Formulae for the Determination of Calculated Pile Capacity in Sand.....	22
2.4	Predicted Pile Capacity.....	23
2.5	Some Characteristics of Pile Capacity Behavior.....	24
2.5.1	The Critical Depth Phenomenon.....	25
2.5.2	Residual Driving Stress.....	26
2.5.3	Toe and Shaft Capacities – Prove of Non Limiting Capacity.....	27
2.5.4	Some Aspects of Analysis of Driven Concrete Pile	28
2.5.5	Shaft Resistance: A Total Stress Approach in Clay	29
2.5.6	Shaft Resistance: Simplified Effective Stress Approach in Clay.. ..	31
2.5.7	Capacity Prediction for Layered Soil.....	33
2.6	Skin Friction on Concrete.....	34
2.6.1	Cohesive Granular Soil.....	35
2.6.2	$f_b$ and $f_c$ on Smooth Surfaced Concrete.....	37
2.7	Static Load Test.....	38
2.7.1	Interpretation of Failure Load.....	40
2.7.2	Choice of Method of Analysis.....	41
2.7.3	Cyclic Loading.....	41
2.7.4	Davisson Failure Criterion.....	43
2.7.5	Chin Failure Criterion.....	44
2.7.6	Butler & Hoy Failure Criterion.....	44



2.7.7	Fuller and Hoy Failure Criterion.....	45
2.8	Summary.....	48
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	
3	Capacity Prediction Technique in Sand Using IT (Development of a New Method).....	50
3.1	N-values and IT .....	51
3.1.1	Stepwise Procedures for IT .....	52
3.2	Earth Pressure Coefficient.....	58
3.2.1	Modified Bearing Capacity Factor.....	59
3.3	Calculated Pile Capacity in Sand, $Q_c$ .....	59
3.3.1	Correction Factors for Capacity Prediction in Sand	60
3.3.2	Bias Factor, $F_{bs}$ , in Sand.....	62
3.3.3	Development of the Bias Factor, $F_{bs}$ .....	63
3.3.4	Predicted Shaft and Toe Capacity.....	65
3.4	Capacity Prediction in Clay.....	66
3.4.1	Correction Factor between N-values and $c_u$ in Cohesive Soil.....	68
3.4.2	Unit Weight of Cohesive Soil.....	69
3.4.3	Normalised Stress Factor, $c_u/\sigma_v'$ in Cohesive Soil	70
3.4.4	Normalized Shape Factor ( $L_e/d$ ) in Cohesive Soil	71
3.4.5	Derivation of the Normalized Shape Factor, $\frac{L_e}{d}$	73
3.4.6	$\beta$ in Cohesive Soil.....	75
3.4.7	Compression Piles.....	77



3.5	Summary.....	78
-----	--------------	----

**CHAPTER 4            RELIABILITY CONCEPT**

4	Reliability Method in Geotechnical Engineering	79
4.1	Previous Study Using Bayesian Theorem.....	80
4.2	Bayes Theorem.....	81
4.3	Factor of Safety.....	82
4.4	Central Factor of Safety.....	83
4.5	Reliability Index, $\beta$ , and Safety Measure.....	84
4.6	Relationship between $Q_m$ , $Q_p$ , $Q_a$ and $\beta$ .....	89
4.7	Probability of Failure.....	92
4.8	Summary.....	93

**CHAPTER 5            ALGORITHM DEVELOPMENT**

5	Stage 1: Calibration and Data Collection...	94
5.1	Stage 2: Capacity Prediction, SF and $\beta$ .....	96
5.2	Stage 3: Allowable Capacity Determination	97
5.3	Calibration Data.....	98
5.4	Derivation of the Shaft Correction Factor, $F_{sc}$ , for Piles in Clay.....	99
5.5	Bias Factor, $F_{bc}$ , and Site Variability, $s_c$ ...	105
5.6	Predicted Capacity for Piles in Clay Layer...	109
5.7	Determination of Allowable Capacity Using Chart	111
5.8	Summary.....	112



## **CHAPTER 6            TESTING OF THE ALGORITHM**

<b>6</b>	<b>Algorithm Testing for Measured Capacities Obtained from Static Load Test.....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Data Collection and Procedures for Alorithm Testina.....</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Data Selection Criteria for Alorithm Testina</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>Deviation of Prediction.....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>6.4</b>	<b>Most Consistent Approach for Davisson Failure Criterion.....</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>6.5</b>	<b>Most Consistent Approach for Chin Failure Criterion.....</b>	<b>120</b>
<b>6.6</b>	<b>Most Consistent Approach for Fuller and Hov Failure Criterion.....</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>6.7</b>	<b>Most Consistent Approach for Butler and Hovs Failure Criterion.....</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>6.8</b>	<b>Determiation of Most Consistent Formula using IT with PDA Analyser Measured Results</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>6.9</b>	<b>Suaageded Deterministic Safety Factors...</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>6.10</b>	<b>Comparison with Other Predictor's Model...</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>6.11</b>	<b>Comparison with Other Predictors at the Northwestern Pile Prediction Svmposium...</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>6.12</b>	<b>Allowable Capacity according to Reliability Approach.....</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>6.13</b>	<b>Determination of Allowable Capacity According to Deterministic Approach.....</b>	<b>134</b>
<b>6.14</b>	<b>Summarv.....</b>	<b>136</b>



