

TECHNICAL REPORT
66-49-PR

AD 643 325

THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY OF SOFT VULCANIZED NATURAL RUBBER: SELECTED VALUES

by
Lois C. K. Carwile
and
Harold J. Hoge

June 1966

UNITED STATES ARMY
NATICK LABORATORIES
Natick, Massachusetts 01760



PIONEERING RESEARCH DIVISION
TC-3

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

Citation of trade names in this report does not constitute an official indorsement or approval of the use of such items.

Destroy this report when no longer needed. Do not return it to the originator.

Distribution of this
document is unlimited

AD _____

TECHNICAL REPORT

66-49-PR

THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY OF SOFT
VULCANIZED NATURAL RUBBER:
SELECTED VALUES

by

Lois C. K. Carwile and Harold J. Hoge

Project Reference:
1P014501B11A

Series: Thermal
Conductivity-3

June 1966

Pioneering Research Division
U. S. ARMY NATICK LABORATORIES
Natick, Massachusetts 01760

FOREWORD

This report is the third of a series on the thermal conductivities of materials of scientific and engineering interest. The values selected are based on thorough study and critical evaluation of published investigations. In a critical survey such as this one, much depends on the judgment of the surveyors. The care that the authors of the present survey have exercised may be judged from the comments they have made on the individual papers examined. Their comments on the more important papers are in the text of the report. In addition, they have made many brief comments on less important papers; these comments are given as annotations, immediately following the listing of the paper in the references.

S. DAVID BAILEY
Director
Pioneering Research Division

APPROVED:

DALE H. SIELING
Scientific Director

W. M. MANTZ
Colonel, QMC
Commanding

CONTENTS

Abstract

1. Introduction	1
2. Characterization of Rubber	2
3. Effect of Compounding Ingredients	6
4. Selection of the Values	8
5. Reliability of the Tables	15
6. Acknowledgment	15
7. Annotated References	16

ABSTRACT

The published literature on the thermal conductivity of natural rubber has been assembled and the results critically evaluated. Best values of thermal conductivity as a function of temperature have been selected. These are presented in both graphical and tabular form; the tables cover the range 80 to 380° K. An attempt was made to consult all work that could significantly affect the choice of best values. Published papers were located with the aid of Chemical Abstracts, Physics Abstracts, the Thermophysical Properties Retrieval Guide, and some other general sources. In addition, relevant references in the papers themselves were followed up until a substantially "closed system" had been generated, as shown by the fact that no new references were being turned up.

THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY OF SOFT VULCANIZED NATURAL RUBBER: SELECTED VALUES

1. Introduction

Natural rubber is a complex material. Raw rubber in itself is a complex substance; in the process of manufacture it becomes still more complex. It is nearly always vulcanized, and compounding ingredients of certain classes are nearly always added. These treatments greatly modify and improve its properties. Among the ingredients that are nearly always added to raw rubber are a vulcanizing agent, an accelerator, one or more activators, and antioxidant, and a softening or lubricating agent. A great many but not all common types of rubber contain, in addition, various fillers; the amount of filler may be small or large.

Raw rubber has a low thermal conductivity, somewhat lower than that of the commoner compounding ingredients; the additives, all, or nearly all, increase the thermal conductivity, k . There are not enough published data on any one composition of rubber to permit us to present selected values for a single composition; we must be content to lump together the data for rubbers of a range of compositions, and even in many cases to accept data for rubbers whose composition is only partially specified. Hence we have found it necessary to ignore the effect on k of small amounts of compounding ingredients, known or unknown. Variation in the amount and kind of such ingredients then contributes to the scattering of the results of different

observers. We believe that this contribution is smaller than the scattering attributable to other causes. (By small amounts, we mean not more than about 5 parts of any single additive per 100 parts of raw rubber, and usually not more than 1 or 2 parts.)

The selected values tabulated in this report refer to soft vulcanized natural rubber containing relatively small amounts of additives.

2. Characterization of Rubber

Raw natural rubber is principally obtained by coagulating the latex of the rubber plant, Hevea brasiliensis. Raw rubber consists of rubber hydrocarbon (about 93 percent by weight) and other natural constituents (about 7 percent). These other constituents include moisture, fatty acids, sterols, esters, proteins, and materials that remain as ash on burning (40). Natural rubber hydrocarbon consists of long chains of cis-polyisoprene. The monomer unit, isoprene, has the formula $\text{CH}_2:\text{CCH}_3\text{CH}:\text{CH}_2$. Monomer and other products are formed when the natural polymer is heated in the absence of air; conversely, isoprene can under the proper conditions be polymerized to form chains of the same structure as those occurring in natural rubber.

The molecular weight of rubber hydrocarbon probably is not an important factor in determining the thermal conductivity. A typical weight-average molecular weight for fresh polymer is 300,000, corresponding to a degree of polymerization of 4400; however, wide variations in molecular weight occur.

In the process of manufacture the molecular weight is reduced. The action of oxygen is one of the important causes. A large part of the reduction in molecular weight takes place while the rubber is being milled.

Vulcanization. Unvulcanized (raw, crude) rubber has few commercial uses. Vulcanized (cured) rubber is ordinarily made by mixing sulfur, an accelerator, and a metallic oxide with raw rubber, and heating (41). Vulcanization produces cross links between polymer chains, greatly improving the mechanical properties of the rubber for most applications. Soft vulcanized rubber is highly extensible, and after being stretched returns very nearly to its original length. There is a considerable variation in the amount of sulfur used in vulcanization. A typical amount in soft rubber is 2.5 parts per 100 parts of raw rubber. Hard rubber is made by greatly increasing the amount of sulfur; a typical amount is 47 parts of combined sulfur per 100 parts of raw rubber (this is 32 percent of the combined weight of rubber plus sulfur).

