Synthesis and characterization of functional copolymer/organo-silicate nanoarchitectures through interlamellar complex-radical (co)terpolymerization
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Abstract. The functional copolymers, having a combination of rigid/flexible linkages and an ability of complex-formation with interlayered surface of organo-silicate, and their nanocomposites have been synthesized by interlamellar complex-radical (co)terpolymerization of intercalated monomer complexes of maleic anhydride (MA) and itaconic acid (IA) with dimethyl dodecylamine surface modified montmorillonite (organo-MMT) (MA…DMDA-MMT and IA…DMDA-MMT) n-butyl methacrylate (BMA) and/or BMA/styrene monomer mixtures. The results of nanocomposite structure–composition–property relationship studies indicate that interlamellar complex-formation between anhydride/acid units and surface alkyl amine and rigid/flexible linkage balance in polymer chains are important factors providing the effective intercalation/exfoliation of the polymer chains into the silicate galleries, the formation of nanostructural hybrids with higher thermal stability, dynamic mechanical behaviour and well dispersed morphology.
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1. Introduction

In the last decade, the attention of many researchers focused on thermoplastic and thermoset polymer silicate layered (PLS), polymer/silica hybrid and polymer/carbon nanotube nanocomposites. This considerable scientific and engineering interest has been stimulated by possibility of the significant improvements in physical, mechanical, thermal and other important specific properties of PLS materials. The results of these researches were summarized and discussed in several reviews and articles [1–7]. PLSs are a class of organic-inorganic hybrids, composed of organic polymer matrix in which layered silicate particles of nano-scale dimension are embedded because these nanocomposites show enhanced mechanical properties [8, 9], gas barrier properties [10], and improved thermal stability [5, 11, 12], low flammability [11, 12] and protection effects from corrosion [13, 14]. Nowadays, organo-clays, especially organo-montmorillonite (MMT) are the most widely utilized silicates in polymer nanotechnology. MMT is a layered silicate crystal lattice which consists of two silica tetrahedral and one aluminium octahedral sheets with a plate-like structure of 1 nm thickness and 100 nm length [15]. The synthesis ways from functional monomers (maleic anhydride and its analogues) to polymer/clay (or silica) nanocomposites include three main methods such as (1) interlamellar (or intercalative, intragallery, etc.) copolymerization in the presence of various type of mineral silicates and organo-silicates, (2) intercalation
of thermoplastic polymers in melt by reactive extrusion in situ processing and (3) sol/hydro-gel method, i.e., reactions of anhydride (or carboxylic group)-containing polymers with organosilanes (polymer/silica hybrid synthesis). Last two methods, especially intercalation of polymers, are the most promising ways to synthesize polymer/intercalant-clay nanocomposites on the base of graft copolymers of maleic anhydride and its analogues as reactive compatibilizers.

Although the most promising reaction to great polymer/clay nanocomposites is the in situ polymerization of functional monomers, such as styrene [16, 17], N-vinylcarbazole [18], 4-vinyl-pyridine [19], methyl methacrylate [20, 21], acrylonitrile [22] and N-butylmaleimide [23], as well as synthesis of low-molecular-weight polyamide 6/hydro-talcite intercalated nanocomposites via in situ polymerization [24], whereas the intercalative radical copolymerization of binary or ternary monomer systems in the presence of mineral clay has been scarcely investigated. The polymerization of acrylate [25, 26], styrene-4-sulfonate [27], sulfopropyl methacrylate [28] and acrylic acid [29] in the inorganic layered materials have also been investigated as organic/inorganic nanocomposite materials. Yu et al. [29] completely polymerized the acrylic acid regularly fixed in layered aminopropylsilica without initiator at 100°C for 24 h to form a novel organic/inorganic nanocomposite named as layered polyacrylamide propylsilica. Examples for interlamellar polymerization of the binary monomer systems are bulk copolymerization of styrene-methyl methacrylate [23, 27, 30], emulsion copolymerization of styrene-acrylonitrile [31], styrene-phenyl maleimide (PhMI) [32] and styrene-butyl methacrylate [33] monomer pairs. It was observed that the polymerization rate was accelerated by the addition of the clay in reaction medium; this addition also significantly influenced the structure and properties of the prepared polymer nanocomposites [23, 27, 34]. Liu et al. [35] investigated the bulk, solution and emulsion copolymerization of styrene with methyl methacrylate and N-phenylmaleimide (PhMI) (at 1:9 molar PhMI/styrene feed ratio) in the presence of organo(cetyltrimethyl ammonium bromide)-modified MMT or Na+-MMT in order to prepare nanocomposites with good dispersability of clay. According to the authors, the catalytic effect of the clay on a polymerization may be mostly caused by the small-size effect of the clay layers, and the active sites are on the surface of the clay particles rather than between layers. Wang et al. [36, 37] showed that a comparison of solution, emulsion, suspension and bulk polymerization along the nanocomposites may also be prepared by melt in situ reactive blending of monomer/polymer/clay mixtures.