## CHAPTER 7

<b>ALGORITHM FOR COMPUTER PROGRAMMING.....</b>	<b>137</b>
--	------------

## CHAPTER 8

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

8	Summary.....	146
---	--------------	-----

8.1	Recommendations.....	148
-----	----------------------	-----

<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>150</b>
------------------------	------------

### APPENDICES

1A	Data for $F_{bs}$ Development.....	160
----	------------------------------------	-----

2A	Data for $s_c$ , $F_{sc}$ and $F_{bc}$ Development.....	161
----	---	-----

3A	Data for Testing of the Algorithm.....	169
----	--	-----

4A	$Q_m$ for the Northwestern Pile Prediction Symposium	174
----	--	-----

5A	Example of Spreadsheet Developed for Capacity Prediction.....	175
----	---	-----

<b>VITA.....</b>	<b>177</b>
------------------	------------



## List of Tables

Table		Page
2.1	Categories of Analysis and Design Procedures (Poulos, 1989)	11
2.2	Categorization of Method for Evaluation of Axial Pile Capacity (Poulos, 1989)	13
2.3	Proposed Coefficient of Skin Friction between Soil and Construction Materials (Potyondy, 1961)	35
3.1	Shaft and Toe Correction Factor, $F_{ss}$ and $F_{ts}$ , for Pile Capacity Prediction in Sand (Ab.Malik, 1992)	61
3.2	N-Cu Correlation Equations and Conditions for Application	68
4.1	Reliability index and its $P_f$	92
5.1	Shaft Correction Factors, $F_{sc}$ , for Piles in Clay	105
5.2	Bias Factors, $F_{bc}$ , and Site Variability, $s_c$ , for Piles in Clay	108



## List of Figures

Figure		Page
2.1(a)	$f_{\phi}$ on Smooth Surfaced Concrete for Non-Cohesive Soil	37
2.1(b)	$f_c$ on Smooth Surfaced Concrete for Cohesive Soil	37
2.2	Load vs Settlement chart	42
2.3(a)	Measured Capacity for Davisson Method	46
2.3(b)	Measured Capacity for Chin Method	46
2.3(c)	Measured Capacity for Fuller and Hoy Method	47
2.3(d)	Measured Capacity for Butler and Hoy Method	47
2.4	Capacity Estimates of [C], [B], [F] & [D]	48
3.1	IT LOOP	57
3.2	$F_{bs[C]}$ derived from Chin Criterion	63
3.3	$F_{bs[D]}$ derived from Davisson Criterion	64
3.4	Capacity ratio ( $Q_{cs}/Q_m$ correlated with $c_v/\sigma_{ov}'$ )	71
3.5	Capacity Ratios ( $Q_m/Q_c$ ) vs $L_e/d$	74
3.6	Simulated Result of $c_v/\sigma_v'$ vs $L_e/d$	76
3.7	Capacity Ratios correlated with $1/\phi$	76
3.8	Capacity Ratios Correlated with $\phi$	77
4.1	Failure State, Limiting State and Safe State	86





Figure		Page
4.2	Failure State, Limiting State and Safe State in a Reduced Coordinate System	88
4.3	Graphical Representation of $\beta$ for a Normal Distribution of SM (Bourguard, 1987; Oboni, 1989)	88
5.1	Calibration of the Algorithm	95
5.2	The Algorithm	100
5.3(a)	$F_{sc}$ for API Method	102
5.3(b)	$F_{sc}$ for LAMBDA Method	103
5.3(c)	$F_{sc}$ for RANDOLPH Method	103
5.3(d)	$F_{sc}$ for SEMPLE & RIGDEN Method	104
5.4(a)	$F_{bc}$ for API Method	106
5.4(b)	$F_{bc}$ for LAMBDA Method	107
5.4(c)	$F_{bc}$ for RANDOLPH Method	107
5.4(d)	$F_{bc}$ for SEMPLE & RIGDEN Method	108
5.5	Design Chart	111



## List of Notations

$Q_c$	Calculated axial pile capacity
$Q_m$	Measured axial pile capacity
$Q_p$	Predicted axial pile capacity
$Q_a$	Allowable axial pile capacity
$Q_{tm}$	Measured toe capacity
$Q_{sm}$	Measured shaft capacity
$L_e$	Effective embedded pile length
$d$	Effective pile diameter
$c_u$	Undrained shear strength
$\sigma_v'$	Overburden stress
API	Pile capacity analytical formula developed by the American Petroleum Institute
RAND	Pile capacity analytical formula developed by Randolph
S&R	Pile capacity analytical formula developed by Semple and Rigden
$\lambda$	Pile capacity analytical formula in clay developed by Foch and Vijaygerjaya and later corrected by Kraft
$Q_{cs}$	Calculated pile shaft capacity in clay layer
$F_{ss}$	Shaft correlation factor for piles in sand
$F_{ts}$	Toe correlation factor for piles in sand
$F_{bs}$	Bias factor for piles in sand
$F_{sc}$	Shaft correlation factor for piles in clay
$F_{bc}$	Bias factor for piles in clay



