

Characterization of Structure-Property Relationships of Poly(urethane-urea)s for Fiber Applications

Matthew J. O'Sickey

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

Garth Wilkes, Chairman
Richey M. Davis
Eva Marand
Judy Riffle
Ravi Saraf

January 18th, 2002
Blacksburg, Virginia

KEYWORDS: poly(urethane-urea)s, microphase separation, elastomers, poly(propylene glycol), PPG, TPG, PTMEG, molecular weight distribution, ultra-low monol content, AFM, SAXS

© 2002, Matthew J. O'Sickey

Characterization of Structure-Property Relationships of Poly(urethane-urea)s for Fiber Applications

Matthew J. O'Sickey

(ABSTRACT)

Poly(urethane)s and poly(urethane-urea)s (PUU) are nearly ubiquitous, having been in existence since before the Second World War. Spandex, a poly(urethane-urea) elastomeric fiber, is found in nearly all articles of apparel as well as in an increasing array of other consumer items. The technology and chemistry of spandex is largely unchanged since its inception in the late 1950s, with the majority of spandex employing poly(tetramethylene ether glycol) as soft segments. Recent developments in catalyst technology have resulted in the production of ultra-low monol content poly(propylene glycol) (PPG), which is nearly difunctional ($f=1.95+$). This enhancement in difunctionality has potentially enabled the use of PPG as a spandex soft segment with potential spandex processing, performance, and economic benefits.

PPG-based spandex elastomers were evaluated in both film and fiber form for the purpose of investigating morphological, orientational, mechanical, and thermal properties with the goal of understanding relationships between chemistry, morphology and properties. Key variables of interest were soft segment molecular weight (MW), molecular weight distribution (MWD), and composition, and hard segment content and composition. Of those, the influence of the molecular weight distribution of the polyol used for soft segments was of foremost interest and had previously been largely neglected during the course of poly(urethane) and poly(urethane-urea) research.

It was found that over the range of PUU compositions suitable for production of spandex, that hard segment content and composition had little effect upon the morphology and thermal and mechanical properties. Appreciable trends as functions of soft segment molecular weight were observed. The soft segment MWD was adjusted through the addition of a low molecular weight

homolog of PPG, tri(propylene glycol) (TPG), decreasing the number average soft segment MW. The results of these experiments were contrary to those for variation of soft segment molecular weight. It was determined that the low MW portion of the polyol MWD contributes to the building of hard segments in addition to or in lieu of soft segments.

Incorporation of TPG in the PUUs resulted in larger, presumably less cohesive, hard domains and increased hard segment content. The TPG containing materials had enhanced tensile properties, less permanent set, and less residual orientation after deformation. These materials proved quite comparable to those using PTMEG soft segments.

Comparison of film and fiber PUUs revealed only minor differences, implying that the trends and conclusions drawn from the study of films with spandex-like compositions would also hold for fibers. The key difference between films and fibers is that fibers maintain some residual ordering and orientation due to drawing of the fibers during processing. Of the processing variables investigated, none impacted the morphology as determined from small angle x-ray scattering.

It was concluded, that of the various compositional variables germane to spandex, the polyol MW and MWD played key roles in development of morphology, and hence properties. The role of polyol MWD had been woefully neglected during the development of spandex previously, and was observed to be a critical variable.

Dedication

To my family – the professional student thing worked out rather nicely

Acknowledgments

There are a seemingly innumerable number of people that deserve acknowledgment for this work and the process of developing it. Many thanks to the good folks as ARCO Chemical that came a-knockin' at our door those many years ago. The opportunity, materials, and financial support they provided as ARCO Chemical, Lyondell, and Bayer were absolutely essential. Especial notice to Dr. Bruce Lawrey for all his assistance and advice.

Quite obviously a great deal of credit is due to Dr. Garth Wilkes for his knowledge, advice, and patience which he applied with the touch of an artist. An old adage says that a kick-in-the-ass leads to a step forward. I certainly appreciate the many steps forward that he initiated when various aspects of the project seemed stalled.

