

**INTERACTION OF METHYL ORANGE WITH  
CATIONIC, ANIONIC AND NONIONIC SURFACTANTS  
IN BUFFERED SOLUTIONS**

*A THESIS*

*Submitted to the*

Program for Postgraduate Studies in Applied and Industrial Technology

Faculty of Science and Technology

Al-Quds University

In Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of  
**Master of Science**  
in  
**Applied & Industrial Technology**

*By*

**Khuloud Jawad Takrouri**

B.Sc.(1998)

*Supervised by*

**Dr. Mustafa Khamis**

Associ. Prof. Physical Chemistry

**Dr. Magdy el-Dakiky**

Assist. Prof. Analytical-Organic Chemistry

**Dr. Adnan Manassra**

Associ. Prof. Analytical Chemistry

Jerusalem/ Palestine

2001

**TO MY DEAR FAMILY**

## ***ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS***

First and foremost I would like to express my sincere thanks and deep appreciation to all those who gave me help and assistance in completing this thesis and producing it in this final form. My special thanks to my prime supervisor, my dear uncle, Dr. Mustafa Khamis. I appreciate the efforts he exerted in the supervision of the practical implementation of the content of the thesis and his help in bringing out, and discussing the results of the thesis.

I also wish to thank my supervisor Dr. Magdy el-Dakiky for the effort and time he contributed. No acknowledgement of thanks would be complete without thanking Dr. Adnan Manassra for his active participation in guidance and help. My thanks to my sister Nisreen Takrouri for her skill and artistry in producing the final draft. Finally, my heartfelt thanks to the staff at the Department of Chemistry, my colleagues and friends for their support and help.

## ABSTRACT

The interaction of methyl orange, an anionic dye, with various surfactants, viz. Anionic (sodium dodecyl sulfate, SDS), nonionic (tritonX-100, TX-100), and cationic (cetyltrimethylammonium bromide, CTAB), has been investigated spectrophotometrically in the submicellar and micellar concentration range. The apparent dissociation constant of the dye, and the apparent thermodynamic parameters, and the association constants of the two forms of the dye were evaluated in presence of different surfactant concentrations.

The results indicates that the  $pK_a$  of methyl orange decrease from 3.67 to 3.32, and 0.70 above CMC values of TX-100 and CTAB respectively. On the other hand, it increases to 3.94 above CMC value of SDS.

The effect of CTAB and TX-100 concentration on MO indicates that when the concentration of CTAB or TX-100 increased in the submicellar concentration it results in decreasing the enthalpy of ionization, entropy of ionization and Gibbs free energy of ionization untill they reach a constant value when the concentration of these surfactants reaches their CMC value. In the case of TX-100 the thermodynamic parameters of ionization of the dye,  $\Delta H_{in}^\circ$ ,  $\Delta S_{in}^\circ$  and  $\Delta G_{in}^\circ$  values decreases from 21.15 kJ/mol, 1.87J/mol.K, and 20.95kJ/mol in aqueous media to 0.00 kJ/mol, -63.57J/mol.K, and 18.95 kJ/mol in the presence of micelles, respectively. In the case of CTAB  $\Delta H_{in}^\circ$ ,  $\Delta S_{in}^\circ$  and  $\Delta G_{in}^\circ$  decreases from 21.15 kJ/mol, 1.87J/mol.K, and 20.95kJ/mol in aqueous media to -53.30 kJ/mol, -200.00J/mol.K, and 4.00kJ/mol in the presence of micelles, respectively. And in the case of SDS  $\Delta H_{in}^\circ$ ,  $\Delta S_{in}^\circ$  and  $\Delta G_{in}^\circ$  increases from 21.15 kJ/mol, 1.87J/mol.K, and 20.95kJ/mol in aqueous media to 32.76 kJ/mol, 34.44J/mol.K, and 22.49kJ/mol in the presence of micelles, respectively.

