# Mechanism of Solvent Crazing in Unmodified and Rubber-Modified Polystyrenes

K. IISAKA and K. SHIBAYAMA, Manufacturing Development Laboratory, Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Minamishimizu, Amagasaki, Hyogo, Japan

## **Synopsis**

The dependence of critical strain on time was determined at  $-20^{\circ}$  and  $20^{\circ}$ C with a Bergen elliptical strain device for unmodified and rubber-modified polystyrenes immersed in *n*-alcohols. Critical strain  $\epsilon_c$  decreased with time and attained a lower limiting value  $\epsilon_{cl}$  at long times. The value of  $\epsilon_{cl}$  decreased with increasing chain length of the *n*-alcohol and with increasing temperature, while it increased with increasing rubber content. In order to elucidate the mechanism of solvent crazing at longer times, the degree of equilibrium swelling  $Sv_{eq}$  and the diffusion coefficient D were also determined by sorption experiment. The lower limiting value of critical stress  $\sigma_{cl}$  was correlated to the value of  $Sv_{eq}$ , irrespective of the rubber content. The At, the time necessary to attain  $\epsilon_{cl}$ , was regarded as the time needed for the thin layer of polymer surface to absorb the liquid to equilibrium for craze formation. The thickness of such a layer was estimated to be about 0.1  $\mu$ m by using the experimental data of At and D. The predominant mechanism of solvent crazing at longer times appears to be a flow process of absorbed polymer at the craze tip.

## INTRODUCTION

The role of solvent in crazing (or cracking) of glassy polymers has been explained in the past years by two major hypotheses, that is, plasticization and surface energy reduction. Recently, Kambour et al.<sup>1,2</sup> reported that the resistance to solvent crazing of two ductile glassy polymers depends on the degree of swelling and the attendant reduction in  $T_g$ . They further suggested<sup>3</sup> that organic liquids do not excert a significant role on surface energy reduction in solvent crazing, as a result of the investigation of solvent crazing of "dry" polystyrene and "dry" crazing of plasticized polystyrene.

Andrews and Bevan<sup>4</sup> measured the minimum surface work  $\tau_0$  required to propagate the discontinuity as a function of temperature for the systems of poly(methyl methacrylate) and alcohols. This quantity  $\tau_0$  varies with temperature in a consistent manner, decreasing rapidly as the temperature rises to a characteristic temperature  $T_c$  and then remaining constant at some value  $\tau_0^*$ for  $T > T_c$ . The value of  $\tau_0^*$  was correlated to the interfacial tension between polymer and solvent, in contrast with the result of Kambour et al.<sup>1,2</sup>

Time and temperature are vitally important parameters in solvent crazing and should be included as variables in all tests for crazing behavior. Kinetic studies on craze initiation in polystyrene in solvents were done as a function of the chain length of *n*-alcohol with a Bergen elliptical strain device.<sup>5</sup> The critical strain decreases with time at shorter times and becomes constant at longer times. It has been concluded that at shorter times where the critical strain decreases with time, the rate of craze initiation is determined by the diffusion of the molecules of liquid into polymer, as the results of the analysis of crazing data in terms of the Eyring model and sorption studies. It was the purpose of this study to

0021-8995/79/0024-2113\$01.00

investigate the molecular mechanism of solvent crazing at longer times where the critical strain attains a lower limiting value.

## **EXPERIMENTAL**

The polymers which were used for the experiments were a general-purpose polystyrene, No. 1, and a high-impact polystyrene, No. 3 (HF 77 and HT 88, respectively, Mitsubishi Monsanto Kasei Co., Japan) and a mixture of HF 77/HT 88 = 50/50 No. 2. The liquids were methyl, ethyl, *n*-propyl, and *n*-butyl alcohols. The content of butadiene rubber in HT 88 was determined to be 8.6 wt-% by IR spectroscopy.