A Typical Soft Rubber. A typical composition for soft vulcanized natural rubber is formula 2A of the American Society for Testing Materials (42). This formula contains, in parts by weight: raw rubber, 100; sulfur, 2.5; benzothiazyl disulfide, 1; zinc oxide, 5; stearic acid, 1; and phenyl beta naphthylamine, 1. These compounding ingredients or their equivalent are likely to be found in almost all rubber samples. Sulfur is the vulcanizing agent; benzothiazyl disulfide (MBTS) is the accelerator, which promotes vulcanization and reduces the amount of sulfur required;

ZnO is an activator that also improves the mechanical properties of the rubber (an activator contributes to the efficiency of the accelerator); stearic acid is an activator that also acts as a softener and lubricant; and phenyl beta naphthylamine is an antioxidant. The major function of each compounding ingredient is the one given above; most compounding ingredients have additional beneficial effects on the rubber.

Typical Fillers. Among the compounding ingredients that are used in rubber only when the application demands it is carbon black, which is very widely used. Other often-used fillers are TiO_2 , CaCO_3 , SiO_2 , and certain clays (43). All these, including carbon black, harden the rubber, and most improve its resistance to abrasion. Carbon black is especially good at imparting abrasion resistance; TiO_2 imparts an attractive white color to rubber. Sometimes the principal function of a filler is to reduce cost.

Density. The density of a sample of rubber is sensitive to the amount of filler present. From the results of Scott (44), the density of a sample containing 2.5 parts by weight of bound sulfur per 100 parts of pure rubber, but without any other compounding ingredients, is found to be 0.927 g cm^{-3} . Additional compounding ingredients, especially zinc oxide, increase the density. Rubber made by standard formula 2A may be expected to have a density of about 0.97. Gengrinovich and Fogel (20) found 0.974 for their stock No. 1, which differs only slightly from standard formula 2A.

The Glass Transition. The glass-transition temperature of a plastic or rubberlike material is the temperature above which it is relatively soft, and below which it is relatively hard and brittle. Many of the properties of the material undergo changes at the glass-transition temperature, or more precisely, in a narrow temperature region. The glass-transition temperature can be determined in various ways; perhaps the most common method is to measure the thermal expansion and locate the temperature at which the expansion coefficient undergoes a large change. For soft vulcanized rubber, the glass-transition temperature is slightly above 200°K . This temperature is sensitive to the degree of vulcanization; hard rubber containing 47 parts by weight of bound sulfur per 100 parts of raw rubber has its glass transition at about 363°K (45). A moderate peak or break in the curve of thermal conductivity versus temperature is to be expected at the glass transition in any plastic or rubberlike material. Soft rubber exhibits such a peak. A few observers have reported a large and somewhat erratic jump in the thermal conductivity of rubber at its glass transition, but these results are probably in error.

Crystallization, Stretching, and Orientation. Raw rubber can be made to crystallize without difficulty; the process is most rapid at about 247°K (-26°C). Soft vulcanized rubber, if not stretched, has almost no tendency to crystallize, and may be assumed to be amorphous. But when it is stretched to 3 or 4 times its original length, a substantial fraction of it crystallizes within a time as short as 1 second, and when it returns to its unstretched

state, the crystallites disappear with comparable rapidity.

The presence of crystallites in stretched rubber should increase its thermal conductivity, since crystals are in general much better heat conductors than are amorphous materials. In addition, the stretching tends to orient the long axes of the polymer molecules in the direction of stretch. There is evidence that heat flows more readily in the direction of orientation of polymer molecules than at right angles to it. However, the experiments on rubber (21, 27) are less conclusive than the results on other polymers (33, 46). Rubber was investigated above its glass transition; the other polymers were investigated below theirs; perhaps this has something to do with the problem. The selected values in the present paper refer to unstretched, uncrystallized rubber.

3. Effect of Compounding Ingredients

The effect of various compounding ingredients on the thermal conductivity of rubber was studied by Williams (31) and by Barnett (15). The results were presented by assigning one value of k to pure rubber and another to each compounding ingredient. The value of k assigned to a compounding ingredient is not in general the true thermal conductivity of the ingredient in either solid or powder form, but simply an empirical constant appropriate to the particular calculation. The conductivity of a binary mixture of rubber and one other ingredient is then found by assuming that the conductivity (at a given temperature) is a linear function of the volume fractions of the two components,

each multiplied by its assigned k-factor. The method may be extended if several additives are present. It must be used with caution, for the curves of k versus either volume fraction or weight fraction of additive usually are noticeably concave upward.

The effect on k of a few of the most important compounding ingredients will be briefly discussed. These are sulfur, zinc oxide, and carbon black. For convenience we will adopt the practice of the rubber industry and specify additives in parts by weight per hundred parts of raw rubber.

Sulfur. Sulfur has only a moderate effect on k; some investigators have in fact found the same conductivity for raw rubber and for soft vulcanized rubber (15, 31). However, we may compare soft and hard rubber; they differ primarily in the amount of combined sulfur present. Our selected value for soft rubber at 25°C (298.15°K) is $0.000360 \text{ cal cm}^{-1} \text{ sec}^{-1} \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$. The average of 9 published values for hard rubber, at or near room temperature, we found to be about 11 percent higher. If we assume the soft rubber to contain 2.5 parts by weight of sulfur per 100 parts of raw rubber, and the hard rubber to contain 47 parts per 100 of rubber, the addition of 10 parts of sulfur to 100 parts of raw rubber will raise k by a little over 2 percent.