Recently, we have reported the synthesis of the functional copolymer/silica (or organo-silicate) hybrids and polypropylene/organo-MMT nanocomposites by (1) reaction of anhydride-containing copolymers with γ-aminopropyltriethoxysilane [38–40], (2) interlamellar copolymerization of maleic anhydride with some vinyl and acrylic comonomers [40] and (3) reactive extrusion in situ processing [4, 40]. In this work, we present (a) the synthesis of poly[maleic anhydride (MA)-co-n-butylmethacrylate (BMA)/organo-MMT, poly(MA-alt-styrene-co-BMA)/organo-MMT, and poly[[ita-
conic acid (IA)-co-styrene-co-BMA)]/organo-MM
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nanoarchitectures prepared by complex-radi-

cal interlamellar copolymerization, (b) the results

of the copolymer composition-nanostructure for-

mation relationship studies, and (c) characteriza-

tion of (co)terpolymer/organo-MMT nanocompos-

ites by thermal (DSC and TGA-DTG), dynamic

mechanical (DMA), X-ray diffraction (XRD) and

scanning electron microscopy (SEM) analysis

methods. Special attention is paid to the role

of complex formation of MA (or IA) and its (co)ter-

polymers with dimethyldodecylamine (DMDA)

surface modified silicate layers in interlamellar

copolymerization reactions and intercalation/

exfoliation of polymer chains between silicate gal-

leries. Taking into consideration of this effect, gen-

eral scheme of interlamellar (co)terpolymerizations

can be represented as shown in Figure 1.

2. Experimental

2.1. Materials

S and BMA monomers (Aldrich) were purified

before use by distillation under moderate vacuum.

MA and IA monomers were obtained from Fluka

(Switzerland). MA was purified by recrystalliza-

tion from anhydrous benzene and sublimation in

vacuum. IA monomer was purified by recrystalliza-

tion from distilled water solution and drying at

60°C. The α,α'-azoisobutyronitrile (AIBN) (Fluka)

was recrystallized twice before use from methanol.

DMDA-MMT (Viscobent SB-1) was purchased

from Bensan (Enez, Turkey) having the following

average parameters: specific surface area

43.6 m²·g⁻¹, specific mesopore volume

0.14 cm³·g⁻¹, content of N 1.12% and C 32.56%,

crystallinity 58.2% (by XRD), melting point (Tm)

160°C (by DSC for the surface alkyl ammonium

complex), temperature of decomposition for

Td(onset) 238°C and Td(max) 361°C (by TGA). All

other solvents and reagents were of analytical grade

and used without purification.

2.2. Terpolymerization procedure

Terpolymerization of MA, S and BMA using given

molar monomer feed ratios of (MA (or IA):S):BMA = (1:1):1.23–5.0 were carried out in methyl

ethyl ketone (MEK) or in N,N'-dimethylformamide

(DMF) (for IA/basic monomer system) with AIBN

as an initiator at constant total concentration of

monomers under nitrogen atmosphere. Reaction

conditions: [M]total = 2.86–3.04 mol·l⁻¹, [AIBN] = 2.03·10⁻² mol·l⁻¹, [Solvent]/[M] = 3, molar

monomer ratios of (MA:S)/BMA = 0.20–0.81, reac-
tion time 24 h, and conversion around 75–92 wt%.

