

AD-A213 213

4

Office of the Chief of Naval Research
Contract N00014-87-K-0326 ✓
Technical Report No. UWA/DME/TR-89/1

Spall Resistance of Alumina

L.R. Deobald, M. Taya, A.S Kobayashi, and H.S. Yoon

DTIC
ELECTE
OCT 03 1989
S D CB D

September 1989

UNCLASSIFICATION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

The research reported in this technical report was made possible through support extended to the Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Washington, by the Office of Naval Research under Contract N00014-87-K-0326. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

89 10 2 121

Spall Resistance of Alumina

L.R. Deobald, M. Taya, A.S Kobayashi, and H.S. Yoon
University of Washington
Department of Mechanical Engineering
Seattle, WA 98195

ABSTRACT

The spall strength of alumina bars was determined using a bar impact apparatus. The fracture morphology in the region of maximum tensile stress caused by the transient wave was investigated using a scanning electron microscope. No microcracking was detected away from the spall plane and the fracture toughness of the unspalled bar remained unchanged with increasing velocity.

INTRODUCTION

The ultimate goal of this research project is to study the residual strength of monolithic ceramics and ceramic/ceramic composites. The results of such a study can be used to design engineered ceramic composites with higher impact resistance. In order to achieve this goal, an impact test, which is a variation of the plate impact test, was developed. The plate impact test produces a one-dimensional compressive square stress pulse, which neglects the effects of lateral inertia caused by Poisson's effect, propagating from the impact face at the speed of sound [1]. The impactor is made of the same material and its length is half of the specimen length. A stress pulse, with a length equal to the specimen length, is thus produced. The wave propagation behavior is illustrated by the wave propagation schematics in Figure 1 and the characteristic diagram of the wave fronts (Lagrangian diagram) in Figure 2. The incoming compressive wave reflects off of the free end as a tensile wave and superposition dictates that the tensile stress component will be cancelled by the compressive component. The result is a shrinking compressive wave centered in the middle of the specimen. As the wave ends cross each other in opposing directions, a tensile component suddenly appears at the center of the specimen. The square tensile wave form will expand outward towards either end until the entire specimen is in a state of tension. This cycle is repeated until the impact energy is dissipated. Details of elastic wave propagation theory are given in Ref. [1]. The maximum stress amplitude of the pulse is given as

$$\sigma = \frac{E V_0}{2C}, \quad C^2 = \frac{E}{\rho} \quad (1)$$

where C is the dilatational bar wave speed, E is the elastic modulus, ρ is the density, and V_0 is the projectile velocity.

Experience with metals shows that spall damage can occur at the location of maximum stress and is a function of the tensile stress amplitude and pulse duration [2]. Based on the Lagrangian diagram, the region of maximum damage due to the stress pulse is located in the middle region of the specimen. Plate impact experiments on MgO crystals generated microcracking near the midplane[3], and plate impact experiments on Cu-SiO₂ crystals produced microvoid formation near the midplane[4]. Alumina has been tested extensively by high velocity plate impact experiments[5-11]. The spall strength of alumina was reported to be dependent on the tensile stress amplitude and strain rate. Microcracks can be "trapped" in brittle materials when the pulse duration is sufficiently short.

A-1

EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

Since the current work requires fracture toughness testing, an impact technique was developed which employs a 50.8 mm bar specimen which is impacted on one end by a bar of half the length (See Fig. 3). The impact apparatus, shown in Figure 4, consists of an air gun, pneumatic controls, and the impact system. The impact carriage, which contains the impactor, is propelled down the guide rails towards the specimen carriage. The impactor first collides with the specimen. Prior to collision of the plastic pieces, the elastic wave traverses the specimen length several times. A sawdust filled catch box receives the airborne specimen.

Since the stress level is a function of the impact velocity, accurate measurement of the velocity is important. The velocity measurement system consists of a low power laser which strikes a mirror mounted on the impactor carriage. The mirror, which has six black lines accurately spaced every 10 mm, travels past the stationary laser beam. The laser beam is reflected into a photodiode, producing a voltage reading by an oscilloscope. The six lines produce peaks in the oscilloscope reading from which the velocity can be determined. The striking velocity, V_0 , is determined by

$$V_0^2 = 2PA/dm \quad (2)$$

The velocity is a function of the pressure, P , the barrel cross sectional area, A , the impactor carriage travel, d , and its mass, m . A calibration curve was established by a straight line fit of the plot of V_0^2 versus P .