The effect of SDS concentration on  $\Delta H_{in}^\circ$  of methyl orange indicates that when the concentration of SDS is increased it hampers the ionization

process and hence increases its  $\Delta H_{in}^{\lambda}$  from 21.15 kJ/mol in aqueous media to 32.76 kJ/mol above the CMC value of SDS. The entropy of ionization for this system increase from 1.87J/mol.K in aqueous media to 34.44 J/mol.K above the CMC value. However the increase in  $\Delta H_{in}^{\lambda}$  is larger than the increase in  $\Delta S_{in}^{\lambda}$  leading to a net increase of  $\Delta G_{in}^{\lambda}$  which make this process less thermodynamically favorable.

The association constant of the two forms of the dye,  $K_c^{\lambda}$  values, to all micelle types were calculated. The results indicated that the association constants of the acidic form of the dye in presence of TX-100 , CTAB and SDS were  $2.50 \times 10^4$ ,  $2.00 \times 10^4$ , and  $2.00 \times 10^4$  liter/mol, respectively. While the association constant of the basic form of the dye in the presence of TX-100, CTAB, and SDS were  $2.50 \times 10^4$ ,  $2.50 \times 10^4$ , and  $1.67 \times 10^4$  liter/mol, respectively.

The results are discussed in light of the stabilization of the two forms of the dye in the micellar core of the different surfactant employed in this work and their effect on properties of the bulk solution phase.

# LIST OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>List of Contents</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Figures</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Illustrations</b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
I.1. Theory of color	2
I.2. Azo dyes	3
I.3. Indicators	7
I.4. Surfactants	8
I.5. Thermodynamics	14
I.5.1. Enthalpy, Gibb's free energy and entropy of ionization	14
I.5.2. Association constant	16
I.6. Surfactant-indicator interactions	17
I.7. Aim of this work	19
<b>II. EXPERIMENTAL</b>	<b>20</b>
II.1. Materials	21
II.2. Instruments	21
II.3. Methods	21
II.3.1. Preparation of stock solution	22
II.3.2. Measurements	22
II.3.2.1. Ionization constant	22
II.3.2.2. Enthalpy of ionization	22
II.3.2.3. Dye-surfactant association constant	23
II.3.2.4. Reproducibility and error analysis	24

<b>III. RESULTS &amp; DISCUSSION</b>	26
III.1. Interaction with nonionic surfactant MO- TX-100 system	27
III.1.1. Absorption spectra	27
III.1.2. Thermodynamics of ionization	33
III.1.2.1. Formic acid	33
III.1.2.2. Methyl orange	33
III.1.3. Association constants	39
III.2. Interaction with cationic surfactant MO-CTAB system	47
III.2.1. Effect of CTAB concentration on $pK_a$ of MO	47
III.2.2. Absorption spectra	50
III.2.3. Thermodynamics of ionization	55
III.2.4. Association constants	58
III.3. Interactions with anionic surfactant MO-SDS system	66
III.3.1. Effect of SDS concentration on $pK_a$ of MO	66
III.3.2. Absorption spectra	70
III.3.3. Thermodynamics of ionization	74
III.3.4. Association constants	77
 <b>CONCLUSION</b>	 84
 <b>REFERENCES</b>	 90
<b>ARABIC SUMMARY</b>	95

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- $\Delta H_{in}^{\lambda}$  : Apparent enthalpy of ionization of the indicator.
- $\Delta H_B^{\lambda}$  : Apparent enthalpy of ionization of the buffer.
- $\Delta G_{in}^{\lambda}$  : Apparent Gibbs free energy of ionization of the indicator.
- $\Delta S_{in}^{\lambda}$  : Apparent entropy of ionization of the indicator.
- $K_a^{\lambda}$  : Apparent dissociation constant of the indicator.
- $K_c^{\lambda}$  : Apparent association constant
- R** : Gas constant (8.314 KJ/mol).
- A** : Absorbance value at a specified wavelength.
- A<sub>a</sub>** : Absorbance value at a specified wavelength of the acidic form of MO.
- A<sub>b</sub>** : Absorbance value at a specified wavelength of the basic form of MO.
- $A_m^{\infty}$  : Absorbance at the saturation limit ( i.e. at high surfactant concentration)
- $A_a$  : Absorbance at the lowest surfactant concentration.
- $\eta$  : Absorbance Ratio ( $A_m^{\infty} - A_a / A - A_a$ )
- $\mu$  : Ionic strength of the solution.
- CMC**: Critical micelle concentration.
- [M]**: Micelle concentration (surfactant molar concentration divided by the aggregation number of the surfactant).
- CTAB**: Cetyltrimethyl ammonium bromide.
- TX-100**: Triton X-100.
- SDS**: Sodium dodecyl sulfonate.
- MO**: Methyl orange.
- C<sub>p</sub>** : Heat capacity.