Appropriate quantities of monomers, solvent

(MEK or DMF) and AIBN were placed in a stan-

dard Pyrex-glass reactor, and was cooled by liquid

nitrogen and flushed with dried nitrogen gas for at

least 3 min, then soldered and placed in a carousel
type microreactor with a thermostated heater and

magnetic mixer. The reaction mixture was stirred at

65 ± 0.1°C for 24 h. The resulting terpolymers

were isolated from reaction mixture by precipitat-
ing with diethyl ether, then washed with several

portions of benzene and dried at 40°C under vac-

uum. The terpolymer compositions were found by

chemical (acid number for MA units) analysis, and

¹H NMR spectroscopy (Figure 2) using integral

area of chemical shifts of monomer functional
groups for quantitative analysis. Under similar con-

ditions, poly(MA-co-BMA) with given composi-
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Figure 2. (a) ¹H NMR (in CHCl₃-d₃), (b) ¹³C NMR (in

DMSO-d₆) and (c) ¹³C NMR-DEPT-135 (in

DMSO-d₆, CH₃ region in negative position) spectra of poly(MA-alt-S-co-BMA)
tion was synthesized. Some characteristics of synthesized (co)terpolymers are presented in Table 1.

### 2.3. Interlamellar (co)terpolymerization procedure

MA (or IA) monomer was dispersed in MEK (or DMF)/DMDA-MMT mixture at monomer/alkyl amine molar ratio of 1:2 by intensive mixing at 40°C for 3 h before reaction to prepare the intercalated complex of monomer with surface alkyl amine. Then appropriate amount of S and BMA comonomers and AIBN (1.0 wt%) was added to reaction mixture containing organo-MMT...MA (or IA) complex and heated with mixing at 65°C under nitrogen atmosphere for 24 h. Prepared composition was isolated by precipitation with diethyl ether, then washed with several portions of benzene and dried under vacuum at 60°C.

### 2.4. Characterization

FT-IR spectra of the (co)terpolymers (KBr pellet) were recorded with FT-IR Nicolet 510 spectrometer in the 4000–400 cm⁻¹ range, where 30 scans were taken at 4 cm⁻¹ resolution. ¹H (¹³C and ¹³C-DEPT-135) NMR spectra were performed on a JEOL 6X-400 (400 MHz) spectrometer with CHCl₃-d₃ or DMSO-d₆ as a solvent at 25°C. Molar fractions of the comonomer units [m₁ and m₂, where m₁ is (MA–S) alternating diad and m₂ is BMA unit] in terpolymers were calculated according to the Equation (1) using NMR analysis data:

\[
\frac{m_1}{m_2} = \frac{n_2 A m_1 (\text{Ph or CH})}{n_1 A m_2 (\text{CH}_3)}
\]

where \(n_1\) and \(n_2\) are the integers of proton(s) in the functional groups of the monomer units, \(A_m1\) and \(A_m2\) are the integral areas per proton from corresponding groups of the monomer unit regions in ¹H NMR spectra.

Acid numbers of the anhydride (or carboxylic)-containing (co)terpolymers were determined by standard titration method. Intrinsic viscosities of the (co)terpolymers with different compositions were determined in DMF at 25 ± 0.1°C within the concentration range of 0.05–1.5 g·dl⁻¹ using an Ubbelohde viscometer. Thermogravimetric (TGA) and differential thermogravimetric (DTG) analyses were performed on a Setaram Labsys TG-DTA 12 Thermal Analyzser (France) at a heating rate of 5°C/min, under nitrogen atmosphere. The differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) was performed on a Shimadzu calorimeter (Japan). Dynamic mechanical analysis (DMA) was performed on a TA Instrument-Q800. Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) patterns were recorded using a JSM-6400 JEOL SEM with an acceleration voltage of 30 kV. The X-ray diffraction (XRD) patterns were obtained from a Rigaku D-Max 2200 powder diffractometer. The XRD diffractograms were measured at 2θ, in the range 1–50°, using a CuKα incident beam (\(\lambda = 1.5406\) Å), monochromated by a Ni-filter. The scanning speed was 1°/min, and the voltage and current of the X-ray tubes were 40 kV and 30 mA, respectively. The Bragg equation was used to calculate the interlayer spacing (d): \(n\lambda = 2dsn\theta\), where n is the order of reflection, and θ is the angle of reflection. Crystallinity of the nanocomposites was calculated using the Equations (2) and (3) [41]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Co)terpolymers</th>
<th>BMA-unit [mol%] (unit ratio)</th>
<th>Acid number [mg KOH·g⁻¹]</th>
<th>[(\eta)] in DMF at 25 ± 0.1°C</th>
<th>Tg [°C] (by DSC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poly(MA-co-BMA)</td>
<td>38.5 (1:1.25)</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly(MA-alt-S-co-BMA)-1</td>
<td>36.7 (1:1:1.16)</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>122.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly(MA-alt-S-co-BMA)-2</td>
<td>54.2 (1:1:2.37)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>100.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly(MA-alt-S-co-BMA)-3</td>
<td>71.1 (1:1:4.92)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where $s$ is the magnitude of the reciprocal-lattice vector which is given by $s = (2\sin \theta)/\lambda$, ($\theta$ is one-half the angle of deviation of the diffracted rays from the incident X-rays and $\lambda$ is the wavelength); $I(s)$ and $I_{c}(s)$ are the intensities of coherent X-ray scattering from both crystalline and amorphous regions and from only crystalline region of polymer sample, respectively, and $d$ is interlayer spacing.