Carbon Black and Zinc Oxide. Both carbon black and zinc oxide affect the thermal conductivity of rubber more than sulfur does. We have plotted and analyzed the published data for these two additives, and find that an addition of 10 parts by weight of carbon black per 100 parts of raw rubber may be

expected to raise k by about 17 percent, at room temperature and somewhat above. In the same temperature region, the same addition of ZnO may be expected to raise k by about 7 percent. These values are presented as rough estimates only, and the curvature known to be present at high concentrations is simply ignored. However, within their limited accuracy, these values appear to be usable up to about 40 parts of carbon black per 100 parts of raw rubber. Kainradl (24) found large differences in the effects of different carbon blacks on k . The size and shape of the particles undoubtedly have some influence. There is evidence that graphite has a different effect from carbon black; it causes the curve of k versus composition to curve upward more steeply.

4. Selection of the Values

As indicated earlier, the tables have been prepared to represent the thermal conductivity of soft, unstretched, vulcanized natural rubber with conventional amounts of compounding ingredients. Standard formula 2A of the ASTM, the composition of which was given in section 2 of this report, is typical of the compositions for which the tables are intended. Before the tables are assumed to apply to any rubber suspected of having a substantially different composition, sections 2 and 3 of this report should be studied.

The selected values given in the tables are represented by the heavy master curve in Fig. 1. The available data were first plotted on a large-scale version of Fig. 1, and a tentative master




Fig. 1. Thermal-conductivity data of references (1) to (12). All are for soft vulcanized natural rubber except the data of Erk, which refer to natural rubber. The heavy line represents the selected values.

curve was drawn. After study and revisions, the master curve shown in the figure was accepted. Table 1 was then prepared by reading values from the accepted master curve. These values were differenced, smoothed, and rechecked for consistency with the master curve before acceptance. Table 2 was derived from Table 1 and is consistent with it.

The selected values follow the general shape of the curve of results of Eiermann and Hellwege (1). These authors made measurements by a quasistationary method (described in reference 47), after establishing the validity of the method in separate experiments. The selected values in the neighborhood of the glass-transition temperature (about 202°K) are of necessity based almost entirely on the results of Eiermann and Hellwege. The sample used by these workers contained 2 percent of sulfur. Since T_g is sensitive to combined-sulfur content, the temperature at which the peak in the k-curve occurs may be expected to shift up or down with variation in content of combined sulfur.

Eiermann and Knappe (2) give two values, one at liquid-air temperature, the other at room temperature, obtained by a steady-state method, to which considerable weight has been given. They undertook this particular investigation to clear up the uncertainty that had existed in the behavior of the thermal conductivity of rubber near and below the glass transition. Values obtained with the apparatus evacuated were erratic, and generally lower than those obtained when the apparatus was filled

Thermal conductivity of soft vulcanized natural rubber

Table 1			Table 2		
T	k	Δ	T	k	Δ
°K	$\frac{\text{millical cm}}{^\circ\text{K cm}^2 \text{ sec}}$		°R	$\frac{\text{Btu in.}}{^\circ\text{R ft}^2 \text{ hr}}$	
80	0.375		150	1.09	
		3			1
100	0.378		200	1.10	
		2			1
120	0.380		250	1.11	
		2			1
140	0.382		300	1.12	
		2			1
160	0.384		350	1.13	
		2			-2
180	0.386		400	1.11	
		2			-2
200	0.388		450	1.09	
		-5			-3
220	0.383		500	1.06	
		-5			-2
240	0.378		550	1.04	
		-6			-1
260	0.372		600	1.03	
		-7			0
280	0.365		650	1.03	
		-5			0
300	0.360		700	1.03	
		-3			
320	0.357				
		-1			
340	0.356				
		-1			
360	0.355				
		0			
380	0.355				

with helium gas. Their evidence seems conclusive that some previous workers obtained erroneous results because of poor thermal contact between the sample and the hot and cold plates. Hardening of the sample at the glass transition appears to greatly increase the possible errors from this source. The values from Eiermann and Knappe plotted in Fig. 1 are the average values obtained with helium gas surrounding the sample, so that good thermal contact was obtained.

Frensdorff (3) gives a valuable set of data covering the range 32° to 99° C. The reported values are of thermal diffusivity α ; the k -values must be computed from the α 's. A standard technique for making this computation for rubber was worked out and used in all cases where α , rather than k , was reported. This technique is described later.

The data of Cherkasova (4) are somewhat puzzling; they have a minimum in k at about 318° K. Cherkasova attributes this minimum to the completion of melting of a crystalline phase, and states that crystallization was produced by long storage at 20° C. Presumably the samples were unvulcanized; there is no statement on this point. Perhaps they were of the modification known as "stark rubber."

Schilling's (5) recent paper includes results for soft vulcanized rubber. His apparatus could be operated in various ways; the results we have plotted were probably obtained by a quasistationary technique.

Schallamach (6), and also Dauphinee, Ivey, and Smith (7), reported thermal-conductivity measurements over temperature ranges extending well below the glass transition. In both investigations the apparatus was evacuated to reduce heat exchange with the surroundings; and in both, the thermal conductivity was erratic and showed a steep drop at and below the glass transition. Eiermann and Knappe have, as mentioned above, explained this as due to poor thermal contact. We have accepted this explanation, and have therefore rejected all data of references (6) and (7) below about 220°K . Above that temperature, for Schallamach the plotted points are reproduced; but for Dauphinee, et al., the points were so numerous and scattered that we have reproduced only the upper straight line that they gave, which we believe represents their more reliable data.