Crazing tests were carried out in a Bergen elliptical strain jig<sup>6</sup> on strips cut from 2.0-mm-thick sheets compression molded at 200°C. In the solvent crazing tests, wicks were used if necessary to avoid crack initiation in the case of a specimen with defective edges.<sup>2</sup> Before the test, the specimens, the jigs, and the liquids were all placed in the thermostat at the testing temperature for more than 30 min. The jigs with specimens attached were immersed in the thermostated liquid for specific periods. After the jigs were taken from the liquid, the specimens were immediately removed from the jigs and then wiped with absorbent cotton. The critical strain  $\epsilon_c$  was determined for each case. Five specimens were used in each case so that a reasonably precise value of  $\epsilon_c$  could be determined. Tests were performed at  $-20^{\circ}$  and  $20^{\circ}$ C for 0.5, 1, 5, 10, 50, 100, 500, 1000, and 2000 min.

Sorption tests were carried out by using films about 50  $\mu$ m thick cast from benzene solutions. In a stoppered tube containing several mililiters of alcohol, the films were hung at the top of the tube without touching the liquid. The change in weight of the films was measured for about 3000 hr at room temperature (20° ± 2°C).

### RESULTS

On immersing the jig with the specimen into the liquid, crazes appeared on the specimen surface. The critical strain  $\epsilon_c$  at which crazes could be detected decreased with time and attained a lower limiting value  $\epsilon_{cl}$  at long times. Figures 1 and 2 show the average value of  $\epsilon_c$  plotted against logarithmic time for samples No. 1 and No. 3 immersed in the *n*-alcohols at  $-20^{\circ}$  and  $20^{\circ}$ C. Table I shows the data of  $\epsilon_{cl}$  for each system of the polymer and alcohol. The values of  $\epsilon_{cl}$  decreased with increasing chain length of the *n*-alcohol, with decreasing rubber content and with increasing temperature.

The value of  $S_v$ , volume of liquid absorbed per unit volume of polymer, increased rapidly with time and attained an equilibrium value at long times. The equilibrium had reached nearly completion for all systems after about 3000 hr. The rate of sorption decreased with increasing chain length of the *n*-alcohol. On the other hand, the degree of equilibrium swelling  $Sv_{eq}$  increased with increasing chain length of the *n*-alcohol. The diffusion coefficient *D* can be determined from the sorption data according<sup>7</sup> to

$$Sv = Sv_{\rm eq} \left[ 1 - \frac{8}{\pi^2} \exp\left( 1 - \frac{\pi^2}{l^2} Dt \right) \right] \tag{1}$$



Fig. 1. Dependence on time of critical strain  $\epsilon_c$  for crazing of sample No. 1 in *n*-alcohols at  $-20^{\circ}$  and  $20^{\circ}$ C.

where l is the thickness of the specimen and t is the time. In Figure 3 the values of log  $[(Sv_{eq} - Sv)/Sv_{eq}]$  against time at shorter times are plotted for No. 1. The diffusion coefficient was calculated from the slope of the linear plots. Table II lists the values of  $Sv_{eq}$  and D for all systems.



Fig. 2. Dependence on time of critical strain  $\epsilon_c$  for crazing of sample No. 3 in *n*-alcohols at  $-20^{\circ}$  and  $20^{\circ}$ C.

TABLE I   Lower Limiting Value $\epsilon_{cl}$ (%)						
	Sample No. 1		Sample No. 2		Sample No. 3	
Alcohol	-20°C	20°C	-20°C	20°C	-20°C	20°C
Methanol	0.36	0.32		_	0.46	0.42
Ethanol	0.29	0.25	0.35	0.31	0.38	0.32
Propanol	0.28	0.24		_	0.32	0.26
Butanol	0.28	0.24		_	0.32	0.26



Fig. 3. Dependence on time of swelling characteristics for sample No. 1 exposed to the saturated vapor of each alcohol.