I'd like to thank the various members of my committee for taking the time to help in this project and for serving: Drs. Davis, Marand, Riffle, and Saraf. Additional thanks are due to Dr. Shultz and Dr. Lawrey for their participation in the defense processes.

Why I'm even here is another aspect warranting credit. Without my family and their encouragement I suspect that I would be doing something less right now. It's is always nice when people say that its obvious that my parents raised me right. Mom, I am so sorry that I didn't get this finished sooner. Experience in my brother's machine shop was invaluable and led me to ask why plastics do what they do. Little did I know at that time how important that would be.

The faculty at Walsh Jesuit High School provided me with a background, education, and toolkit for success that has helped open more doors than I ever would have guessed possible. I particularly wish to thank Br. Baranek (Chemistry), Mr. Cardone and Mr. Gavlinski (English), and Dr. Worthington and Mr. Rohr (History).

I owe an incredible debt to Dr. Peppas (Purdue) who encouraged me to stick with Chemical Engineering and History and noted that I didn't ask the right questions to be willing to settle with only a B.S. Dr. Peppas told me once that not enough engineers and researchers care about history and the lessons it can

teach. Not only is it important to not reinvent the wheel, it is also important to know why the wheel was invented in the form it was. His advice led me to nearly two years of undergraduate polymer research with Dr. Hilary Lackritz (Purdue). That experience resulted in rather late decision to apply to graduate schools. The good folks at Ohio University gave me an appreciation for why graduate coursework is much more rewarding than undergraduate work. Unfortunately, they didn't have a polymer project for me.

At both Purdue and Ohio University an eclectic assortment of people made the process much more bearable: Vakis Potamianos, Steve Lewis, Steve George, Dr. Bob Wilkens, Julie Wheatley, and Jimmy Prouty. If nothing else, you introduced me to darts and the accompanying libations.

Along with Dr. Wilkes, a number of faculty gave me a real desire to learn and a great eagerness to go to class each day: Dr. Peppas (Purdue), Dr. Ward, Dr. Wightman, Dr. Eva Marand, Dr. Davis, and Dr. Peter Graham (VT English – Romantic Literature). Those breaks from research made the process much more rewarding.

A great many people made my work here a lot easier, but foremost of those are Sandy Simpkins and Steve McCartney. Without those two, the Wilkes lab would cease to exist. All of my labmates have contributed to my understanding of polymers, but a few have really aided me in my development as a scientist and researcher: Bryan Kaushiva, Kurt Jordens, Chris Robertson, and David Godshall. Above and beyond the “lab stuff”, they are *good people*.

Along with my labmates, I have to acknowledge those people that have kept me alive and amused that last half a decade: Dogshall, Jody, Cody, Swampthing, Howard, Artie, the Thursday night gamers (Brett, Laura, Brent, Polk, Cody), the good people at Champs and the Underground, and all the good folks in the Blacksburg Area Darters (and all the dozens of people who have been on my dart teams) and particularly the Carnivorous Crickets (undefeated for the entire year of 2001—chirp, chirp, chirp).

Finally and most importantly, my wife Tanya, without her patience, understanding, tolerance, patience, restraint, inspiration, patience, advice, and comfort I'd be lost.

“...a magical day when super-science mingles with the bright stuff of dreams...”