A strain gage (M-M CEA-06-064UW-350) was mounted 21.6 mm from the impact face in order to monitor the transient strain wave. Since the strain pulse has only a 6.2 μ sec duration, the measurement system had to have at least a 10 MHz response. The gage was a part of a potentiometer circuit which incorporated a high band pass filter (See Fig. 5). The ten gain amplifying circuit had a 20 MHz response, and the digital oscilloscope was set to 20 MHz. Since the strain gage has a finite gage length, it will average a rapidly varying signal over its gage length [12,13]. One may either correct the distortion or simply keep the gage length as small as possible in order to minimize the distortion [12]. The gages which were used had a 1.6 mm gage length. Smaller gages could not be employed since they could not dissipate enough heat on the specimens of poor heat conductivity. Excessive current will thermally damage the strain gage [13,14]. Data acquisition programs have been written for a wave form which is to be stored on the computer disk, sent to the oscilloscope for accurate time, strain, and strain rate measurements, and allows a portion of the wave form to simulate propagation in the specimen.

The specimens were precision cut and ground to the dimensions shown in Figure 3. Since the specimens were to be examined under a scanning electron microscope (S.E.M.), one side surface of the specimen was polished prior to testing. Polishing was performed on a flat glass plate using 6 micron and 1 micron diamond paste.

A critical requirement of a plate impact experiment is that the two impacting faces must meet with perfect flatness, and to satisfy this, the two surfaces must be flat and perpendicular to the adjacent sides. Precision grinding was followed by briefly polishing the ends on a flat glass plate using 6 micron and 1 micron diamond paste. The contact between the surfaces was checked under a microscope while the specimens were on a flat surface. Even with careful machining, the impact carriages did not meet perfectly. A mold

was designed so that urethane specimen/impactor holders were molded directly in the machine. A single ground steel bar passed through both molding cavities. When the solid metal piece was removed, perfectly aligned cavities were created in both plastic pieces. A smaller metal bar was added to create a cavity for the strain gage and its wires. The urethane had the added benefit of being dimensionally stable during curing and resilient to the impact force.

Once the impactor and specimen were installed in the impact apparatus, a final check was made by shining a helium-neon laser light along the line of contact with a white paper in the back ground. When no laser light could pass the contact line, then good square strain pulses were produced. A poor contact between the impactor and specimen caused sinusoidal wave forms with a superimposed slight flexural wave.

RESULTS

Alumina (Coors AD-85) bar specimens were impacted up to 14.0 m/s. Those specimens impacted above 12.2 m/s failed by complete spall. Specimens which did not fail by complete spall were tested for fracture toughness, K_{IC} . All specimens were subjected to rigorous optical and S.E.M. evaluation.

Bar Impact Test

The strain wave record is correlated with the Lagrangian diagrams in Figures 6 and 7 for the impact velocities of 12.2 m/s and 14.0 m/s. The wave forms are basically square as predicted by elementary bar theory, and the higher frequency oscillations are apparent which is attributed to the lateral inertia. The wave forms compare closely to experimental results for long rods obtained by Miklowitz[15]. The "zero strain" periods predicted by the Lagrangian diagram did not appear due to the three dimensional effects. As expected, the first compressive pulse has the longest "true" duration. Interestingly, the spalled specimen impacted at 14.0 m/s failed on the second cycle of tension. This was consistent among all specimens which failed by complete spall and supports the theory of cumulative damage.

Figure 8 displays the predicted and experimentally determined stresses plotted against the impact velocity. The predicted stress was calculated using Equation (1) with the measured impact velocity and wave speed, and the stress was obtained from the measured strain. Both values used the manufacturers value of Young's modulus (see Table 1). Some question arose in the measurement of the strain level since lateral inertia effects cause jagged wave forms. The measurement was taken at the peak values, but wave theory indicates that this could lead to stress values which are 27% too high (see Ref. 15).