Rehner (8) reported α rather than k . The steep slope of his curve casts doubt on the reliability of the data.

The papers mentioned thus far are the only ones we have found that give data for soft rubber covering appreciable ranges of temperatures. A set of data for hard rubber, given by Erk (9), is included in Fig. 1 for comparison. Note that hard rubber shows no peak near 200°K , where the glass transition of soft rubber occurs. The glass transition of hard rubber may be expected to occur at about 363°K ; however, Erk's data are too widely spaced to prove or disprove the existence of a peak in the k -curve in this region.

A number of papers not so far discussed contain only a single value of k ; a few contain more than one value but cover no appreciable temperature range. These papers have been evaluated, and the data from three (10, 11, 12) are given in the figure. In all three a steady-state hot-plate method was used. The rest of this group of papers were considered less reliable or less usable for various reasons. These remaining papers are listed in the second group of references, with numerical k -values and annotations.

To calculate values of k from values of thermal diffusivity, α , the equation $k = \alpha \rho c_p$ is used, where ρ is density and c_p is specific heat at constant pressure. For density, we have used the values of Scott (44). For specific heat, we have used a paper of Bekkedahl and Matheson (48), in which c_p is tabulated at 5° intervals. Above the range of the tables we used linear extrapolation.

The Thermal Conductivity at Higher Temperatures.

The selected values of k in Table 1 extend from 80 to 380°K , and the master curve becomes nearly level at the upper end of this range. In a study of the resistance of various rubbers to high temperatures, Hayes, Smith, Kidder, Henning, Rigby, and Hall (49) made measurements and reported thermal-conductivity values for natural rubber at 100, 300, and 400°F (up to 478°K). A measurement at 500°F had to be discontinued because of deterioration of the sample.

The results are not plotted in Fig. 1, because the sample

contained among the compounding ingredients 50 parts (on the rubber) of carbon black. Such an addition of carbon black raises the k-values by roughly 85 percent. In the range of their measurements, Hayes, et al. found dk/dT negative, with a value of about $5 \times 10^{-7} \text{ cal cm}^{-1} \text{ sec}^{-1} \text{ }^{\circ}\text{K}^{-2}$. It is reasonable to expect rubber without carbon black also to have dk/dT negative between 380 and 500° K and, until additional measurements have been made, it is reasonable to use the value 5×10^{-7} given above for both soft and highly compounded rubber.

5. Reliability of the Tables

The tabulated values of k near and above room temperature are believed to be accurate to ± 8 percent or better. At lower temperatures, where the data are scarcer, the uncertainty is perhaps 12 or 15 percent. We attribute roughly half the uncertainty to errors in the experimental measurements, and half to differences in composition of the rubber.

6. Acknowledgment

We are indebted to Dr. Lawrence A. Wood of the National Bureau of Standards for a number of valuable suggestions.

7. ANNOTATED REFERENCES

Containing Data Plotted in Fig. 1

1. K. Eiermann and K. H. Hellwege, "Thermal conductivity of high polymers from -180°C to 90°C ," J. Polymer Sci. 57, 99-106 (1962). Their Fig. 1 contains 89 plotted points for rubber, from which values of T and k were read.
2. Kurt Eiermann and Werner Knappe, "A simple plate apparatus for the determination of the thermal conductivity of plastics, with a contribution to the question of thermal contact at low temperatures," Z. angew. Physik 14, 484-8 (1962). "Room temperature" has been taken to be 25°C ; "liquid-air" temperature, -180°C .
3. H. K. Frensdorff, "The thermal diffusivity of natural rubber," J. Appl. Polymer Sci. 6, S28-9 (1962). His Fig. 1 contains 33 "zero-time corrected" points, from which values of T and α were read.
4. L. N. Cherkasova, "Effect of structure on the thermal conductivity of polymers," Russian J. Phys. Chem. 33, 9, 224-6 (1959). Her Fig. 2 contains 16 plotted points, from which values of T and k were read.
5. H. Schilling, "Thermal conductivity of elastomer-filler systems at 20 to 90°C ," Kautschuk und Gummi 16, 84-7 (1963). Values of T and k at the ends of the interval of measurement are tabulated. The remaining values were read from Schilling's Fig. 1. The two curves for unfilled rubber appear to be duplicates. The 6 interior points of each were read and corresponding values were averaged.

6. Adolf Schallamach, "The heat conductivity of rubber at low temperatures," Proc. Phys. Soc. (London) 53, 214-8 (1941). His Fig. 2 contains 13 points, from which values of T and k were read. For reasons given in the text, we have rejected all except those for the 5 highest temperatures.
7. T. M. Dauphinee, D. G. Ivey, and H. D. Smith, "The thermal conductivity of elastomers under stretch and at low temperatures," Can. J. Research A 28, 596-615 (1950). No values of plotted points were read from the graphs; instead, the upper solid straight line of their Fig. 5 has been used.
8. John Rehner, Jr., "Heat conduction and molecular structure in rubberlike polymers," J. Polymer Sci. 2, 263-74 (1947). The values in his table 1 are extrapolations. We have therefore used his Fig. 2; it contains 18 points, from which values of T and α were read.
9. S. Erk, "Physical properties, application and processing of synthetic materials," in Der Chemie - Ingenieur, Vol. 3, Part 2, A. Eucken and M. Jakob, editors (Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig, 1938), p. 360-86. On hard rubber.
10. J. A. Weh, "Thermal conductivity of insulating materials," Gen. Elec. Rev. 40, 138-40 (1937). The temperature of the measurement has been taken to be 45^oC.
11. Ezer Griffiths and G. W. C. Kaye, "The measurement of thermal conductivity," Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A 104, 71-98 (1923). We have accepted one k-value from their table 13, the value for 92 percent rubber.