-Lee & Peart

“This is my dissertation, is it not nifty, worship the dissertation”

-with apologies to Pete Abrams

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Section 2-1: Materials - Poly(propylene glycol)	5
Section 2-2: Materials - Poly(urethane)s and poly(urethane-urea)s	15
Section 2-3: Materials - Microphase Separation	20
Section 2-4: Materials - Hydrogen Bonding	27
Section 2-5: Materials – Spandex	33
Section 2-6: Methods	39
Section 2-7: Methods - Small angle x-ray scattering	41
Section 2-8: Methods – Atomic Force Microscopy	57
Section 2-9: Methods – Dynamic mechanical analysis	61
Section 2-10: Methods – Differential scanning calorimetry	67
Section 2-11: Methods – Thermogravimetric analysis	71
Section 2-12: Methods – Wide angle x-ray scattering	73
Section 2-13: Methods – Birefringence	75
Section 2-14: Methods – Infrared linear dichroism	80
Section 2-15: Chapter 2 References	83
CHAPTER 3: NOMENCLATURE, EXPERIMENTAL MATERIALS & PROCEDURES	90
Section 3-1: Nomenclature	91
Section 3-2: Materials	93
Section 3-3: Experimental Procedure	96

Section 3-4: Chapter 3 References	102
CHAPTER 4: INFLUENCE OF SOFT SEGMENT MOLECULAR WEIGHT AND HARD SEGMENT CONTENT ON STRUCTURE-PROPERTY RELATIONSHIPS OF POLY(URETHANE-UREA)S	103
Section 4-1: Overview	103
Section 4-2: Introduction & Literature Review	104
Section 4-3: Experimental-Materials	109
Section 4-4: Experimental Results	112
Section 4-5: Conclusions	127
Section 4-6: Chapter 4 References	129
CHAPTER 5: INFLUENCE OF INFLUENCE OF LOW MOLECULAR WEIGHT POLYOL COMPONENTS ON STRUCTURE-PROPERTY RELATIONSHIPS OF POLY(URETHANE-UREA)S	131
Section 5-1: Overview	132
Section 5-2: Introduction and Literature Review	133
Section 5-3: Experimental Materials	137
Section 5-4: Results	139
Section 5-5: Discussion	155
Section 5-6: Conclusions	156
Section 5-7: Chapter 5 References	158
CHAPTER 6: INFLUENCE OF MIXED SOFT SEGMENTS OF ULTRA-LOW MONOL POLY(PROPYLENE GLYCOL), POLY(TETRAMETHYLENE ETHER GLYCOL) AND TRI(PROPYLENE GLYCOL) ON STRUCTURE-PROPERTY RELATIONSHIPS OF POLY(URETHANE-UREA)S	159
Section 6-1: Overview	159

Section 6-2: Introduction & Literature Review	161
Section 6-3: Experimental Materials	165
Section 6-4: Experimental Results	168
Section 6-5: Conclusions	181
Section 6-6: References	182
CHAPTER 7: ORIENTATION BEHAVIOR OF ULTRA-LOW MONOL CONTENT POLY(PROPYLENE GLYCOL) SOFT SEGMENT POLY(URETHANE-UREA)S	184
Section 7-1: Overview	184
Section 7-2: Introduction & Literature Review	184
Section 7-3: Experimental	187
Section 7-4: Experimental Results	190
Section 7-5: Conclusions	203
Section 7-6: Chapter 7 References	205
CHAPTER 8: POLY(URETHANE-UREA) FIBERS WITH SOFT SEGMENTS OF ULTRA-LOW MONOL CONTENT POLY(PROPYLENE GLYCOL)	206
Section 8-1: Overview	206
Section 8-2: Introduction & Literature Review	207
Section 8-3: Experimental	211
Section 8-4: Experimental Results	213
Section 8-5: Conclusions	218
Section 8-7: Chapter 8 References	221
CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	222
Section 9-1: Conclusions	222

