Introduction

Particleboard is a panel material manufactured under pressure, essentially from particles of wood and/or other lingo-cellulosic fibrous materials (for example, wood chips, sawdust and flax shives) with the addition of an adhesive (Nemli, 2000). The growing demand for wood based panels has led to continuous efforts to find new resources as an alternative wood. Forest residues are potentially usable in different ways (Reineke, 1965). Disregarding any ecological, silvicultural or fuel values of forest residue, this material may have waste value in particleboard manufacture. Manufacturing value added panel products may be the most efficient use of such waste residues (Lehman and Geimer, 1974). The forest products industry produces large quantities of bark every year, 66% of which is used for thermal energy production. However, a significant amount of bark is still unused (Blanchet et al., 2000).

Because of its reactivity and pungent odour formaldehyde has been regulated in the workplace in numerous countries for many years, and in the 1970’s attention was paid to problems of formaldehyde emission from wood based panels into buildings (Vyse, 1993). Nemli et al. (2004) evaluated the effect of impregnating wood particles with mimosa bark extract on some
properties of particleboard. In that study, 5% bark extract was prepared from mimosa bark that had been extracted using at 100 °C and was provided by the manufacturer. Particles were soaked for 3 h in the extract. They stated that particleboards made from particles impregnated with mimosa bark extract had lower mechanical, physical and formaldehyde emission values than those of boards made from unimpregnated particles.

The objectives of this study were to determine whether formaldehyde emission and thickness swelling in particleboard can be reduced with the use of mimosa bark in the core layer of particleboard as a raw material and to investigate the effects of bark use on the mechanical properties of particleboard. The difference between this study and that of Nemli et al. (2004) lies in the bark usage method.

Materials and Methods

Black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia* L.) trees, with an average diameter at breast height of 20 cm, collected from the Black Sea region of Turkey, and mimosa bark from the Aksu Leather Company in Turkey were used in the production of particleboards.

The raw materials were reduced to chips using a commercial chipper, and a ring type flaker was used to break the chips down to particle size. The particles were dried to 3% moisture content in a laboratory-type dryer and classified into 2 sizes using a vibrating horizontal screen for the core and face layers. Dried particles were mixed with urea formaldehyde resin (55% solid content and 1% ammonium chloride solution as a hardener), 9% for the core and 10% for the face, in a laboratory blender. The shelling ratio, the ratio of the face thickness to the total thickness of the panels, was 0.40 for all experimental panels. The mats (56.5 cm by 56.5 cm by 2 cm thick) were manually formed and were pressed in an electrically heated press using a pressure of 27.5 kg cm⁻², at 150 °C for 5 min. All the panels were manufactured with an average target density of 0.68 g cm⁻³. Five different types of panel were made using various mixtures of bark. Bark was used only in the core layer of the panels. A total of 15 experimental panels were made in the laboratory.

Thirty samples were prepared for modulus of rupture (MOR), modulus of elasticity (MOE), internal bond strength (IB), and thickness swelling (TS) tests (2 h immersion) based on EN specifications. These were conditioned at a temperature of 20 °C and 65% relative humidity before any tests were carried out (EN 310, 1993; EN 319, 1993; EN 317; 1993). Formaldehyde emission (FE) was conducted according to the DIN EN 717-3 (1996) standard (WKI-Bottle method). Three specimens were prepared to determine the FE of the panels. The dimensions of the samples were 50 x 450 mm, 50 x 450 mm, 50 x 50 mm, 50 x 50 mm and 25 x 25 mm for the MOR, MOE, IB, TS and FE tests, respectively.

Data for each test were statistically analyzed. ANOVA was used to test for significant differences between factors and levels. When ANOVA indicated a significant difference among factors and levels, a comparison of the means was carried out employing the Tukey test to identify which groups were significantly different from others.

Results and Discussion

Mean values of MOE, MOR, IB strength, TS and FE, and statistical analysis results are shown in Table 1. Based on EN standards, 11.5 N mm⁻² for general uses, 13 N mm⁻² for furniture manufacturing, and 1600 N mm⁻² for furniture manufacturing are the minimum requirements for the MOR and MOE of particleboard panels, respectively (EN 312-2, 1996; EN 312-3, 1996). All types of panels made in this study satisfied the MOR and MOE requirements for general uses and furniture manufacturing, with the exception of panel types D and E.

