1 OF 1
ADA
090175

END
DATE
FILMED
11-80
DTIC

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Contract N00014-76-C-0200

Task No. NR 356-504

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 19

Rubber-Modified Epoxies: Transitions and Morphology

by

L. T. Manzione, J. K. Gillham and C. A. McPherson

Prepared for Publication

in the

Journal of Applied Polymer Science

Princeton University
Polymer Materials Program
Department of Chemical Engineering
Princeton, NJ 08544

September 1, 1980

Principal Investigator
J. K. Gillham
609/452-4694

80 10 7 053

(14) TR-19

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
Technical Report No. 19	AD-A090175	(9) Technical rept.

4. TITLE (and Subtitle)	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
Rubber-Modified Epoxies: Transitions and Morphology.	Sept. 1979-Sept. 1980
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER

7. AUTHOR(s)	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
L. T. Manzione, J. K. Gillham & C. A. McPherson	N00014-76-C-0200

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
Polymer Materials Program Department of Chemical Engineering Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544	Task No. NR 356-504

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE
Office of Naval Research 800 North Quincy St. Arlington, VA 22217	Sept. 1980
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 29

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
(12) 36	
	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Rubber Toughened Epoxies
Transitions
Morphology
Mechanical Properties

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

A variety of different morphologies, and therefore mechanical properties, can be obtained from a single rubber-modified epoxy formulation. The volume fraction, domain size, and the number of particles of phase-separated rubber are determined by the competing effects of incompatibility, rate of nucleation and domain growth, and the quenching of morphological development by gelation. These factors can be varied by the butadiene/acrylonitrile ratio of the reactive rubber, the temperature of cure and the gelation time. These

DD FORM 1473   EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
1 JAN 73
S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

401377

ideas have been exploited to control the development of morphology of these amorphous systems. Phase separation was investigated by electron microscopy, viscometry, and dynamic mechanical analysis.

Accession For
NTIS CRA&I
DTIC TAB
Unannounced
Justification

By
Distribution
Availability Codes

A

RUBBER-MODIFIED EPOXIES: TRANSITIONS AND MORPHOLOGY

L. T. Manzione[†] and J. K. Gillham
Polymer Materials Program
Department of Chemical Engineering
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08544

and

C. A. McPherson
Engineering Research Center
Western Electric Co.
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

SYNOPSIS

A variety of different morphologies, and therefore mechanical proper-
ties, can be obtained from a single rubber-modified epoxy formulation. The
volume fraction, domain size, and the number of particles of phase-separated
rubber are determined by the competing effects of incompatibility, rate of
nucleation and domain growth, and the quenching of morphological development
by gelation. These factors can be varied by the butadiene/acrylonitrile
ratio of the reactive rubber, the temperature of cure and the gelation time.
These ideas have been exploited to control the development of morphology of
these amorphous systems. Phase separation was investigated by electron
microscopy, viscometry, and dynamic mechanical analysis.

[†]Current address: Bell Laboratories, Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974

INTRODUCTION

Low levels of carboxyl-terminated reactive liquid rubber copolymers of butadiene and acrylonitrile (CTBN) can improve the toughness and impact properties of cured epoxy resins.[1,2] In-situ phase separation occurs during the cure of the epoxy matrix. The dispersed rubbery phase can introduce energy dissipation mechanisms.

Gelation and vitrification are the two most important macroscopic phenomena that occur during the isothermal cure of crosslinking systems. The theoretical gel point is the critical conversion at which branched molecules of mathematically infinite molecular weight are first formed. Below this conversion all of the molecules are finite. Gelation is accompanied by a large increase in viscosity. In principle, the conversion needed to gel can be calculated from the functionality of the starting material.[3] Vitrification is the formation of a glassy solid from low molecular weight liquid or from the rubbery state through a change of temperature, molecular weight or crosslinking. A specific chemical conversion is needed to vitrify at a fixed temperature.