12. O. Tesche, "Determination of the thermal conductivity of technical materials," Z. techn. Physik 5, 233-6 (1924).

We have accepted the third entry in his table, for "Gummi 90%."

Containing Data Not Plotted in Fig. 1

These references contain the data judged to be less important than those in references (1) to (12). The arrangement is alphabetical. Each of the references in this group is followed by a brief annotation, in which the k-values reported in the paper are included. Numerical values given below are in $\text{cal cm}^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1} \text{C}^{-1}$.

13. Am. Soc. Testing Materials, "Tentative method of test for comparing the thermal conductivities of solid electrical insulating materials, Tentative Standard D325 - 30T," Proc. ASTM 30, I, 1224-8 (1930). The use of standard specimens made from rubber was anticipated; with varying amounts of graphite added to increase the conductivity. For soft vulcanized rubber (no graphite), k is given as 0.000342; for an unspecified temperature, presumably at, possibly above, room temperature.
14. W. Backes, "Contribution to the thermal conductivity of vulcanizates of natural and synthetic rubber," Kautschuk und Gummi 9, WT257-60 (1956). Thermal diffusivity was measured, presumably near room temperature. We have averaged the two values for unmasticated rubber without carbon-black filler, and computed k; the result is $k = 0.000437$.

15. C. E. Barnett, "Thermal properties of rubber compounds. I. Thermal conductivity of rubber and rubber compounding materials," *Ind. Eng. Chem.* 26, 303-6 (1934). No numerical value is given for soft rubber, but we have read a value from the graph of k versus volume fraction of ZnO. At zero ZnO-content, $k = 0.00032$. Presumably this value is for room temperature. Presumably also it is for raw rubber, but Barnett states that raw and cured rubber have the same k -value.
16. L. N. Clarke and R. S. T. Kingston, "Equipment for the simultaneous determination of thermal conductivity and diffusivity of insulating materials using a variable-state method," *Australian J. Appl. Sci.* 1, 172-87 (1950). This paper gives $k = 0.000365$ at 25°C ; however the density of the rubber is 1.10 g cm^{-3} , so the sample must be considered to be outside our limits for soft natural rubber.
17. C. Cuthbert, "Vulcanisation: application of unsteady-state heat conduction theory," *Trans. Inst. Rubber Ind.* 30, 16-32 (1954). A nonsteady-state method gave for rubber, $k = 0.000455$, and showed "no significant change with temperature over the range room temperature to 280°F ."
18. L. Frumkin and Yu. Dubinker, "Investigation of the thermal conductivity of rubber," *Rubber Chem. Technol.* 11, 359-71 (1938). Two values in this paper appear to fall within our limits for soft vulcanized natural rubber. These are the first value in table I: $k = 0.000431$; and the first value in table IV: $k = 0.000355$. We cannot be sure of the temperature; the average temperature of the hot plate appears to have been 65°C .

19. L. S. Frumkin and Yu. B. Dubinker, "The heat conductivity of rubber," Rubber Chem. Technol. 13, 361-74 (1940).

The curve for "pure mixture" in Fig. 9 of this paper gives the thermal diffusivity of soft vulcanized natural rubber (the English translation of the title of the paper is incorrect - it should be "thermal diffusivity," not "heat conductivity").

We have taken the value for diffusivity from this curve at a sphere-center temperature of 50°C. and have calculated from it a k-value of 0.000174. The mean temperature to be associated with this value is not given; a rough estimate is 55°C.

20. V. I. Gengrinovich and V. O. Fogel, "Thermophysical characteristics of cured rubber stocks," Rubber Chem. Technol. 32, 444-53 (1959). One value is given for soft vulcanized natural rubber (Stock No. 1): $k = 0.000314$.

A nonsteady-state method was used. We estimate the temperature corresponding to this value to be 90°C.

21. J. Hennig, "The thermal conductivity of stretched high polymers below and above the glass-transition temperature," Kolloid Z. und Z. Polymere 188, 159-60 (1963). A comparison method was used; the reference sample was poly-CTFE with an accepted k of 0.000325. For soft vulcanized rubber unstretched, and also for stretched rubber perpendicular to the direction of stretch, k was found to be 0.00036 at 25°C.

22. A. S. Herschel, G. A. Lebour, and J. T. Dunn, "Experiments to determine the thermal conductivities of certain

- rocks, showing especially the geological aspects of the investigations," Brit. Assoc. Advancement Sci. Report of 49th Annual Meeting, p. 58-63 (1879). For soft vulcanized natural rubber two values are given: for a gray "nearly pure" sample, $k = 0.00044$ at 46°C ; for a red sample, $k = 0.00034$ at 49°C .
23. G. B. Hodgetts, "A method of measuring the thermal conductivity of wire coatings," Brit. J. Appl. Phys. 13, 310-3 (1962). Insulated and uninsulated wires were immersed in running water and electrically heated; the temperature rises were calculated from the observed electrical resistances. The k -value found for a rubber insulation is 0.00033, at a temperature of about 30°C .
 24. Primus Kainradl, "Method for the measurement of the thermal conductivity of vulcanizates. Effect of carbon blacks and fillers," Gummi und Asbest 5, 44-6 (1952). A comparison method was used; the reference sample was hard rubber, whose k -value (not given) was known to 2.5 percent. From his Fig. 2, at 0 percent additive, we find $k = 0.000378$; it corresponds to a temperature of approximately 19°C .
 25. Otto Krischer and Horst Esdorn, "A simple, rapid process for the simultaneous determination of the thermal conductivity, heat capacity, and heat-penetration number of solid materials," VDI Forschungsheft 450 (Suppl. to Forsch. Gebiete Ingenieurw. B 21), 28-39 (1955). A nonsteady-state method was developed; for rubber it gave $k = 0.000508$ and $k = 0.000511$ at 24°C . As a check the same sample was measured in a conventional,