The IB strength requirements are 0.24 N mm⁻² and 0.35 N mm⁻² for general-purpose boards and interior fitments, respectively. Except for panel types D and E the other groups were found to comply with IB strength values for general uses and interior fitments (including furniture).

Based on EN standards, particleboard should have a maximum thickness swelling value of 8%. Average thickness swelling of the specimens ranged from 8.23% to 14.47% (Table 1). All the panels had higher thickness swelling values than those allowed by EN 317 standard (max. 8% for 2 h immersion). These high values may be related to the fact that no wax or other hydrophobic substance was used during particleboard manufacture. It
seems that additional treatment of particles, such as acetylating or heat treatment of particles and coating of the particleboard surfaces with melamine-impregnated paper, would improve the dimensional stability of the particleboards (Volz, 1973; Wisherd and Wilson, 1979; Hall et al., 1984; Hofstrand et al., 1984; Tisler et al., 1986; Nemli, 1995).

The addition of 6.25% bark did not significantly affect particleboard modulus of rupture, modulus of elasticity, internal bond strength, thickness swelling or formaldehyde emission. However, increasing bark content up to 25% statistically reduced the mechanical properties, thickness swelling and formaldehyde emission of the particleboard (Table 1).

The decrease in formaldehyde emission and thickness swelling values may be due to the high amounts of polyphenolic extractives and tannin in the bark. These compounds can react with formaldehyde in the adhesive, even at normal temperatures, to yield condensation products with high bonding potential. In addition, reactions between the phenolic extractives, washed acids in the bark and formaldehyde in the adhesive could cause an improvement in formaldehyde emission.

It has been reported that bark usage improved the formaldehyde emission and thickness swelling of the panels made from various species (Chen and Paulitsch, 1974; Roffael, 1982; Prasetya and Roffael, 1991; Lelis and Roffael, 1995; Kalaycioğlu and Nemli, 1997). Decreases in mechanical properties may be due to the porous structure of the bark. This structure causes a higher adhesive absorption ratio than that of wood particles. For this reason, adhesive levels between the particle surfaces are insufficient.

Conclusions

In this study, various amounts of mimosa bark were used to make particleboard panels. In the light of the preliminary results of this study, mimosa bark could be used in particleboard manufacture. The addition of 6.25% bark did not significantly affect modulus of rupture, modulus of elasticity, internal bond strength, thickness swelling or formaldehyde emission. However, increasing bark content up to 12.50% reduced the mechanical properties and improved the formaldehyde emission and thickness swelling of particleboard. It is suggested that bark levels should not exceed 12.50% in the panels if these are to maintain their desirable properties. It was stated that one of the methods of lowering formaldehyde emission from particleboard was the use of mimosa bark as a raw material in the core.

Further studies should be performed to examine mimosa bark as a raw material in the surface layers to evaluate other panel properties such as screw holding capacity, linear expansion, and overlaying ability with surface coatings. Moreover, different tree barks and mixtures, shelling ratios, and resin contents should also be considered in the production of different panels to better understand manufacture and raw materials.
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Table 1. Properties of particleboard and Tukey test results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel Type</th>
<th>Bark Usage (%)</th>
<th>MOR* (N mm⁻²)</th>
<th>MOE* (N mm⁻²)</th>
<th>IB* (N mm⁻²)</th>
<th>TS* (%)</th>
<th>FE* (mg CH₂O)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.93 (a)</td>
<td>1804.02 (a)</td>
<td>0.48 (a)</td>
<td>14.47 (a)</td>
<td>1.45 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>14.76 (a)</td>
<td>1793.36 (a)</td>
<td>0.46 (a)</td>
<td>14.31 (a)</td>
<td>1.38 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>13.48 (b)</td>
<td>1679.94 (b)</td>
<td>0.36 (b)</td>
<td>12.66 (b)</td>
<td>1.05 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.24 (c)</td>
<td>1545.33 (c)</td>
<td>0.27 (c)</td>
<td>10.54 (c)</td>
<td>0.83 (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.07 (d)</td>
<td>1414.25 (d)</td>
<td>0.18 (d)</td>
<td>8.23 (d)</td>
<td>0.66 (d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Different letters in parentheses represent statistical significance while the same letters indicate a similarity of differences (P < 0.05).
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