A mixture of low molecular weight bisphenol-A type epoxy resin, 10 parts per hundred parts resin (phr) of CTBN, and 5 phr piperidine is homogeneous at the start of cure if the cure temperature is above some critical solubility temperature (which is designated T_{s_0}). In the presence of piperidine there is a rapid reaction of the carboxyl end groups of the CTBN with the epoxide ring.[4] The large excess of bis epoxy resin results in the rubber being capped at both ends by one unit of epoxy. Further reaction of this rubber-containing diepoxide occurs with the unreacted epoxy. There is a simultaneous increase in molecular weight and viscosity coincident with

the development of the network structure. The rubber and epoxy become less compatible with cure, and a phase separation point is reached where rubber-rich domains precipitate in the epoxy-rich matrix. Once gelation has occurred the morphology is fixed.[1,4,5,6] Long gel times promote complete separation.[5] If the material gels quickly the rubber domains may not have sufficient time to develop and smaller, fewer domains form.[5] If gelation occurs prior to phase separation the rubber is trapped in the network structure and no domains form.

The compatibility of the rubber and epoxy can be controlled by the acrylonitrile content of the rubber modifier as well as the cure conditions. The CTBN modifiers of higher acrylonitrile content are more compatible with epoxy in terms of solubility parameter and they precipitate at a later stage of cure.

A variety of different morphologies, and therefore material properties, can be obtained from a single rubber-modified epoxy formulation. The volume fraction, domain size, and number of particles of phase-separated rubber are determined by the competing effects of incompatibility, rate of nucleation and domain growth, and the quenching of morphological development by gelation.

EXPERIMENTAL

Materials

The rubber modifiers employed were low molecular weight copolymers of butadiene and acrylonitrile manufactured by the B. F. Goodrich Co. under the trade name Hycar[(R)] CTBN. Three rubbers of varying acrylonitrile content were employed. Chemical and physical properties and the nomenclature of the

modifiers are presented in Table 1. The table also includes information on a carboxyl-terminated liquid polybutadiene (CTB) which was not examined further after finding that it was not initially compatible with the epoxy resin in the range of temperatures used for cure (i.e. $T_{S_0} > T_{cure}$).

A low molecular weight liquid diglycidyl ether of bisphenol A (DGEBA) epoxy resin, Epon 828, Shell Chemical Co., was used. It was cured with piperidine (b.p. 105°C), a tertiary amine catalyst that is effective in promoting the homopolymerization of epoxy.

Formulations and cure conditions are summarized in Table 2. Notation for the formulations is also provided in Table 2.

Techniques

Dynamic mechanical spectra were obtained using a fully automated Torsional Braid Analyzer (TBA)[7] over a temperature range of -190° to 200°C at 1.5°C/min in a dry helium atmosphere. TBA was used to study the glass transition of the rubber ($_R$Tg) and epoxy ($_E$Tg) phases in the cured systems. Specimen preparation consisted of impregnating a multifilament glass fiber braid with the fluid reactant mixture. No solvent was used. After mounting, the specimens were cured in the instrument.

Scanning electron micrographs (SEM) were obtained on fracture surfaces of cured rubber-modified epoxies with an AMR 1000 SEM. Cast specimens ($\sim$1/8" thick) were fractured in air immediately after being removed from liquid nitrogen. They were coated with a thin layer of gold using a high-vacuum gold sputterer.

Transmission electron micrographs (TEM) were obtained on ultra-thin microtomed sections which had been prepared from cast specimens which had

been stained with a 1% solution of osmium tetroxide (OsO_4/THF).[8]

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The series of rubber-modified epoxies cured with piperidene was used to study the development of morphology. An objective was to develop widely different morphologies from the same proportion of 10 phr of CTBN. A preliminary report has been published (9). Relationships between morphology and energy dissipation mechanisms for a rubber-modified epoxy system are reported in a subsequent paper.[10] Cure temperatures of 90°, 120°, and 150°C were employed to widen the compatibility range of each rubber. All three temperatures are above the initial solubility temperature, T_{s_0}, for each system. The mechanical loss spectrum for each of the modified epoxies is presented in Fig. 1. Corresponding SEM micrographs (Fig. 2) indicate that the intensity of the rubber damping peak correlates with the volume fraction of phase-separated rubber. The volume fraction was evaluated from the SEM micrographs using stereology.[11] The morphological results are summarized in Table 3. The intensity of the rubber damping peak has been reported to correlate with the volume fraction of phase-separated rubber when specimens are prepared in the same manner and have similar morphology.[12]

Differences were found in the temperature of the unmodified epoxy glass transition (Fig. 1a). The low temperature cures provide the highest $_ET_g$. This may be the result of different time/temperature paths of cure which result in different network structures. There are, however, complications in the present system due to volatilization of piperidine. At high cure temperatures the concentration of piperidine could be diminished and again lead to different network structures from those formed at low

temperatures.