## DISCUSSION

Kambour<sup>8</sup> suggested that the plasticization of polymer is a predominant mechanism for solvent crazing and that critical strain can be correlated to solubility of liquid into polymer. In Figure 4(a) the values of  $\epsilon_{cl}$  against the solubility parameters  $\delta l$  of each alcohol are plotted. The two curves shown correspond to samples No. 1 and No. 3. The  $\epsilon_{cl}$  values decrease monotonically with decreasing  $\delta l$  and probably are smallest at the solubility parameters  $\delta p$  of the respective polymers (that is, for No. 1,  $\delta p = 8.6$  and for No. 3,  $\delta p = 8.1-8.6$ ). The curve for No. 3 lies above that for No. 1, that is, the former is more resistant to crazing in the same environment than the latter. The solubility parameter does not always predict solubility of liquid into polymer, since the solubility seems to depend on molecular size and shape of the liquid. In Figure 4(b) the values of  $\epsilon_{cl}$  against  $Sv_{eq}$  are plotted. Two curves are again shown, corresponding to No. 1 and No. 3, as well as the curves of  $\epsilon_{cl}$  versus  $\delta l$ . The above results suggest that the parameters  $\delta l$  and  $Sv_{eq}$  serve as correlating ones for  $\epsilon_{cl}$ , but the respective correlations are not the same for both polymers. Crazing in glassy polymers is attributed to a stress-activated devitrification of a small amount of material at the tip of a flaw to a rubbery state, and subsequently the softened material forms cavities under stress.<sup>9-11</sup> Recently, Kambour et al.<sup>3</sup> determined critical strain

TABLE I	Ι
---------	---

Diffusion Coefficients $D$ (×10 <sup>-2</sup> cm <sup>-</sup> /sec) and Equilibrium Solubility $Sb_{eq}$ (×10 <sup>-2</sup> cm <sup>-</sup> /cm <sup>-</sup> )						
	Sample No. 1		Sample No. 2		Sample No. 3	
Alcohol	$\overline{D}$	Sv <sub>eq</sub>	D	Sveq	D	Sv <sub>eq</sub>
Methanol	6.09	1.82		_	2.34	2.00
Ethanol	3.32	1.98	2.10	2.10	1.00	2.64
Propanol	0.91	2.10		—	0.63	2.95
Butanol	0.59	2.22			0.62	2.98



Fig. 4. Lower limiting value of the critical strain  $\epsilon_c$  for crazing of polystyrenes as functions of (a) solubility parameter  $\delta$  of *n*-alcohol and (b) equilibrium solubility  $Sv_{eq}$ : O, No. 1;  $\Delta$ , No. 2;  $\bullet$ , No. 3.

 $\epsilon_c$  from the two kinds of crazing experiments: crazing of polystyrene in each of a variety of organic liquids, and crazing in air by a set of specimens molded from mixtures of o-dichlorobenzene and polystyrene. They reported that the values of  $\epsilon_c$  are correlated identically to the  $T_g$  values of the swollen films and of the preplasticized specimens, irrespective of the kind of crazing experiment.<sup>3</sup> The  $T_g$  of the absorbed polymers was estimated from the data of  $Sv_{eq}$  according to Kelley and Bueche<sup>12</sup>:

$$T_g(\text{system}) = [4.8 \times 10^{-4} c T_g + \alpha s (1-c) T_{g'}] / [4.8 \times 10^{-4} c + \alpha s (1-c)]$$
(2)

where  $T_g$  is the glass temperature of the system, c is the volume fraction of polymer, and  $\alpha s$  and  $T_{g'}$  are the thermal expansion coefficient and glass temperature of the solvent, respectively. The parameters used for the calculation are listed in Table III. Here, the  $T_{g'}$  of the alcohols were assumed to be 0.67  $T_{m'}$  ( $T_{m'}$  is the melting temperature of an unsymmetric molecule). The values of  $T_g$  were about 80° and 70°C, respectively, for No. 1 and No. 3 in any alcohol. This result indicates that the  $\epsilon_{cl}$  is not directly related to the  $T_g$ , since the polymer having the lower  $T_g$  is more resistant to crazing.