$S_s$	Site variability factor for piles in sand
$S_c$	Site variability factor for piles in clay
$S_{sc}$	Site variability factor for piles in layered soil
$\vartheta$	Dimensionless factor
$N$	SPT N-Values
$N_o$	Bearing capacity factor
$q_b$	Tip bearing capacity
$S_t$	Ratio of radial effective stress to end bearing pressure in vicinity of the pile
$\phi'$	Effective angle of shearing resistance
$\gamma_n'$	Effective unit weight of soil
$\gamma_n$	Total unit weight of soil
$\gamma_w$	Unit weight of water
$\sigma'_v$	Effective overburden stress
$\tau_s$	Unit shaft friction capacity
[D]	Interpretation method of loading test using Davisson's failure criterion
[C]	Interpretation method of loading test using Chin's failure criterion
[IT]	Calculated pile capacity using Iterative Technique
[API]	Pile prediction formula for piles in clay layer derived from API method
[RAND]	Pile prediction formula for piles in clay layer derived from Randolph's method
[S&R]	Pile prediction formula for piles in clay layer derived from Semple and Rigden's method



$[\lambda]$	Pile prediction formula for piles in clay layer derived from $\lambda$ method
$[X]+[Y]$	Combination of pile prediction formula in sand derived from X and pile prediction formula in clay derived from Y
$[X]+[Y]+[Z]$	$[X]+[Y]$ Prediction is compared with $[Z]$ failure criterion
$[X]$	$[D]$ , $[C]$ or $[IT]$
$[Y]$	$[API]$ , $[RAND]$ , $[S\&R]$ and $[\lambda]$
$[Z]$	$Q_{m[PDA]}$ , $Q_{m[D]}$ , $Q_{m[C]}$ , $Q_{m[F]}$ or $Q_{m[B]}$
$Q_{m[PDA]}$	Measured capacity from PDA test
$Q_{m[D]}$	Measured capacity using Davisson failure criterion
$Q_{m[C]}$	Measured capacity using Chin failure criterion
$Q_{m[F]}$	Measured capacity using Fuller and Hoy failure criterion
$Q_{m[B]}$	Measured capacity using Butler and Hoy failure criterion
$Q_m/Q_p$ Or $Q_p/Q_c$	Capacity ratios
$\sigma^*$	Interpreted standard deviation

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1 Introduction

Piled foundation was previously differentiated from shallow foundation using the ratio of embedded pile length to pile diameter ( $L_e/d > 4$ ). This method of differentiating deep and shallow foundation has long been used for carrying the superstructure load into the soil stratum (Berezantzev, 1965). Pile design is usually based on the requirement that the pile and the soil surrounding it must be able to withstand the maximum load, which can occur during the life span of the structure, (Meyerhof, 1970). The analysis involved is usually carried out by introducing a safety factor on the pile capacity, and this is known as **deterministic** design. However, the safety factors are arbitrarily chosen.

For this reason **reliability** methods were introduced into the capacity analysis procedure. Reliability technique is recognized as well as suited for pile capacity studies since piles are one of the few civil engineering materials that are routinely tested to failure, (Bourguard, 1987). Reliability methods are nowadays recognized as a powerful tool in geotechnical engineering. The Bayesian rule, which is the principal reliability method used

in this study, allows prior probability distribution to be upgraded. The reliability method has been used extensively in geotechnical engineering related problems for at least the past two decades. Previously Ab.Malik, (1992), has developed an algorithm for capacity determination in sand, whereby a simple static formula and reliability method (Bayesian-theorem) was applied to rationally determine the allowable capacity. This was probably a premier study attempting to associate deterministic and reliability method in the analysis of axial pile capacity.

A large portion of this study will concentrate on the prediction of pile axial capacity. Demand for economic and fast track construction makes the prediction of pile capacity and performance before piles are constructed a very attractive alternative (Thurman & D'Applonia, 1965). Capacity prediction has come a long way since Mr. Wellington in 1888, who claimed that the Engineering News (EN) formula which is based on dynamic equation, to be the safest and none the better (... "no better or safer formula than this for the safe working load for piles under all ordinary conditions"... ) than this formula (Komornik, 1971). However, it is well known that since the EN formula, there have been many computational methods developed for the determination of pile capacity. This is mainly contributed by the increased knowledge on the pile soil behavior and the increased usage of computers. As stated by Terzaghi in 1960 "...our theories will be superseded by better ones..."