Rubber that did not phase separate remained dissolved and could plasti-
cize the epoxy glass transition temperature. Because of the complications
alluded to, the differences in $_E T_g$ (Figures 1b,1c,1d) cannot be attributed
to plasticization, but this plasticization phenomenon has been noted in
other rubber-modified epoxy formulations.[5,13] Investigation of the antici-
pated coupling of the temperature and intensity of the rubber glass transition
with the temperature and intensity of the epoxy glass transition should provide
indirect morphological evidence on the extent of phase separation.

However, the rubber damping peak always occurs at or below the T_g of
unreacted CTBN even though CTBN is capped with DGEBA (see Ref. 5 which also
shows that the depression of $_R T_g$ decreases with increasing amounts of rubber
modifier in the formulations). DGEBA and CTBN must be incorporated in the
domains since the domain size is much larger than the molecular length of the rubber.
For a homogeneous blend, $_R T_g$ should be shifted higher than the T_g of CTBN,
for example according to the Gordon-Taylor copolymer equation.[14] There are
several reasons why this shift is not observed. A high magnification
transmission electron micrograph of a typical rubber domain [from a dicyan-
diamide-cured epoxy[10]] is shown in Figure 3. The micrograph of this specimen
(stained with OsO_4) clearly shows discrete areas of unstained epoxy inside
the rubber domain. Phase segregation within the domain may explain why $_R T_g$
is not shifted to higher temperature due to blending of rubber and epoxy.
(It is noted in Figure 3 that the rubber appears to be concentrated in the
outer annulus of the larger domains.)

A second consideration is the effect of thermal shrinkage stresses.
Triaxial thermal shrinkage stress[15] develops in the dispersed domain phase

on cooling through the epoxy glass transition temperature since the co-
efficient of thermal expansion of the rubbery state is larger than that of
the glassy state. The domains are thereby constrained by the glassy epoxy
matrix. The glass transition of the rubber in the domain phase is depressed,
and therefore, $_RTg$ can be below the Tg of pure CTBN.

A third consideration arises from the apparent shift of the $_RTg$ loss
peak[5] due to the addition of the intensity of the rubber damping
peak to that of the low temperature secondary relaxation of the epoxy
($_ETsec < _RTg$).

The extent of phase separation depended on a number of factors. Formu-
lation 13/150 contained the most compatible rubber [CTBN (X13)] and formed
a clear single-phase material when cured at 150°C; visibly, all the rubber
remained in solution. Cured 13/120 and 13/90 were both two-phase systems
with low levels of phase-separated rubber and very small domains. The three
cured resins which contain CTBN(X8) showed a maximum in the average domain
size at the intermediate cure temperature and a slight maximum in volume
fraction of phase-separated rubber at the lowest cure temperature. The
resins containing the least compatible of the three rubbers [CTBN(X15)]
showed maxima in both domain size and volume fraction at the intermediate
cure temperature. The presence of these maxima at intermediate conditions
suggests the influence of competing effects. A proposed generalized repre-
sentation of morphology as a function of cure temperature is presented in
Figure 4: it shows the volume fraction of phase-separated rubber at a
maximum at intermediate temperatures and an unchanging morphology after
gelation.

A complementary study was undertaken to determine how domain formation

was influenced by the viscosity of the curing medium. The CTBN(X15) modi-
fied resin was used because it showed maxima in domain size and volume
fraction at the intermediate temperature (120°C). Cure was conducted at
both 90° and 150°C. Aliquots were removed intermittently and their viscos-
ities at the cure temperature were determined using a Haake$^{(R)}$ Rotovisco
cone and plate viscometer equipped for high temperature measurements. The
resin cured at 90° had a higher initial viscosity than the resin cured at
150°C. The time to gel should follow Arrhenius behavior causing the gel
time at 150° to be much shorter than the gel time at 90° and a crossover in
viscosity versus time [gelation being measured as an isoviscous event[7]].
Presumably, because of the loss of piperidine due to volatilization, the
gel time at 150° was only slightly shorter than at 90°C. Visual observation
of a cloud point in the curing resin indicated that phase separation in both
resins occurred prior to this crossover point and before gelation (Figs. 5a
& 5b). The domains formed at 90° had precipitated in a more viscous medium
than those formed at 150°C.