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table[1]</b>	Absorbance–temperature data of $1 \times 10^{-5} \text{M}$ MO, $8 \times 10^{-5} \text{M}$ TX-100 at $\lambda=540 \text{nm}$ , $\text{pH}= 3.37$ , $\mu=0.1 \text{M}$ . $A_a= 0.470, A_b=0.082$	45
<b>Table[2]</b>	$\text{pK}_a^{\lambda}$ values of methyl orange at $25^\circ\text{C}$ in the presence of different TX-100 concentrations together with its thermodynamic parameters of ionization at $25^\circ\text{C}$ .	45
<b>Table[3]</b>	Absorption parameters and $K_o^{\lambda}$ for acidic form and basic form of methyl orange in the presence of TX-100.	46
<b>Table[4]</b>	Absorbance–temperature data of $1 \times 10^{-5} \text{M}$ MO, $8 \times 10^{-5} \text{M}$ CTAB at $\lambda=540 \text{nm}$ , $\text{pH}=\text{pK}_a^{\lambda}$ of MO at the used concentration of CTAB, $\mu=0.5 \text{M}$ . $A_a= 0.268, A_b=0.000$ .	64
<b>Table[5]</b>	The $\text{pK}_a^{\lambda}$ values and the apparent thermodynamic parameters of ionization of MO at different CTAB concentration at $25^\circ\text{C}$ and $\mu= 0.05 \text{M}$ .	64
<b>Table[6]</b>	Absorption parameters and $K_o^{\lambda}$ for acidic form and basic form of methyl orange in the presence of CTAB.	65
<b>Table[7]</b>	Absorbance–temperature data of $1 \times 10^{-5} \text{M}$ MO, $1 \times 10^{-1} \text{M}$ SDS at $\lambda=540 \text{nm}$ , $\text{pH}=\text{pK}_a^{\lambda}$ of MO at the used concentration of SDS, $\mu=0.1 \text{M}$ . $A_a= 0.657, A_b=0.015$ .	83
<b>Table[8]</b>	The $\text{pK}_a^{\lambda}$ values and the apparent thermodynamic parameters of ionization of methyl orange at different SDS concentrations at $25^\circ\text{C}$ and $\mu=0.1 \text{M}$	83
<b>Table[9]</b>	Absorption parameters and $K_o^{\lambda}$ for acidic form and basic form of methyl orange in the presence of SDS.	84
<b>Table [10]</b>	Thermodynamic parameters of surfactants-MO systems, $[\text{MO}] = 1 \times 10^{-5} \text{M}$ , $[\text{surfactant}]=1 \times 10^{-2} \text{M}$ , temperature= $25^\circ\text{C}$ .	86