- two-plate apparatus; the result was $k = 0.000506$ at 28°C .
26. Adolf Schallamach, "Heat conductivity of rubber at low temperatures," *Nature* 145, 67 (1940). The first two values in this report we consider superseded by reference (6). However, the third value was obtained by a different method, by filling a rubber bag with liquid nitrogen, immersing it in liquid oxygen, and noting the rate of evaporation of nitrogen. The value of k found by this method at 83°K is 0.000010 , a very low value.
27. Heinz Tautz, "The variation of the thermal conductivity of rubber with stretching," *Kolloid Z.* 174, 128-33 (1961). Heat flow took place along the two legs of a doubled thread of rubber under conditions not favorable to accurate measurement of k . From Fig. 2 we read off the two values of k at zero extension. The average is 0.000144 ; it corresponds to a temperature of 59°C .
28. M. S. Van Dusen, "The thermal conductivity of heat insulators," *J. Am. Soc. Heating Ventilating Engrs.* 26, 625-52 (1920). This contains an accurate measurement made by the guarded hot-plate method: $k = 0.000420$ at approximately 30°C . Unfortunately, the density (1.10 g cm^{-3}) is so high that the sample must be considered to be outside our limits for soft natural rubber.
29. R. Vieweg and F. Gottwald, "Measurements of thermal diffusivity of plates of synthetic materials in a steam calorimeter," *Kunststoffe* 32, 10-2 (1942). A sample with a thermocouple at its center is suddenly exposed to steam,

and the rate of temperature rise is observed. Only one of the reported values, that for natural rubber of density 1.05 g cm^{-3} , falls within our limits. The value of k given by Vieweg and Gottwald for this sample is 0.00039, the corresponding temperature lies somewhere between room temperature and 100°C , say at 60°C .

30. V. S. Volkenshtein and N. N. Medvedev, "Determination of the coefficients of thermal diffusivity and thermal conductivity of solid and liquid materials," *Inzhener.-Fiz. Zhur.*, Akad. Nauk Belorus, S. S. R. 2, No. 10, 26-32 (1959). A ~~un~~steady-state method was used, in which a reference material was required. For soft rubber, using gypsum as the reference material, they report $k = 0.00050$; when sand was the reference material, they found $k = 0.00036$. The temperature of measurement appears to be room temperature.
31. Ira Williams, "Thermal properties of various pigments and of rubber," *Ind. Eng. Chem.* 15, 154-7 (1923). Two methods of measurement were used; both involved the condensation of steam. Williams found no difference in the k -values of raw and cured rubber, and gives, for the temperature range 45 to 100°C , $k = 0.00032$.

Containing Data for Which Another Reference
is Preferred

The arrangement is alphabetical.

32. L. N. Cherkasova, "Effect of structure on the thermal conductivity of polymers," *Zhur. Fiz. Khim.* 33, 1928-32 (1959). This is the Russian original of (4).

33. K. Eiermann, "Heat conduction by synthetic materials in dependence on structure, temperature, and previous history," *Kunststoffe* 51, 512-7 (1961). Reference (1) is preferred. However, this paper contains a fuller description of the work.
34. L. Frumkin and Yu. Dubinker, "Investigation of the thermal conductivity of rubber," *Kauchuk i Rezina* 1936, No. 2, 132-40, and No. 3, 333. This is the Russian original of (18).
35. L. S. Frumkin and Yu. B. Dubinker, "The thermal diffusivity of rubber," *Kauchuk i Rezina* 1939, No. 6, 25-34. This is the Russian original of (19).
36. V. I. Gengrinovich and V. O. Fogel, "Thermophysical characteristics of cured rubber stocks," *Kauchuk i Rezina* 1957, No. 4, 27-32. This is the Russian original of (20).
37. W. Knappe, "New results in the field of thermal conductivity of high polymers," *Plaste und Kautschuk* 9, 189-94 (1962). Reference (1) is preferred.
38. M. S. Van Dusen, "The thermal conductivity of heat insulators," *Trans. Am. Soc. Heating Ventilating Engrs.* 26, 385-414(1920). Reference (28) is preferred.
39. M. S. Van Dusen, "The thermal conductivity of heat insulators," *J. Am. Soc. Refrig. Engrs.* 7, 202-31 (1920). Reference (28) is preferred.

Containing No Original Thermal-Conductivity

Data on Soft Vulcanized Natural Rubber

40. Otis D. Cole, "Natural rubber," in Introduction to rubber technology, Maurice Morton, editor (Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York, 1959), p. 72-5.