Section 9-2: Recommendations	226
Section 9-3: Chapter 9 References	228
VITA	229

List of Figures

Figure 2-1. Base Catalyzed Production of Poly(propylene glycol)	6
Figure 2-2. Base catalyzed production of PPG - primary product and monol side reaction product	6
Figure 2-3. Monol content as a function of equivalent molecular weight for conventional base catalyzed PPG, di-metal cyanide catalyzed PPG, and improved di-metal cyanide catalyzed Acclaim PPG	7
Figure 2-4. Calculated functionality as a function of equivalent molecular weight for conventional base catalyzed PPG, di-metal cyanide catalyzed PPG, and improved di-metal cyanide catalyzed Acclaim PPG	9
Figure 2-5. Theoretical elastomer molecular weight for 2000 g/mol conventional base catalyzed PPG, di-metal cyanide catalyzed PPG, and improved di-metal cyanide catalyzed Acclaim PPG	10
Figure 2-6. Comparison of molecular weight distributions of PTMEG and Acclaim PPG	11
Figure 2-7. Comparison of molecular weight distribution of conventional based catalyzed PPG (dotted line) and ultra-low monol content PPG with comparable number average molecular weights.	11
Figure 2-8. Dry Spinning Process Schematic	12
Figure 2-9. Synthesis of isocyanate end-capped PPG-based prepolymer.	15
Figure 2-10. Chain extension of isocyanate end-capped PPG-based prepolymer with MDI and 80% EDA – 20% PDA diamine mix	16
Figure 2-11. Comparison of PTMEG and PPG	17
Figure 2-12. Number of polyol backbone bonds as a function of polyol for PPG and PTMEG	18
Figure 2-13. Simplistic schematic of a microphase separated	23

materials	
Figure 2-14. Reinforced elastomer (a) and toughened plastic (b)	23
Figure 2-15. Structure of generalized poly(urethane)	27
Figure 2-16. Hydrogen bonding in poly(urethane)s	28
Figure 2-17. FTIR spectra of model hard segments of 2,4 TDI-BD	29
Figure 2-18. A generalized poly(urethane-urea)	30
Figure 2-19. Model compound investigated by Sheng-Kang	30
Figure 2-20. FTIR spectra of typical poly(urethane-urea)	30
Figure 2-21. Otto Bayer. ⁵	35
Figure 2-22. Lycra sales with respect to total sales of DuPont's Specialty Fibers	37
Figure 2-23. Scattering by two point centers	41
Figure 2-24. Schematic representation of scattering of x-rays by groups of electrons	42
Figure 2-25. Schematic of one dimensional correlation function	47
Figure 2-26 Block collimation system for a Kratky camera	48
Figure 2-27. Interphase thickness determination	52
Figure 2-28. Bragg condition	53
Figure 2-29. Schematic of scanning tunneling microscope	57
Figure 2-30. General schematic of AFM probe-tip/sample interactions	58
Figure 2-31. Tapping mode AFM used to obtain a phase image	59
Figure 2-32. AFM Tapping mode height (left) and phase (right) images	60
Figure 2-33. Stress and strain in DMA and phase offset delta	63

Figure 2-34. DMA results of random and block copolymers	65
Figure 2-35. DTA schematic	67
Figure 2-36. DSC scans and information obtained from them	69
Figure 2-37. Schematic and example of wide angle x-ray scattering for PTMEG crystallites in a PTMEG containing poly(urethane-urea) film material.	74
Figure 2-38. Orientation of a polymer chain with respect to a reference axis	76
Figure 2-39. Hermans' orientation function, f, as function of the angle, θ that the polymer makes with respect to a reference direction	77
Figure 3-1. Schematic of picture frame sample jig. A stretched film sample is placed across the piece on the left and fixed in position by placing the piece on the right on top of it	99
Figure 4-1. SAXS Curves for A) 6.3% and B) 9.0% Hard Segment Content Poly(urethane- urea)s	112
Figure 4-2. A) Interphase Thicknesses Using Koberstein's Method of Analysis and, B) Using Bonart's Method of Analysis	115
Figure 4-3. AFM phase images of {(P2K)}-2K-9.0, illustrating the influence of tapping strength	117
Figure 4-4. AFM tapping mode phase images (500 nm x 500 nm) of PUUs as function of HS content and SS length	118
Figure 4-5. AFM of Hard Segment Gelled Material {(P8K)}-8K-9.0	119
Figure 4-6. DMA of A) 6.3% and B) 9.0% HS Poly(urethane-urea) Elastomers	122
Figure 4-7. DSC of 6.3% & 9.0% HS Poly(urethane-urea) Elastomers	124
Figure 4-8. Stress-strain Curves of Different Poly(urethane) Elastomers With 4000 g/mol PPG-based MDI-endcapped Prepolymers, Cured With BDO.	127