Fracture Toughness Determination

The unbroken specimens were subjected to K_{IC} evaluation by the procedure presented in References [16-18]. The fracture toughness is plotted as a function of impact velocity in Figure 9. The K_{IC} was found to be independent of impact velocity. Variation of K_{IC} in Figure 9 is attributed only to the experimental scatter. Values of K_{IC} are close to those given by the material's manufacturer in Table 1.

Macro/Micro Damage Evaluation

Figure 10 maps the macrocracking found in the specimens which failed by complete spall. The alumina bars subjected to low velocity impact in this test did not exhibit the duration and magnitude dependency of failure. The specimen which did not fail at 12.2 m/s showed an unusual crack originating at the impact face. No other cracking was found in the intact specimens. The polished side surface revealed no wide spread microcracking when examined under the scanning electron microscope, but an uncommon microcrack was found originating at a pore (Fig. 11). This was the only microcrack found not associated with a spall fracture.

The fracture faces of the spalled specimens and quasi-static fractured specimens were examined under the S.E.M., and the damage characteristics are summarized in Table 2. The spall failed specimens exhibited extensive crack branching (see Fig. 12) where the quasi-static fracture specimens showed none. The fracture surfaces were qualitatively examined for intergranular and transgranular fracture characteristics. In both cases only a small percentage (~5-10%) of the grains failed by transgranular fracture (see Fig. 13) and the remaining surface was intergranular failure. The spall fracture surface exhibited substantial microcracking evidence of both grain separation (see Fig. 14) and transgranular fracture (see Fig. 15). The grain separation occurrences appeared to correlate with the impact velocity. Such intergranular failures only appeared at the spalled fractured surface, hence no change could be expected in the physical properties of the unspalled specimens.

CONCLUSIONS

The low velocity impact event produced essentially no microcracking away from the spall planes. This was reflected by no change in the fracture toughness of the intact bars.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is being supported by the Office of Naval Research, ONR Contract N00014-87-K-0326. The authors appreciate the support of Dr. Y. Rajapakse of the ONR. The careful work of machinists Richard Terry and Tom Collins is also appreciated.

REFERENCES

1. Zukas, J.A., Nicholas, T., Hallock, S.F., Greszczuk, L.B., Curran, D.R., *Impact Dynamics*, John Wiley and Sons, pp. 8-9, 367-382, 1982.
2. Meyers, M.A., Aimone, C.T., "Dynamic Fracture (Spalling) of Metals", *Progress in Material Science*, **28**, pp 1-96, 1983.
3. Kim, K.S., Clifton, R.J., "Dislocation Motion in MgO Crystals Under Plate Impact," *Journal of Material Science*, **19**, pp. 1428-1438, 1984.
4. Taya, M., Hall, I.W., Yoon, H.S., "Void Growth in Single Crystal Cu-SiO₂ During High Strain-Rate Deformation," *Acta Metall.*, **33**(12), pp. 2143-2153, 1985.
5. Munson, D.E., Lawrence, R.J., "Dynamic Deformation of Polycrystalline Alumina," *Journal of Applied Physics*, **50**(10), pp. 6272-6282, 1979.