And rews and Bevan<sup>4</sup> proposed a theoretical equation for the minimum work of craze formation  $\tau_0$ . The equation is slightly modified for the work of craze formation under an environment:

$$\tau_0 = 2.42(h\beta_s\gamma/\rho)f^{2/3} + 0.33\beta_pY\psi hf$$
(3)

where h is the craze thickness,  $\beta_s$  is the factor by which the surface energy is reduced by adsorption,  $\gamma$  is the interfacial energy of the voids,  $\rho$  is the mean

TABLE IIIParameters Used for the Calculation of $T_g^a$				
Alcohol	$T_m'$ , K	$\alpha s, C^{-1}$	$T_{g'}$ , K	
Methanol	178	0.0017	126	
Ethanol	169	0.0011	107	
Propanol	146	0.00096	98	
Butanol	183	0.00093	123	

<sup>a</sup> The  $T_g$  values of No. 1 and No. 3 are 368° and 358°K, respectively.

distance between void centers, f is the void fraction,  $\beta_p$  is the factor by which Y is reduced by the plasticizing effect of the solvent, Y is the shear yield stress, and  $\psi$  is a constant of value 4.4. For the present polymers, stress relaxation is not so rapid even at room temperature. It was concluded in the previous report<sup>5</sup> that the only time-dependent factor in eq. (3) is  $\beta_p$ , which is controlled by the diffusion of the molecules of liquid into polymer, and that the observed dependence of  $\epsilon_c$  on time results from the time dependence of  $\beta_p$ . Accordingly,  $\epsilon_{cl}$  is considered to be the critical strain in the case of the  $\beta_p$  at the equilibrium swelling.

The values determined by Andrews and Bevan<sup>4</sup> were those obtained in the equilibrium state at the temperature of the test. Andrews and Bevan suggested that Y = 0 at  $T \ge T_c$  and  $T_c$  is identified with the glass transition temperature of a solvated zone at the craze tip where the cavitation takes place. The testing temperatures studied here were relatively low compared with the estimated  $T_g$  of the polymers swollen to equilibrium, that is,  $T < T_c$ , and therefore the  $\epsilon_{cl}$  is considered to be in the temperature region  $T > T_c$ , which is dependent on shear stress.

Various criteria have been proposed by many investigators<sup>8</sup> in terms of stress or strain for craze initiation. Much experimental evidence is needed to decide which criterion, stress or strain, is more favorable for craze initiation. Gent<sup>13</sup> has proposed that the dilatational stress at a flaw tip increases the free volume of the material at the flaw tip and reduces its  $T_g$ . He has given the following criterion for craze initiation:

$$\sigma_c/3 = [\beta(T_g - T) + P]/k$$

where  $\sigma_c$  is the critical applied tensile stress,  $\beta$  is the hydrostatic pressure coefficient of  $T_g$ , T is the test temperature, P is the applied hydrostatic pressure, and k is the stress concentration factor relating the applied stress to the microscopic stress acting at the flaw tip. In the case of the solvent crazing, the polymeric material at a flaw tip absorbs the solvent to the degree of the equilibrium swelling and softens.

The present crazing data were evaluated according to the stress criterion, taking in consideration the proposed theory by Gent. The  $\epsilon_{cl}$  data were trans-



Fig. 5. Lower limiting value of critical stress  $\epsilon_{cl}$  for crazing of polystyrenes as function of solubility parameter  $\delta$  of *n*-alcohol: O, No. 1;  $\Delta$ , No. 2;  $\bullet$ , No. 3.

		€cl20°C/€cl~20°C <sup>C</sup>			
Sample no.	M	E	P	B	$Y_{20^{\circ}C}/Y_{-20^{\circ}C}^{b}$
1	0.88	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.85
3	0.91	0.83	0.81	0.81	0.77

TABLE IV The Decreasing Rate of  $\epsilon_{cl}$  and Y with Temperature<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> No. 1:  $Y_{20^{\circ}C} = 420 \text{ kg/cm}^2$ ,  $Y_{-20^{\circ}C} = 490 \text{ kg/cm}^2$ . No. 2:  $Y_{20^{\circ}C} = 240 \text{ kg/cm}^2$ ,  $Y_{-20^{\circ}C} = 310 \text{ kg/cm}^2$ .

<sup>b</sup> Instron testing data at extension rate of 1 cm/min.