41. W. J. Roff, Fibres, plastics, and rubbers. A handbook of common polymers (Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1956), p. 103-4.
42. ASTM standards on rubber products (with related information), Am. Soc. Testing Materials, Philadelphia, 20th ed., 1961, p. 6.
43. Ralph F. Wolf, "Nonblack compounding ingredients," in Introduction to rubber technology, Maurice Morton, editor (Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York, 1959), p. 213-55.
44. Arnold H. Scott, "Specific volume, compressibility, and volume thermal expansivity of rubber-sulphur compounds," J. Research Natl. Bur. Standards 14, 99-120 (1935).
45. Gordon M. Martin and Leo Mandelkern, "Glass formation in polymers: II. The system rubber-sulfur," J. Research Natl. Bur. Standards 62, 141-6 (1959).
46. K. H. Hellwege, J. Hennig, and W. Knappe, "Anisotropy of thermal expansion and heat conduction in uniaxially stretched amorphous high polymers," Kolloid-Z. und Z. Polymere 188, 124-7 (1963).
47. K. Eiermann, K. H. Hellwege, and W. Knappe, "Quasi-stationary measurement of the heat conductivity of plastics in the temperature range from -180°C to $+90^{\circ}\text{C}$," Kolloid-Z. 174, 134-42 (1961).
48. Norman Bekkedahl and Harry Matheson, "Heat capacity, entropy, and free energy of rubber hydrocarbon," J. Research Natl. Bur. Standards 15, 503-15 (1935).

49. Robert A. Hayes, Floyd M. Smith, Glenn A. Kidder,
James C. Henning, Jack D. Rigby, and George L. Hall,
"Research on high-temperature resistant rubber
compounds," U. S. Air Force, Wright Air Development
Division Tech. Rpt. 56-331, Part IV, (April 1960), 157 p.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Mr. Richard Anderson
Plastics Materials, Div. 1113-1
Sandia Corporation
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dr. William H. Evans
Thermochemistry Section
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D. C. 20234

Dr. Daniel R. Flynn
Heat Transfer Section
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D. C. 20234

Dr. Serge Gratch, Chairman
ASME Committee K-7, Heat Transfer
Division
P. O. Box 2053
Dearborn, Michigan

Dr. N. E. Hager, Jr.
Research and Development Center
Armstrong Cork Company
Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Mr. R. C. Kantayya
Interdisciplinary Materials
Research Center
Dept. of Chemical Engineering
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York 12180

Professor Donald E. Kline
Nuclear Engineering Department
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Dr. Donald McIntyre, Chief
Macromolecules Section
National Bureau of Standards
Washington 25, D. C.

Mr. Jules Pinsky, Manager
Research and Development Lab.
Plax Corporation
Box 1019
Hartford, Connecticut

Mr. Frank J. Powell
Heat Transfer Section
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D. C. 20234

Mr. Henry E. Robinson, Chief
Heat Transfer Section
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D. C. 20234

Dr. Daniel R. Stull
Thermal Research Laboratory
574 Building
The Dow Chemical Company
Midland, Michigan

Dr. Y. S. Touloukian, Director
Thermophysical Properties Research
Center, Purdue University
2595 Yeager Road
West Lafayette, Indiana

Dr. Guy Waddington, Director
Office of Critical Tables
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue
Washington 25, D. C.

Dr. L. A. Wood, 311.00
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D. C. 20234

Dr. Harold W. Woolley
Statistical Physics Section, IBS
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D. C. 20234

Mr. Richard B. Zipin
School of Mechanical Engineering
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana 47907

Mrs. Suzanne S. Eichacker
Claire Road
Vernon, Connecticut

Joseph Kaye and Company
737 Concord Avenue
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Geophysics Research Directorate
Cambridge Research Center
Air Research and Development
Command
Hanscom Field
Bedford, Massachusetts

Avco Research Laboratories
Everett, Massachusetts

Mr. Dave Trageser
High Voltage Engineering Corp.
Burlington, Massachusetts

Dr. Arthur C. Cope, Head
Department of Chemistry
Mass. Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dr. Lawrence J. Heidt
Department of Chemistry
Mass. Institute of Technology
Cambridge 39, Massachusetts

Itek Corporation
1605 Trapelo Road
Waltham 54, Massachusetts

Sylvania Corporation
Woburn, Massachusetts

Tracerlab
1601 Trapelo Road
Waltham 54, Massachusetts

Dr. Charles Walcott
Dir. of Engineering and
Applied Physics
Harvard University
Cambridge, 38, Massachusetts

Dr. M. Levy, Chief
Refractory Coatings Section
Watertown Arsenal Laboratories
Watertown 72, Massachusetts

Dr. Homer Priest
Ordnance Materials Research
Watertown Arsenal
Watertown, Massachusetts

Commanding General
USA Test and Evaluation Command
ATTN: AMSTE-TAA
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.

Commanding General
U. S. A. Nuclear Defense Laboratory
Army Chemical Center
Maryland

Commanding General
USA Combat Developments Command
ATTN: CDCMR-O
Fort Belvoir, Virginia

Commanding General
U. S. A. Edgewood Arsenal
ATTN: Directorate of Commodity Mgmt
Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland

Director, Engineering and Ind Svcs
Attn: Directorate of Chemical Engineer
Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland

Commanding General
U. S. A. Electronics Research
and Development
Attn: Tech Info Div
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

Commanding Officer
U. S. A. Materials Research
Agency
Attn: Technical Library
Watertown, Mass. 02172

Commanding Officer
USACDC Nuclear Group
Fort Bliss, Texas 79916

Commanding Officer
U. S. A. Research Office-Durham
Attn: CRD-AA-TP
Box CM, Duke Station
Durham, North Carolina

Commanding Officer
U. S. A. Polar Research and
Development Center
Fort Belvoir, Virginia

Commanding Officer
U. S. A. Cold Regions Research
and Engineering Laboratories
Hanover, New Hampshire

Directorate of Science and
Technology, DCS/Research and
Development, HQ., U. S. Air Force
Washington 25, D. C.