Figure 5-1. 5 th cycle stress-strain curves of PUU films cycled to 500% elongation	135
Figure 5-2. TPG content in materials used in this study	139
Figure 5-3. SAXS results for systems A) without, B) with TPG, and C) with TEG.	140
Figure 5-4. Interphase thicknesses as determined via Bonart's method	143
Figure 5-5. Tapping mode AFM phase images for variable ratio of setpoint amplitude to free amplitude of oscillation (r_{sp})	144
Figure 5-6. Atomic force micrographs demonstrating the impact of using TPG in poly(urethane-urea) formulations	146
Figure 5-7. Dynamic mechanical analysis of poly(urethane-urea) systems A) without TPG or TEG, B) with TPG, and C) with TEG	147
Figure 5-8. DSC comparison of systems with and without TPG	150
Figure 5-9. Impact of varying levels of TPG on location of soft segment glass transition	151
Figure 5-10. Impact of TPG upon mechanical properties	152
Figure 5-11. Birefringence of stretched materials	154
Figure 5-12. Schematics of morphologies A) without TPG, and B) with TPG.	156
Figure 6-1. Synthesis Methods 2-Step Production of Mixed Soft Segment PUUs	165
Figure 6-2. SAXS scattering profiles of pure 2000 g/mol PPG and PTMEG based poly(urethane-urea) systems	168
Figures 6-3. SAXS profiles for poly(urethane-urea)s with mixed soft segments	170
Figure 6-4. SAXS profiles for poly(urethane-urea)s with randomly assembled soft segments of 4000 g/mol PPG, TPG and 2000 g/mol PTMEG	171

Figure 6-5. SAXS profiles for poly(urethane-urea)s with mixed soft segments of 8000 g/mol PPG, TPG and 2000 g/mol PTMEG in which the prepolymers were made separately	172
Figure 6-6. 500nm x 500nm tapping mode AFM phase image micrographs	173
Figure 6-7. Wide angle x-ray scattering images of poly(urethane-urea) films stretched to 350% elongation	175
Figure 6-8. DMA of poly(urethane-urea)s fabricated with mixed PPG-PTMEG soft segments that contain no TPG	176
Figure 6-9. Tan δ behavior from DMA for poly(urethane-urea)s fabricated with mixed PPG-TPG-PTMEG soft segments	177
Figure 6-10. Second heating DSC scans of poly(urethane-urea)s fabricated with mixed soft segments of PPG and PTMEG	179
Figure 6-11. Normalized heat of fusion results for poly(urethane-urea)s of mixed PTMEG and PPG soft segments, with and without TPG	180
Figure 7-1. Hard segment orientation for small and large elongations	187
Figure 7-2. Time dependence of PUU birefringence after 350% elongation.	188
Figure 7-3: Stretching treatments for second group of orientation studies.	189
Figure 7-4: Birefringence of PUUs with hard segments of variable composition due to varying chain extender ratio of ethylene diamine to propylene diamine.	191
Figure 7-5: Influence of soft segment length and hard segment content on birefringence of PUUs	192
Figure 7-6: Influence of soft segment molecular weight distribution / TPG content on birefringence of PUUs	193
Figure 7-7: Hard segment orientation, as determined by infrared linear dichroism of 1640 cm^{-1} urea carbonyl absorption band, for PUUs with varying hard segment content	194