For the sake of discussion, the diffusivity of rubber (A) in epoxy
solvent (B) is considered to be proportional to the temperature/viscosity
ratio through the Stokes-Einstein relation[16]

$$D_{AB} = kT/6\pi R_A n_B \qquad\qquad I$$

where k is the Boltzmann constant, R_A is the radius of rubber adduct mole-
cules which can be estimated from the molar volume of the rubber adduct,
T is the absolute temperature, and n_B is the viscosity of epoxy. From the
viscosity data (Fig. 5a) and Eq. I, a seven fold increase in diffusivity
occurs over the temperature range of cure investigated (90° to 150°C).

Diffusivity is the controlling factor for phase separation if the time re-
quired for diffusion (t_{diff}) is longer than the time available for phase
separation (t_{ps}). The characteristic time scale of diffusion in two dimen-
sions is:[16]

$$t_{diff} = \frac{L^2}{2D_{AB}} \qquad\qquad II$$

A length scale (L) can be assigned from the average two dimensional dis-
tance between domain centers obtained from micrographs of the cured speci-
mens (L = 10 microns). It is difficult to assign a representative diffu-
sivity since the diffusivity, like the viscosity, is time dependent. A
minimum diffusion time can be obtained by evaluating the diffusivity at
the onset of phase separation. Both epoxy and rubber adduct are low
molecular weight at this time so the Stokes-Einstein expression can probably
be applied. A range in diffusion time of $\sim$ 3 minutes at 90° to $\sim$ ½ minute
at 150° was calculated from equation II.

The nominal time available for phase separation is also difficult to
assign because the rate of phase separation is not uniform. The time dif-
ference between the cloud point and the gel time may be used as the maximum
phase separation time.

$$t_{ps} = t_{gel} - t_{cl} \qquad\qquad III$$

This time is about 110 minutes at both 90° and 150°. Comparison of the time
for phase separation and the diffusion time indicates that the minimum dif-
fusion time is considerably shorter than the time available for phase separa-
tion. No constraint of morphology development would be expected under these
conditions for these two temperatures. It is important to note, however,

that the diffusivity will continually decrease during cure, whereas the driving function for phase separation increases with increasing molecular weight during cure. The effective diffusion time is therefore longer than the value based on the viscosity at phase separation whereas the effective phase separation time is shorter than the time between the cloud point and gelation.

Experimental evidence to support this contention has been obtained. Earlier results[17] have shown that domain development in a series of similar resins cured with different catalyst levels at 170°C was constrained by gelation when the gel time was 5 minutes or less. The diffusion time for that system at 170° is therefore about 5 minutes. In the present case, kinetic effects on the morphology were found at 90°C. There is a ten-fold decrease in diffusivity between the cures at 170° and 90°C. The effective time scale for diffusion at 90° in that earlier system was therefore about 50 minutes. Assuming that the two systems are similar, the time scales for diffusion and phase separation are of the same order of magnitude for cure at 90°C and it is therefore feasible to expect kinetic constraint under these conditions.

Comparison of the minimum time of diffusion obtained from the conditions at phase separation and the nominal phase separation time is important because in many commercial applications the resins are highly viscous materials with gel times of only a few minutes. These resins are highly susceptible to morphological constraint and this constraint can often be predicted by comparing the diffusion and phase separation time scales.

The kinetic and thermodynamic factors involved in phase separation parallel those which control crystallization of linear polymers. The overall

rate of crystallization passes through a maximum between two temperature limits. The glass transition temperature serves as the lower bound below which crystal growth cannot occur due to kinetic limitations of transporting polymer to the crystal surface. The melting point (T_m) provides the upper temperature limit. The presence of kinetic and thermodynamic competing effects results in a maximum in the overall rate of crystallization at some intermediate temperature.

In rubber-modified thermosetting materials, there is an upper isothermal temperature limit, the solubility temperature (T_s), above which rubber and epoxy are sufficiently compatible that phase separation does not occur prior to gelation. Short gel times inhibit morphological development and lower the T_s temperature. T_{s_0} is the upper temperature limit for phase separation of the unreacted resin and may be above or below the glass transition temperature of the initial reactant mixture $(_{Resin}T_g)$. If $T_{s_0} < {}_{Resin}T_g$, then $_{Resin}T_g$ is the lower temperature limit in practice for phase separation from a homogeneous reactive solution since phase separation does not occur in a vitrified matrix. A proposal for general behavior is illustrated in Figure 6 which shows the volume fraction of phase-separated rubber formed above T_{s_0} after long times from homogeneous solution versus the isothermal temperature.