6. Yaziv, D., Bless, S.J., Rosenberg, Z., "Spall and Recompaction of Ceramics Using Double-Impact Technique," *Journal of Applied Physics*, **58**(9), pp 3415-18, 1985.
7. Brandon, D.G., Yeshurun, Y., Rosenberg, Z., Ozeri, Y., "Micromechanisms of Impact Failure in Engineering Ceramics," *Macro- and Micro-Mechanics of High Velocity Deformation and Fracture*, K. Kawata, J. Shiori, Eds., IUTAM Symposium, Tokyo, Japan, 1985, pp. 127-135.
8. Rosenberg, Z., Yeshurun, Y., D.G. Brandon, "Dynamic Response and Microstructure of Commercial Alumina", International Conference on Mechanical and Physical Behaviour of Materials Under Dynamic Loading, *Journal De Physique*, Colloque C5, Supplement au n^o8, Tome 46, pp 331-341, September 1985.
9. Brandon, D.G., Yeshurun, Y., "Mechanisms of Dynamic Failure in Debased Alumina," *Ceramic Microstructures '86: Role of Interfaces*, Berkeley, CA, USA, Plenum Press, New York, pp 807-818, 1987.
10. Yeshurun, Y., D.G. Brandon, Venkert, A., Rosenberg, Z., "The Dynamic Properties of Two-Phase Alumina/Glass Ceramics", International Conference on Mechanical and Physical Behaviour of Materials Under Dynamic Loading, *Journal De Physique*, Colloque C3, Supplement au n^o9, Tome 49, pp 11-19, September 1988.
11. Yeshurun, Y., Brandon, D.G., Rosenberg, Z., "Impact Damage Mechanisms in Debased Alumina," *Impact Loading and Dynamic Behavior of Materials*, C.Y. Chiem, H.-D. Kunze, L.W. Meyer, Eds., 1, DGM Informationsgesellschaft, Verlag, pp. 399-405, 1988.
12. Bickle, L.W., "The Response of Strain Gages to Longitudinally Sweeping Strain Pulses," *Experimental Mechanics*, **10**(8), pp. 333-337, 1970.
13. Dally, J.W., Riley, W.F., *Experimental Stress Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York, pp. 180-182, 217-227, 1978.
14. "Optimizing Strain Gage Excitation Levels," Micro-Measurements, Tech Note 127, Aug 1968.
15. Miklowitz, J., *The Theory of Elastic Waves and Waveguides*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1978, pp. 42-60, 383-394.
16. Jenkins, M.G., "Ceramic Crack Growth Resistance Determination Utilizing Laser Interferometry, PhD Dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, 1987.
17. Chuck, L., Fuller, E.R., Freiman, S.W., "Chevron-Notch Bend Testing in Glass: Some Experimental Problems," Chevron-Notched Specimens: Testing and Stress Analysis, ASTM STP 855, J.H. Underwood, S.W. Freiman and F.R. Baratta, Eds., *American Society for Testing and Materials*, Philadelphia, 1984, pp. 167-175.
18. Munz, D., Bubsey, R.T., Shannon, J.L., Jr., "Fracture Toughness Determination of Al₂O₃ Using Four-Point-Bend Specimens with Straight-Through and Chevron Notches," *Journal of the American Ceramic Society*, **63**(5-6), pp. 300-305.

Table 1, Material Properties

Material	Alumina(Al_2O_3)
Manufacturer's Designation	Coors AD-85
Elastic Modulus(GPa)	221
Possion's Ratio	0.22
Density (g/cc)	3.41
Flexural Strength (MPa)	317
Fracture Toughness ($\text{MPa}\sqrt{\text{m}}$)	3 - 4
Bar Wave Speed (km/s)	8.1

Table 2, Fracture Face Characteristics of Alumina

	<u>Out of Plane Microcracks</u>				
	<u>Intergranular Primary Failure</u>	<u>Transgranular Primary Failure</u>	<u>Intergranular & Triple points</u>	<u>Transgranular Cracking</u>	<u>Crack Branching</u>
Unimpacted quasi-static fracture	1	2	4	5	5
Quasi-static fracture(12.2m/s)	1	2	3	5	5
Spall fracture (12.5 m/s)	1	2	2	3	3
Spall fracture (14.0 m/s)	1	2	2	3	3
1. Extensive					
2. Common					
3. Occasional					
4. Rare					
5. Non-existent					




Figure 1, Wave propagation schematic in a plate impact test.




Figure 2, Characteristic diagram of the wave fronts (Lagrangian diagram).





Figure 3, Specimen Geometry and Strain Gage Location.



CROSS SECTION PROFILE VIEW

Figure 4, Impact Apparatus, including airgun, impact carriage, specimen carriage.




Figure 5, Strain Gage Circuit; $R_b = 562 \Omega$, $V = 15$ volts

Strain History of Bar Impacted at 12.2 m/s

Material: Coors alumina

No Spall Failure

Maximum Stress: 169 MPa ($E=221$ GPa)

Estimated Half Period, t : 6.1 micro-sec.