Figure 7-8: Hard segment orientation, as determined by infrared linear dichroism of 1640 cm^{-1} urea carbonyl absorption band, for PUUs with varying soft segment length	195
Figure 7-9: Hard segment orientation, as determined by infrared linear dichroism of 1640 cm^{-1} urea carbonyl absorption band, for PUUs with varying soft segment molecular weight distribution / TPG content	196
Figure 7-10: Hard segment orientation, as determined by infrared linear dichroism of 1640 cm^{-1} urea carbonyl absorption band, for a PUU that has been stretched, held for 3 hours in the stretched position, relaxed for 15 minutes and retested	197
Figure 7-11. Birefringence for three PUUs	199
Figure 7-12. Hard segment orientation for three PUUs	200
Figure 7-13. Thirty second and one hour set for three PUUs	201
Figure 7-14. SAXS profiles for 3 PUUs that have been stretched and allowed to relax	203
Figure 8-1. Dry Spinning Process Schematic	208
Figure 8-2: Orientation of hard segments in two spandex fibers	210
Figure 8-3: FESEM micrographs of spandex fibers.	212
Figure 8-4: Small angle x-ray scattering profiles for fibers and films of comparable composition showing both equatorial and meridinal scans	213
Figure 8-5: Small angle x-ray scattering profiles for fibers and films of comparable composition	214
Figure 8-6: DSC determine soft segment glass transition of fiber and film PUUs of comparable composition	215
Figure 8-7: Effect of repeated heatings on soft segment glass of a PPG/TPG based fiber as detected by DSC	216
Figure 8-8. Effect of repeated heatings on melting endotherm of a PTMEG based fiber as detected by DSC	217
Figure 8-9: Differences between fiber and film PUUs as denoted	218

by DMA

Figure 8-10: Influence of duct temperature on interdomain spacing 218

Figure 8-11: Influence of air and spin gas temperature on interdomain spacing 219

Figure 8-12: Influence of line speed on interdomain spacing 219

Figure 8-13: Influence of twister gas pressure on interdomain spacing 220

List of Tables

Table 1-1. Alternate names for the polymers and reagents used in this study.	4
Table 2-1. Properties of PU elastomers fabricated from ultra-low monol content PPG (Acclaim) and conventional PPG (Arcol)	14
Table 2-2. Properties of component reagents	17
Table 2-3. Comparison of PPG and PTMEG	18
Table 2-4. Experimental techniques applied in this study	25
Table 2-5. FTIR band assignments for poly(urethane-urea)s	29
Table 2-6. Hydrogen bonding as a function of temperature for PUs & PUUs	31
Table 2-7. Shivers' criteria for segmented polymers useful for elastomeric fibers applications	34
Table 2-8. Ultee's list of soft and hard segments useful for elastomeric fibers	34
Table 2-10. Forms of $H^2(s)$, assuming a sigmoidal gradient across the interphase region	56
Table 2-11. Characteristics of common techniques for imaging and measuring surface morphology	61
Table 4-1. Monol content of conventional and ultra-low monol PPG	107
Table 4-2. Sample nomenclature and hard segment contents	110
Table 4-3. Viscosities of prepolymers used in poly(urethane-urea) synthesis.	111
Table 4-4. Interdomain spacings and interphase thicknesses of PPG-based PUUs	113
Table 4-5. Soft segment glass transition temperatures of PPG-based poly(urethane-urea)s	123
Table 4-6. Mechanical properties of PPG-based poly(urethane-	126

urea)s

Table 5-1. Sample nomenclature and hard segment contents	138
Table 5-2. Interdomain spacings and interphase thicknesses of PPG-based poly(urethane-urea)s	141
Table 5-3. Soft segment glass transition temperatures of PPG-based poly(urethane-urea)s	148
Table 5-4. Mechanical properties of PPG-based poly(urethane-urea)s	153
Table 6-1. Sample nomenclature and hard segment contents	166
Table 6-2. Interdomain spacings and soft segment glass transitions of mixed soft segment based PUUs	178