Differences in the compatibility of the CTBN rubber modifiers with epoxy resin cause the cured formulations to fit onto different portions of the curves presented in Fig. 6.

CTBN(X13), the most compatible rubber, results in T_s being below 150° since resin 13/150 is a clear single phase material after cure. The plot of volume fraction of phase separated rubber versus the temperature of cure indicates that formulations with this rubber span only a small portion near

T_S of the entire curve (see Figure 7a).

T_S increases as the compatibility of rubber and epoxy decreases. T_S is greater than 150° for formulations with CTBN(X8) since cured 8/150 is a two-phase material. The data for CTBN(X8) systems still fall on the upper thermodynamically controlled side of the plot of volume fraction of rubber versus temperature of cure but they are approaching the maximum as the small differences in volume fraction between cured 8/120 and 8/90 indicate (see Figure 7b).

Formulations containing CTBN(X15), the least compatible resin, are shifted sufficiently from their T_S that after cure the volume fraction of phase-separated rubber straddles a maximum at 120° (Figure 7c). CTBN(X15) and Epon 828 did not provide a homogeneous starting material below 90°C (i.e. $T_{S_0} < 90°C$).

The systems were not cured above 150°C because of loss of piperidine.

CONCLUSIONS

The thermomechanical transitions and the extent of phase separation in rubber-modified epoxies have been studied as a function of the acrylonitrile content of the modifier and the temperature of cure. The intensity of the low temperature damping peak associated with the glass transition of the material in the segregated rubbery phase, $_RTg$, was found to correlate with the volume fraction of phase separated rubber. The $_RTg$ transition is found at or below the value for the pure rubber. The effect of triaxial thermal shrinkage stresses on the domains makes it difficult to obtain any firm conclusions from the location of $_RTg$.

The varying extents of phase separation were attributed to the competing effects of thermodynamic compatibility and transport of the rubber in a polymerizing system in which morphological development is eventually quenched by gelation. This phenomenon is analogous to crystallization kinetics in linear polymers where a maximum in overall crystallization growth rate is obtained at an intermediate temperature between Tg and T_m. Domain formation (nucleation) and growth in a thermosetting system are further complicated by polymerization and gelation. There is a finite time required for rubber to separate into the rubber-rich domains. This time is continually increasing during cure due to the increase in viscosity caused by the increase in molecular weight. Actual phase separation may lag the thermodynamic force for phase separation. Gelation halts phase separation and seals the morphology; the temperature of gelation therefore determines the morphology.

ADDENDUM

In the course of this work, the thermomechanical properties of the components were obtained using TBA. Thermomechanical spectra for the unreacted CTBN and CTB rubbers are presented in Fig. 8. A glass transition temperature and a distinct T > Tg relaxation were identified in each spectrum. The ratio of (T>Tg)/Tg°K was 1.17 indicating this event is the T_{ll} phenomenon identified by Boyer and co-workers.[18] The intensity of the T_{ll} relaxation relative to its Tg relaxation decreased with increasing acrylonitrile content of the copolymer.

Curing of a rubber-modified epoxy resin eliminates the T_{ll} relaxation of the rubber in most cases. One noted exception is when there is complete phase separation of CTB(2000X162). (This rubber in the absence of epoxy has the most intense T_{ll}.) The thermomechanical spectrum of this two phase system (Fig. 9) exhibits an epoxy Tg, a rubber Tg and a damping maximum above and one (a shoulder) below the glass transition of the rubber. The $_RTg$ and the $T > _RTg$ peaks correspond to the Tg and T_{ll} relaxations for CTB(2000X162).

This approach suggests a technique for characterizing the fluid state of polymers above Tg. The material can be encapsulated as a dispersed second phase in a rigid matrix. Thermomechanical properties of the composite can then be obtained by conventional dynamic mechanical methods.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

TABLE 1. Properties of Reactive Liquid Rubbers

Hycar Molecular Wt.	CTBN(1300X13) 3500	CTBN(1300X8) 3500	CTBN(1300X13) 3500	CTB(2000X162) 4800
Acrylonitrile Content, wt.%	27	17	10	0
Viscosity, Brookfield cp @ 27°C	625,000	125,000	55,000	40,000
Solubility Parameter	9.14	8.77	8.45	8.04
Specific Gravity	0.960	0.948	0.924	0.907
T_g°, °C (< 1 Hz)	-30	-45	-59	-74

Materials and data supplied by B. F. Goodrich Co., Brecksville, Ohio.
°Glass transition temperature determined by TBA in the present work.