Figure 6, Correlation of measured strain with Lagrangian diagram; velocity = 12.2 m/s.

Strain History of Bar Impacted at 14.0 m/s

Material: Coors alumina
 Complete Spall Failure
 Maximum Stress: 196 MPa ($E=221$ GPa)
 Estimated Half Period, t : 6.1 micro-sec.




Figure 7, Correlation of measured strain with Lagrangian diagram; velocity = 14 m/s.




Figure 8, Measured and predicted stress level.




Figure 9, Fracture toughness as a function of impact velocity.




Figure 10, Map of macrocracking in impacted alumina bars.




Figure 11, Uncommon microcrack leading from a pore, $V_0 = 10.1$ m/s.




Figure 12, Macroscopic crack branching



Figure13, Evidence of transgranular fracture; velocity = 14 m/s.



Figure 14, Intergranular crack (grain separation) in alumina; velocity = 14 m/s.



Figure 15, Transgranular fracture crossing several grains; velocity = 12.5 m/s.

Office of Naval Research 800 N Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5000 Attn: Code 11325M (4 copies)	Naval Surface Weapons Center White Oak, MD 20910 Attn: Code R30 Technical Library	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command Washington, DC 20362 Attn: Code 310B	Dr. M.L. Williams School of Engineering University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA 15261	Professor J. Awerbuch Dept of Mech Engr & Mechanics Drexel University Philadelphia, PA 19104
Office of Naval Research 800 N Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5000 Attn: Code 1131	Naval Surface Weapons Center Dahlgren, VA 22448 Attn: Technical Library	US Naval Academy Mechanical Engineering Dept. Annapolis, MD 21402	Professor R.H. Gallagher President Clarkson University Potsdam, NY 13676	Professor T.H. Lin University of California Civil Engineering Dept Los Angeles, CA 90024
Defense Documentation Cntr (4 copies) Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 02314	Naval Civil Eng Library Port Hueneme, CA 93043 Attn: Technical Library	Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940 Attn: Technical Library	Dr. D.C. Drucker Dept. of Aerospace Eng. & Mechanics University of Florida Tallahassee, FL 32611	Professor G.J. Dvorak Dept of Civil Engr Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, NY 12180
Naval Research Laboratory Washington, DC 20375 Attn: Code 6000	Naval Underwater Systems Center New London, CT 06320 Attn: Code 44 Technical Library	Mr. Jerome Persh Stl Spect for Matls & Struct OUSDE & E. The Pentagon Room 301089 Washington, DC 20301	Professor B.A. Boley Dept. of Civil Engineering Columbia University New York, NY 10025	Dr. R.M. Christensen Chemistry & Mtrl Sci Dept Lawrence Livermore Natl Lab PO Box 80P Livermore, CA 94550
Naval Research Laboratory Washington, DC 20375 Attn: Code 6300	Naval Underwater Systems Center Newport, RI 02841 Attn: Technical Library	Professor J. Hutchinson Harvard University Div. of Applied Sciences Cambridge, MA 02138	Professor J. Duffy Brown University Division of Engineering Providence, RI 02912	Professor J.R. Rice Division of Applied Sciences Harvard University Cambridge, MA 02138
Naval Research Laboratory Washington, DC 20375 Attn: Code 6380	Naval Weapons Center China Lake, CA 99555 Attn: Technical Library	Dr. Harold Liebowitz, Dean School of Engr. & Applied Sci. George Washington University Washington, DC 20052	Professor J.D. Achenbach Northwestern University Dept of Civil Engineering Evanston, IL 60208	Professor W.N. Sharpe The Johns Hopkins University Dept of Mechanics Baltimore, MD 21218
Naval Research Laboratory Washington, DC 20375 Attn: Code 5830	NRL/Underwater Sound Reference Dept. Orlando, FL 32856 Attn: Technical Library	Professor G.T. Hahn Vanderbilt University Dept. of Mech. & Matls. Engr. Nashville, TN 37235	Professor F.A. McClintock Dept of Mechanical Engineering Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA 02139	Professor C.F. Shih Brown University Division of Engineering Providence, RI 02912
Naval Research Laboratory Washington, DC 20375 Attn: Code 6390	Chief of Naval Operations Department of the Navy Washington, DC 20350 Attn: Code 0P-098	Professor Albert S. Kobayashi Dept. of Mechanical Engineering University of Washington Seattle, WA 98195	Professor D.M. Parks Dept of Mechanical Engineering Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA 02139	Professor A. Rosakis California Institute of Tech Graduate Aeronautical Labs Pasadena, CA 91125