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure[1]</b>	Effect of temperature on the absorption spectra of $10^{-5}$ M Methyl Orange in the presence of different concentrations of TX-100 using formic acid buffer.	29
<b>Figure[2]</b>	The electronic absorption spectra of $10^{-5}$ M methyl orange at various temperatures in the range of 23.5 to 54.8°C, $\mu=0.1$ M.	31
<b>Figure[3]</b>	Absorbance of $10^{-5}$ M methyl orange at $\lambda=540$ nm versus various TX-100 concentrations at different temperatures.	32
<b>Figure[4]</b>	$pK_a^{\lambda}$ versus $1/T$ of 0.5M Formic acid at different TX-100 concentrations.	34
<b>Figure[5]</b>	Log $(A-A_a/A_b-A)$ versus $1/T$ for $10^{-5}$ M methyl orange at various TX-100 concentrations.	35
<b>Figure[6]</b>	Enthalpy of ionization of methyl orange in (kJ/mol) versus TX-100 concentration.	38
<b>Figure[7]</b>	Absorbance of $10^{-5}$ M MO versus [TX-100].	41
<b>Figure[8]</b>	Absorbance of $10^{-5}$ M MO versus [TX-100] at $\lambda=420$ nm. $pH=1.80\pm 0.02$ , $Temp.=20.0\pm 0.1^{\circ}C$	42
<b>Figure[9]</b>	A plot of $\eta$ versus the reciprocal of the micelles concentration $[M]^{-1}$ of TX-100 for a: acidic form, and b: basic form of methyl orange.	43
<b>Figure[10]</b>	Absorption spectra of $10^{-5}$ M MO in the presence of $5 \times 10^{-4}$ M CTAB at different pH.	48
<b>Figure[11]</b>	pH-absorption relationship of $10^{-5}$ M MO in the presence of $1 \times 10^{-6}$ M CTAB at $\lambda=422$ and 508nm	49
<b>Figure[12]</b>	The dependence of $pK_a^{\lambda}$ of methyl orange on CTAB concentrations.	49
<b>Figure[13]</b>	Absorption spectra of MO versus CTAB concentration. $pH=0.55\pm 0.02$ .	52

<b>Figure[14]</b>	Effect of temperature on the absorption of $10^{-5}$ M Methyl Orange in the presence of different concentrations of CTAB using formic acid buffer at $\text{pH} = \text{pK}_a \pm 0.02$ of methyl orange at used concentration of CTAB, and $\mu=0.1\text{M}$	53
<b>Figure[15]</b>	Absorbance of $10^{-5}$ M methyl orange versus various [CTAB] concentrations at different temperatures. $\text{pH}=\text{pK}_a \pm 0.02$ , $\mu=0.1\text{M}$ .	54
<b>Figure[16]</b>	$\text{Log}(A-A_a/A_b-A)$ versus $1/T$ for $10^{-5}$ M methyl orange at various CTAB concentrations .	56
<b>Figure[17]</b>	Enthalpy of ionization of methyl orange in (kJ/mol) versus the concentration of CTAB.	57
<b>Figure[18]</b>	Absorbance of $10^{-5}$ M MO versus [CTAB], $\text{Temp.} = 25.0^\circ\text{C} \pm 0.1$ .	60
<b>Figure[19]</b>	Absorbance of $10^{-5}$ M MO versus [CTAB] at $\lambda=420\text{nm}$ , $\text{Temp.} = 25.0 \pm 0.1^\circ\text{C}$ .	62
<b>Figure[20]</b>	A plot of $\eta$ versus the reciprocal of the micelles concentration $[\text{M}]^{-1}$ of CTAB for a: acidic form, and b : basic form of methyl orange.	63
<b>Figure[21]</b>	Absorbance of $10^{-5}$ M MO in the presence of $1 \times 10^{-1}$ M SDS at different pH values.	68
<b>Figure[22]</b>	pH-absorption relationship of $10^{-5}$ M MO in the presence of $1 \times 10^{-1}$ M SDS at $\lambda=452$ , and $516\text{nm}$ .	69
<b>Figure[23]</b>	The $\text{pk}_a$ values of methyl orange in the presence of different SDS concentrations.	69
<b>Figure[24]</b>	Absorption spectra of MO versus SDS concentration. $\text{pH}=1.84 \pm 0.02$ .	71
<b>Figure[25]</b>	Effect of temperature on the absorption spectra of $10^{-5}$ M MO in the presence of different concentrations of SDS using formic acid buffer at $\text{pH} = \text{pK}_a \pm 0.02$ of MO at used concentration of SDS, and $\mu=0.1$ .	72