TABLE 2. Composition and Cure of Model Resins: Notation

Formulation (phr): 100.0 Epon 828, 10.0 CTBN, 5.0 Piperidine

	Cure		
Modifier	90°C/18 hr.	120°C/14 hr.	150°C/4 hr.
None	828/90	828/120	828/135
CTBN (X13)	13/90	13/120	13/150
CTBN (X8)	8/90	8/120	8/150
CTBN (X15)	15/90	15/120	15/150

TABLE 3. Morphology:Summary

Resin	D	ϕ_2	N
13/90	0.10	0.01	90
13/120	0.10	0.01	90
13/150	-	0.00	0
8/90	0.7	0.14	35
8/120	1.4	0.12	11
8/150	1.3	0.05	5
15/90	0.8	0.10	25
15/120	4.1	0.17	1.4
15/150	3.2	0.07	0.8

D : Average domain diameter in microns

ϕ_2 : Volume fraction of phase-separated rubber

N : Number of domains/100 μ^2.

TABLE CAPTIONS

Table 1. Properties of Reactive Liquid Rubbers.

Table 2. Composition and Cure of Model Resins: Notation.

Table 3. Morphology: Summary.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1. TBA damping curves for unmodified and modified epoxy resins cured at 150°C (see Table 2): a) 828/90, 828/120, 828/135; b) 13/90, 13/120, 13/150; c) 8/90, 8/120, 8/150; d) 15/90, 15/120, 15/150.

Fig. 2. SEM micrographs of rubber-modified epoxy cured at 90°, 120° and 150°C (see Table 2): a) 13/90; b) 13/120; c) 13/150; d) 8/90; e) 8/120; f) 8/150; g) 15/90; h) 15/120; i) 15/150.

Fig. 3. TEM micrograph of rubber-modified epoxy resin (see text).

Fig. 4. Morphology map (schematic).

Fig. 5. Steady shear viscosity of curing epoxy resin plotted against the elapsed time of cure:
a) data for times near phase separation; b) data up to gelation.

Fig. 6. Schematic plot of volume fraction of phase-separated rubber formed after long times above T_{s_0} from homogeneous solution versus the isothermal temperature. T_s is the minimum temperature at which phase separation occurs prior to gelation. T_{s_0} is the minimum temperature at which the initial reactants are mutually soluble. $_{Resin}T_g$ is the glass transition temperature of the homogeneous reactants. T_{s_0} can be above (as indicated) or below $_{Resin}T_g$.

Fig. 7. Volume fraction of phase-separated rubber versus the temperature of gelation
a) CTBN(X13), b) CTBN(X8), c) CTBN(X15).

Fig. 8. Thermomechanical spectra (TBA) for CTBN rubbers.

Fig. 9. Thermomechanical spectrum (TBA) for rubber-modified epoxy which displays the T_{ll} relaxation of the rubbery phase.

REFERENCES

1. E. H. Rowe, A. R. Siebert and R. S. Drake, Mod. Plast., 47, 110 (1970).

2. J. N. Sultan and F. J. McGarry, Polym. Eng. and Sci., 13(1), 29 (1973).

3. P. J. Flory, *Principles of Polymer Chemistry*, Cornell Univ. Press, Ithaca, NY (1953).

4. C. K. Riew, E. H. Rowe and A. R. Siebert, Adv. in Chem. Series No. 154, 326, R. D. Deanin and A. M. Crugnola,Eds. American Chemical Society, Washington, D.C. (1976).

5. J. K. Gillham, C. A. Glandt, and C. A. McPherson, Am. Chem. Soc. Div. Organic Coatings and Plastics Chem., 37(1), 195 (1977). See also, J. K. Gillham, C. A. Glandt and C. A. McPherson, in "Chemistry and Properties of Crosslinked Polymers", S. S. Labana, Ed., Academic Press, NY (1977), p. 491.