David W. Taylor Naval Ship R & D Center Annapolis, MD 21402 Attn: Code 28	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command Washington, DC 20362 Attn: Code 05R25	Professor L.B. Freund Brown University Division of Engineering Providence, RI 02912	Dr. M.F. Kanninen Southwest Research Institute PO Drawer 28510 6220 Culebra Road San Antonio, TX 78284	Professor D. Post VA Polytechnic & State U Dept of Engr Science & Mechanics Blacksburg, VA 24061
David W. Taylor Naval Ship R & D Center Annapolis, MD 21402 Attn: Code 2812	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command Washington, DC 20362 Attn: Code 05R26	Professor B. Budiansky Harvard University Division of Applied Sciences Cambridge, MA 02138	Professor F.P. Chiang Dept of Mechanical Engr State U of NY at Stony Brook Stony Brook, NY 11794	Professor W. Sachse Cornell University Dept of Theoretical & Applied Mechanics Ithaca, NY 14853
David W. Taylor Naval Ship R & D Center Annapolis, MD 21402 Attn: Code 2814	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command Washington, DC 20362 Attn: Code 09B31	Professor S.N. Atluri Georgia Institute of Technology School of Engr. & Mechanics Atlanta, GA 30332	Professor S.S. Wang Dept of Theoretical & Appl Mechs University of Illinois Urbana, IL 61801	
David W. Taylor Naval Ship R & D Center Annapolis, MD 21402 Attn: Code 1700	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command Washington, DC 20362 Attn: Code 55Y	Professor G.Springer Stanford University Dept. of Aeronautics & Astronautics Stanford, CA 94305	Professor Y. Weitsman Civil Engr Department Texas A&M University College Station, TX 77843	
David W. Taylor Naval Ship R & D Center Annapolis, MD 21402 Attn: Code 1720	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command Washington, DC 20362 Attn: Code 55Y2	Professor H.T. Hahn Dept of Engr Sciences & Mech Penn State University 227 Hammond Bldg University Park, PA 16802	Professor I.M. Daniel Dept of Mechanical Engr Northwestern University Evanston, IL 60208	
David W. Taylor Naval Ship R & D Center Annapolis, MD 21402 Attn: Code 1720.4	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command Washington, DC 20362 Attn: Code 03D	Professor S.K. Datta University of Colorado Dept. of Mechanical Engineering Boulder, CO 80309	Professor C.T. Sun School of Aeronautics & Astronautics Purdue University W. Lafayette, IN 47907	
Naval Air Development Center Warminster, PA 18974 Attn: Code 6043	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command Washington, DC 20362 Attn: Code 7226			
Naval Air Development Center Warminster, PA 18974 Attn: Code 6063	Commander Naval Sea Systems Command Washington, DC 20362 Attn: Code 310A			

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER UWA/DME/TR-89/1
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Spall Resistance of Alumina		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Technical Report
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER UWA/DME/TR-89/1
7. AUTHOR(s) L.R. Deobald, M. Taya, A.S. Kobayashi, H.S. Yoon		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-87-K-0326
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Dept of Mech Engr, FU-10 University of Washington Seattle, Washington 98195		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of the Chief of Naval Research Arlington, Virginia 22217-5008		12. REPORT DATE 9/89
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 15
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 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) alumina, impact, spall strength		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The spall strength of alumina bars was determined using a bar impact apparatus. The fracture morphology in the region of maximum tensile stress caused by the transient wave was investigated using a scanning electron microscope. No microcracking was detected away from the spall plane and the fracture toughness of the unspalled bar remained unchanged with increasing velocity.		