<b>Figure[26]</b>	Absorbance at $\lambda=540\text{nm}$ of $10^{-5}\text{M}$ methyl orange versus various [SDS] concentrations at different temperatures. $\text{pH}=\text{pK}_a \pm 0.02$ , $\mu=0.1\text{M}$ .	73
<b>Figure[27]</b>	$\text{Log}(A-A_a/A_b-A)$ versus $1/T$ for $10^{-5}\text{M}$ methyl orange at various SDS concentrations .	75
<b>Figure[28]</b>	Enthalpy of ionization of methyl orange in (kJ/mol) versus the concentration of SDS.	76
<b>Figure[29]</b>	Absorbance of $10^{-5}\text{M}$ MO versus [SDS], Temperature = $25.5^\circ\text{C}\pm 0.1$ .	79
<b>Figure[30]</b>	Absorbance Of $10^{-5}\text{M}$ MO versus [SDS] at $\lambda=420\text{nm}$ , Temp.= $25.5\pm 0.1^\circ\text{C}$ .	80
<b>Figure[31]</b>	A plot of $\eta$ versus the reciprocal of the micelles concentration $[\text{M}]^{-1}$ of SDS for a: acidic form, and b : basic form of methyl orange	81

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

<b>Illustration[1]</b>	Azo group in azo dyes	3
<b>Illustration[2]</b>	Methyl orange	3
<b>Illustration[3]</b>	Azo/hydrazone tautomerization	4
<b>Illustration[4]</b>	Amino/imino tautomerization	4
<b>Illustration[5]</b>	Azonium/ammonium tautomerization	4
<b>Illustration[6]</b>	Amino-azo protonation at terminal nitrogen atom	5
<b>Illustration[7]</b>	Amino-azo protonation at $\beta$ -nitrogen atom of the azo group	5
<b>Illustration[8]</b>	1:1 copper(II):azo complex	6
<b>Illustration[9]</b>	2:1 dye:metal nonpolar complex	6
<b>Illustration[10]</b>	TritonX-100	9
<b>Illustration[11]</b>	3-dimethyldodecylamine propane sulphonate	11
<b>Illustration[12]</b>	Normal micelle (aqueous environment)	11
<b>Illustration[13]</b>	Reverse micelle (non aqueous environment)	12
<b>Illustration[14]</b>	The hexagonal phase	13
<b>Illustration[15]</b>	The viscous isotropic phase	13
<b>Illustration[16]</b>	The lamellar phase	13
<b>Illustration[17]</b>	The acid-base equilibrium of methyl orange	27
<b>Illustration[18]</b>	The tautomerization of protonated form of methyl orange	28
<b>Illustration[19]</b>	The energy profile of MO-different surfactant systems	87
<b>Illustration[20]</b>	The suggested mechanism of interaction of methyl orange with micelles	89

# INTRODUCTION

## L1: THEORY OF COLORS

Colors are a human observation of the inverse of a visible absorption spectrum. It is created by the absorption of electromagnetic radiation of wavelength between 400 and 700nm. The energy of the light absorbed by the molecule promotes an electron to a higher energy level. This energy difference corresponds to 170-300kJ/mol for visible light and 300-12000kJ/mol for ultraviolet light<sup>(1)</sup>.

According to the Einstein-Bohr frequency condition (eq.1), the energy difference between the ground and excited states,  $\Delta E$ , is directly proportional to the observed frequency ( $\nu$ ) and so inversely proportional to the wavelength of light ( $\lambda$ )<sup>(2,4)</sup>.

$$\Delta E = h\nu = \frac{hc}{\lambda} \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

In the wave-mechanical model for the three-dimensional distributions of an electron, the electron orbits in the original Bohr atomic model are replaced by orbital, i.e. the distribution function of single electrons. The Shrodinger equation (2) describes the motion of an electron of mass  $m$  under a potential energy  $U$  as a function of the three Cartesian coordinates  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$ .  $E$  and  $\psi$  the total energy and the eigenfunction of the electron in different states respectively.

$$\frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial z^2} + \frac{8\pi^2 m}{h^2} [E - U(x, y, z)]\psi = 0 \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

An exact solution for this equation is possible only for extremely simple systems. Multi-electron systems, however, are solved by appropriate approximation methods such as the *valance bond theory* (VB) and molecular orbital theory. The valence bond theory was first applied to the hydrogen molecule. The wave mechanical computation showed that this process corresponds to a stabilization of  $H_2$  relative to 2 H. Extreme distributions of electrons in VB representations are called limiting structures. In the *molecular orbital theory* (MO), the molecular wave functions are formed by a linear