6. C. B. Bucknall, *Toughened Plastics*, Applied Science Publishers Ltd., London, pp. 36, 37 (1977).

7. J. K. Gillham, Polym. Eng. and Sci. 19, 676 (1979). See also, J. K. Gillham, Amer. Institute of Chemical Engineers Journal, 20(6), 1066 (1974).

8. C. K. Riew and R. W. Smith, J. Polym. Sci., A-1, 9, 2739 (1971).

9. L. T. Manzione, J. K. Gillham and C. A. McPherson, Amer. Chem. Soc., Preprints, Div. Org. Coat. Plastic. Chem., 41, 364 (1979).

10. L. T. Manzione, J. K. Gillham and C. A. McPherson, Amer. Chem. Soc., Preprints, Div. Org. Coat. Plast. Chem., 41, 371 (1979). See also, J. Applied Polymer Sci., this issue.

11. *Quantitative Microscopy*, R. T. DeHoff and F. N. Rhines, Eds., McGraw Hill, NY (1968).

12. H. Keskkula, S. G. Turley and R. F. Boyer, J. Appl. Polym. Sci., 15, 351 (1971).

13. L. T. Manzione, Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton University (1979).

14. T. G. Fox and S. Loshaek, J. Polym. Sci. 15, 371 (1955).

15. R. H. Beck, S. Gratch, S. Newman and K. C. Rusch, Polymer Letters, 6, 707 (1968).

16. *Transport Phenomena* , R. B. Bird, W. E. Stewart, E. N. Lightfoot, Wiley, NY (1969).

17. C. A. Glandt, Ph.D. Thesis, Princeton University (1976).

18. R. F. Boyer, Polym. Eng. and Sci. 19, 732 (1979).

Figure 1a

Figure 1b

Figure 1c

Figure 1d

FIGURE 2

Figure 2a

Figure 2b

Figure 2c

FIGURE 2

Figure 2d



Figure 2e

Figure 2f

45''

FIGURE 2

Figure 2g

Figure 2h

Figure 2i

1μ

FIGURE 3

MORPHOLOGY MAP

FIGURE 4

VISCOSITY VS. TIME

Figure 5a

VISCOSITY VS. TIME

Figure 6

FIGURE 7

THERMOMECHANICAL BEHAVIOR
OF CTBN RUBBERS

CTBN (X13)
$T_g -30°$
$T_{ll} 14°$

CTBN (X8)
$T_g -45°$
$T_{ll} -9°$

CTBN (X15)
$T_g -59°$
$T_{ll} -21°$

CTB (X162)
$T_g -74°$
$T_{ll} -47°$

LOG DECREMENT

TEMPERATURE °C

FIGURE 8

FIGURE 9

SP472-3/A1

472:GAN:716:ddc
78u472-608

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, GEN

	No. Copies		No. Copies
Office of Naval Research Attn: Code 472 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217	2	U.S. Army Research Office Attn: CRD-AA-IP P.O. Box 1211 Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709	1
ONR Branch Office Attn: Dr. George Sandoz 536 S. Clark Street Chicago, Illinois 60605	1	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Mr. Joe McCartney San Diego, California 92152	1
ONR Area Office Attn: Scientific Dept. 715 Broadway New York, New York 10003	1	Naval Weapons Center Attn: Dr. A. B. Amster, Chemistry Division China Lake, California 93555	1
ONR Western Regional Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena, California 91106	1	Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory Attn: Dr. R. W. Drisko Port Hueneme, California 93401	1
ONR Eastern/Central Regional Office Attn: Dr. L. H. Peebles Building 114, Section D 666 Summer Street Boston, Massachusetts 02210	1	Department of Physics & Chemistry Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
Director, Naval Research Laboratory Attn: Code 6100 Washington, D.C. 20390	1	Dr. A. L. Slafkosky Scientific Advisor Commandant of the Marine Corps (Code RD-1) Washington, D.C. 20380	1
The Assistant Secretary of the Navy (RE&S) Department of the Navy Room 4E736, Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20350	1	Office of Naval Research Attn: Dr. Richard S. Miller 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217	1
Commander, Naval Air Systems Command Attn: Code 310C (H. Rosenwasser) Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20360	1	Naval Ship Research and Development Center Attn: Dr. G. Bosmajian, Applied Chemistry Division Annapolis, Maryland 21401	1
Defense Technical Information Center Building 5, Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	12	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Dr. S. Yamamoto, Marine Sciences Division San Diego, California 91232	1
Dr. Fred Saalfeld Chemistry Division, Code 6100 Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375	1	Mr. John Boyle Materials Branch Naval Ship Engineering Center Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112	1