<sup>c</sup> M, methanol; E, ethanol; P, propanol; B, buthanol.

formed into those of  $\sigma_{cl}$  through  $\sigma_{cl} = \epsilon_{cl} \cdot E$  (Young's modulus  $E = 2.9 \times 10^4$  and  $2.1 \times 10^4$  kg/cm<sup>2</sup> for No. 1 and No. 3, respectively). In Figure 5 are plotted the values of  $\sigma_{cl}$  against  $Sv_{eq}$ . The  $\sigma_{cl}$  is correlated to the  $Sv_{eq}$ , irrespective of the kind of rubber content in polystyrene. This fact suggests that the solvent crazing can be better described by the criterion of stress than of strain. The values of  $\epsilon_{cl}$  were observed to be dependent on temperature for all systems. The solubility parameters of the polymer and the alcohol are not so much dependent on temperature. The decreasing rate of Y with temperature is similar to that of  $\epsilon_{cl}$  (or  $\sigma_{cl}$ ), as shown in Table IV. This suggests that the temperature dependence of  $\epsilon_{cl}$  can be again described in terms of eq. (3). Shear yield stress decreases greatly with volume fraction of solvent in polymer/solvent mixtures.<sup>14</sup> On exposure to liquid, the major part of reduction in  $\epsilon_{cl}$  (or  $\sigma_{cl}$ ) is considered to arise from the Y term in eq. (3).

The time At for the critical strain to attain  $\epsilon_{cl}$  was about 10 min for each system at 20°C. The rate of craze initiation on exposure to liquids is controlled by the diffusion of the molecules of liquid into polymer,<sup>5</sup> and accordingly the time Atcan be regarded as the time needed for the critical thickness of surface layer on the specimen to absorb the liquid to equilibrium for craze formation. Here, the thickness of the softened material necessary for craze formation can be estimated by using the experimental data of At and D. The critical thickness  $l_c$  can be computed from eq. (1), when  $Sv/Sv_{eq} = \frac{1}{2}$ . The calculated value of  $l_c$  was about 0.1  $\mu$ m, comparable to the experimental value of the depth of a craze reported by other investigators.<sup>4</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

Time and temperature are vitally important parameters for solvent crazing. The critical strain  $\epsilon_c$ , which was determined with a Bergen elliptical strain device, decreased with time and attained a lower limiting value  $\epsilon_{cl}$  at long times. The solvent crazing at long times can be explained in terms of the stress criterion for craze formation. The predominant mechanism for solvent crazing at long times appears to be a polymer flow process at a critical value  $\epsilon_{cl}$  of the applied stress.

The liquid molecules need not necessarily penetrate the bulk phase of the polymer. The thickness of the polymer surface to absorb the liquid to equilibrium for craze formation was estimated to be about  $0.1 \,\mu$ m by using the experimental data of At and D. This value is comparable to the depth of a craze.

#### References

1. G. A. Bernier and R. P. Kambour, Macromolecules, 1, 393 (1968).

2. R. P. Kambour, E. E. Romagosa, and C. L. Gruner, Macromolecules, 5, 335 (1972).

3. R. P. Kambour, C. L. Gruner, and E. E. Romagosa, J. Polym. Sci., Polym. Phys. Ed., 11, 1879 (1973).

4. E. H. Andrews and L. Bevan, Polymer, 13, 337 (1972).

5. K. Iisaka, Y. Nishimoto, and K. Shibayama, J. Polym. Sci., Polym. Phys. Ed., 17, 791 (1979).

6. R. L. Bergen, Jr., SPE J., 667 (1962).

7. J. Crank and G. S. Parks, Diffusion in Polymers, Academic Press, New York, 1967.

8. R. P. Kambour, J. Polym. Sci., Macromol. Rev., 7, 1 (1973).

9. S. B. Newman and I. Wolock; J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand., 58, 339 (1957).

10. O. K. Spurr, Jr., and W. D. Niegisch, J. Appl. Polym. Sci., 6, 585 (1962).

11. R. P. Kambour, Polymer, 5, 143 (1964).

12. F. N. Kelley and F. Bueche, J. Polym. Sci., 50, 549 (1961).

13. A. N. Gent, J. Mater. Sci., 5, 925 (1970).

14. E. H. Andrews, G. M. Levy, and J. Willies, J. Mater. Sci., 8, 1000 (1973).

Received September 26, 1978 Revised July 5, 1979