Directorate of Science and
Technology, AFRSTD, DCS/Res and
Dev., HQ., U. S. Air Force
Washington, D. C. 20330

Defense Director, Technical Info
Office of Director of Defense
Research and Engineering
Room 3D1040 Pentagon
Washington 25, D. C.

Director
U. S. A. Engineer Research and
Development Laboratories
Attn: Technical Document Center
Fort Belvoir, Virginia

Director
Air University Library
Attn: AUL3T-7575
Maxwell AFB, Alabama 36112

Director, Library
U. S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pa. 17013

Director, Army Technical Information
U. S. Army Research Office
OCD, Room 209A
Arlington 4, Virginia

Commandant
U. S. A. Quartermaster School
Attn: Quartermaster Library
Fort Lee, Virginia 23801

Commander
U. S. Naval Ordnance Test Station
Attn: Code 12
China Lake, California 93557

Commander
U. S. A. Chemical Res and Dev Lab
Attn: Technical Library
Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland

The Army Library
Attn: Procurement Section
Room 1A522, The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20310

Library
U. S. Weather Bureau
Washington, D. C. 20235

Air Force Cambridge Res Labs
Laurence G. Hanscom Field
Attn: CRMCLR, Res. Library,
Stop 29
Bedford, Mass. 01731

U. S. A. NLABS LN Office
ASDL-8
Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio

U. S. A. Ballistic Res Lab
Attn: AMXBR-TC, Mr. B.F. Armendt
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md. 21005

U. S. Dept. of Agriculture
Division of Acquisitions
National Agricultural Library
Washington, D. C. 20250

U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Reports Section, Headquarters Library
Mail Station G-017
Division of Technical Information
Washington, D. C. 20545

Redstone Scientific Information Ctr
U. S. A. Missile Command
Attn: Chief, Document Section
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama

U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Div of Tech Info Extension
P. O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, Tenn 37831

U. S. Naval Research Laboratory
Code 6140
Washington, D. C. 20390

Chief, Bureau of Ships
Room 2510, Main Navy
Code 364A4
18th and Constitution Ave., NW
Washington, D. C.

Exchange and Gift Division
Library of Congress
Washington, D. C. 20540

U. S. Army Materiel Command
Research Division AMCRD-RL
Res and Dev Directorate
Bldg. T-7
Washington, D. C. 20315

Library
U. S. Naval Supply Research and
Development Facility
Naval Supply Center
Bayonne, New Jersey 07002

Commanding General
U. S. A. Weapons Command
ATTN: AMSWE-RDR
Rock Island, Illinois

Unclassified

Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) U. S. Army Natick Laboratories Natick, Massachusetts 01760		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
		2b. GROUP	
3. REPORT TITLE THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY OF SOFT VULCANIZED NATURAL RUBBER: SELECTED VALUES			
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) Third in a Series			
5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial) Carwile, Lois C. K. and Hoge, Harold J.			
6. REPORT DATE June 1966		7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 26	7b. NO. OF REFS 49
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.		9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) 66-49-PR	
b. PROJECT NO. 1P014501B11A			
c.		9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)	
d.		Series: Thermal Conductivity-3	
10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES Distribution of this document is unlimited. Release to Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information is authorized.			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY U. S. Army Natick Laboratories Natick, Massachusetts 01760	
13. ABSTRACT The published literature on the thermal conductivity of natural rubber has been assembled and the results critically evaluated. Best values of thermal conductivity as a function of temperature have been selected. These are presented in both graphical and tabular form; the tables cover the range 80 to 380° K. An attempt was made to consult all work that could significantly affect the choice of best values. Published papers were located with the aid of <u>Chemical Abstracts</u> , <u>Physics Abstracts</u> , the <u>Thermophysical Properties Retrieval Guide</u> , and some other general sources. In addition, relevant references in the papers themselves were followed up until a substantially "closed system" had been generated, as shown by the fact that no new references were being turned up.			

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Thermal conductivity	8		7		7	
Heat transfer	8					
Rubber	9		9		9	
Natural	0		0		0	
Hevea	0		0		0	
Raw	0		0		0	
Transport properties	8					
Thermophysical properties	8					
Temperature			6			
Calibration	4					
Equipment	4					
Corrections	4					
Compounding					6	
Additives					6	
Vulcanization					6	

INSTRUCTIONS

1. **ORIGINATING ACTIVITY:** Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (*corporate author*) issuing the report.

2a. **REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:** Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2b. **GROUP:** Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. **REPORT TITLE:** Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. **DESCRIPTIVE NOTES:** If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. **AUTHOR(S):** Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. **REPORT DATE:** Enter the date of the report as day, month, year; or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7a. **TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES:** The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7b. **NUMBER OF REFERENCES:** Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8a. **CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER:** If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8b, 8c, & 8d. **PROJECT NUMBER:** Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9a. **ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S):** Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9b. **OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S):** If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (*either by the originator or by the sponsor*), also enter this number(s).

10. **AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES:** Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

- (1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."
- (2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."
- (3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through _____."
- (4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through _____."
- (5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through _____."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. **SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES:** Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. **SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY:** Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (*paying for*) the research and development. Include address.

13. **ABSTRACT:** Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U).

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. **KEY WORDS:** Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, rules, and weights is optional.