SP472-3/A3

472:GAN:716:ddc
78u472-608

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, GEN

No.
Copies

Dr. Rudolph J. Marcus
Office of Naval Research
Scientific Liaison Group
American Embassy
APO San Francisco 96503   1

Mr. James Kelley
DTNSRDC Code 2803
Annapolis, Maryland 21402   1

-32-

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 356A

	No. Copies		No. Copies
Dr. Stephen H. Carr Department of Materials Science Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	1	Picatinny Arsenal Attn: A. M. Anzalone, Building 3401 SMUPA-FR-M-D Dover, New Jersey 07801	1
Dr. M. Broadhurst Bulk Properties Section National Bureau of Standards U.S. Department of Commerce Washington, D.C. 20234	2	~~Dr. J. K. Gillham~~ ~~Department of Chemistry~~ ~~Princeton University~~ ~~Princeton, New Jersey 08540~~	1
Professor G. Whitesides Department of Chemistry Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	1	Douglas Aircraft Co. Attn: Technical Library C1 290/36-84 AUTO-Sutton 3855 Lakewood Boulevard Long Beach, California 90846	1
Professor J. Wang Department of Chemistry University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah 84112	1	Dr. E. Baer Department of Macromolecular Science Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio 44106	1
Dr. V. Stannett Department of Chemical Engineering North Carolina State University Raleigh, North Carolina 27607	1	Dr. K. D. Pae Department of Mechanics and Materials Science Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903	1

Dr. D. R. Uhlmann
Department of Metallurgy
   and Material Science
Massachusetts Institute
   of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
	1	NASA-Lewis Research Center
		Attn: Dr. T. T. Serofini, MS-49-1
		21000 Brookpark Road
		Cleveland, Ohio 44135
			1

Naval Surface Weapons Center Attn: Dr. J. M. Augl, Dr. B. Hartman White Oak Silver Spring, Maryland 20910	1	Dr. Charles H. Sherman Code TD 121 Naval Underwater Systems Center New London, Connecticut	1
Dr. G. Goodman Globe Union Incorporated 5757 North Green Bay Avenue Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201	1	Dr. William Risen Department of Chemistry Brown University Providence, Rhode Island 02192	1
Professor Hatsuo Ishida Department of Macromolecular Science Case-Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio 44106	1	Dr. Alan Gent Department of Physics University of Akron Akron, Ohio 44304	1

SP472-3/B7

472:GAN:716:ddc
78u472-608

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 356A

	No. Copies		No. Copies
Mr. Robert W. Jones Advanced Projects Manager Hughes Aircraft Company Mail Station D 132 Culver City, California 90230	1	Dr. T. J. Reinhart, Jr., Chief Composite and Fibrous Materials Branch Nonmetallic Materials Division Department of the Air Force Air Force Materials Laboratory (AFSC) Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433	1
Dr. C. Giori IIT Research Institute 10 West 35 Street Chicago, Illinois 60616	1	Dr. J. Lando Department of Macromolecular Science Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio 44106	1
Dr. M. Litt Department of Macromolecular Science Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio 44106	1	Dr. J. White Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering University of Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee 37916	1
Dr. R. S. Roe Department of of Materials Science and Metallurgical Engineering University of Cincinnati Cincinnati, Ohio 45221	1	Dr. J. A. Manson Materials Research Center Lehigh University Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015	1
Dr. Robert E. Cohen Chemical Engineering Department Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	1	Dr. R. F. Helmreich Contract RD&E Dow Chemical Co. Midland, Michigan 48640	1
Dr. T. P. Conlon, Jr., Code 3622 Sandia Laboratories Sandia Corporation Albuquerque, New Mexico	1	Dr. R. S. Porter Department of Polymer Science and Engineering University of Massachusetts Amherst, Massachusetts 01002	1
Dr. Martin Kaufmann, Head Materials Research Branch, Code 4542 Naval Weapons Center China Lake, California 93555	1	Professor Garth Wilkes Department of Chemical Engineering Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, Virginia 24061	1
Professor S. Senturia Department of Electrical Engineering Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	1	Dr. Kurt Baum Fluorochem Inc. 6233 North Irwindale Avenue Azuza, California 91702	1
		Professor C. S. Paik Sung Department of Materials Sciences and Engineering Room 8-109 Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	1