$$\chi_c = \frac{\int_0^\infty s^2 I_c(s)\, ds}{\int_0^\infty s^2 I(s)\, ds}$$

where $W_c$ and $W_a$ are the areas of the crystalline and amorphous portions in the X-ray diffractogram, respectively.

Intercalation or exfoliation degree (ED) was calculated according to the Equation (4):

$$\text{ED} \,[\%] = \frac{I_e}{I_e + I_0} \times 10^{-2}$$

where $I_e$ (or $I_0$) and $I_0$ are the intensity of the diffraction peaks associated with the exfoliated and non-exfoliated structures at corresponding 2$\theta$ values.

3. Results and discussion
3.1. Complex-radical interlamellar copolymerization

Intercalation and exfoliation of functional polymer chains between surface modified silicate layers are one of the most important processes proceeding through chemical or physical interactions of functional groups from the monomers and/or growing polymer chains with surface alkyl amine in the interlamellar copolymerization. Character of this interaction strongly depends on the nature and functionality of the chosen monomer and polymer chains, which may provide an effective interaction with silicate layers via complex-formation, hydrogen bonding, and amidization/imidization reactions (in the case of primary alkyl amine modified MMT [4]). Effect of H-bonding in ternary solvent/proton-donor polymer/proton-acceptor polymer system was also reported by Figueruelo et al. [42]. Taking this principle into consideration, we have investigated the radical-initiated interlamellar copolymerization of MA as a strong hydrophilic electron-acceptor monomer with BMA as an amphiphilic comonomer and interlamellar copolymerization of two monomer systems such as MA–BMA and itaconic acid (IA as a hydrophilic electron-acceptor monomer capable of H-bonding)–BMA in the presence of DMDA surface modified MMT silicate layers as a surfactant with positive charge tertiary amine group ending. The functional copolymers, having a combination of rigid/flexible linkages and an ability of complex-formation with interlayered surface of organo-silicate, and their nanocomposites have been synthesized by interlamellar complex-radical copolymerization of MA or IA (acceptor monomer) and $n$-butyl methacrylate (BMA-acceptor) in MEK (or DMF) at 70°C in the interlayered region of DMDA surface modified MMT (DMDA-MMT) used as a nano-reactor (Figure 1). To elucidate the effect of DMDA-MMT in copolymerization and its interaction with functional monomers, especially with MA and IA monomer units, and in the formation of nano-structures, we also synthesized pure copolymers under similar conditions without DMDA-MMT for the comparative analysis of the obtained results. It was observed that copolymerization rate and copolymer conversion significantly depend on the presence of DMDA-MMT. Addition of DMDA-MMT as a complex-forming agent essentially increases the copolymer yield. This fact can be explained by the catalytic effect of organo-MMT as a complex-forming agent, which is similar to the well known effect of Lewis acids in complex-radical polymerizations [43]. Catalytic effect of organo-silicates in radical polymerization of vinyl and acrylic monomers have also been observed by many researchers [23, 27, 34, 35]. In order to increase the effectivity of intercalation process and therefore, the formation of nano-structures in the studied system, MA and IA monomers were dispersed between silicate galleries before copolymerization reactions to prepare the fixed interlayer anhydride/alkyl amine (MA…DMDA-MMT) and carboxylic acid/alkyl amine (IA…DMDA-MMT through strong H-bonding) com-
In this case, two carbonyl or carboxylic groups of the MA (or IA) monomer molecule interact with two neighboring silicate platelet surfaces having tetrahedral structures, which contain alkyl ammonium cations, through interlayer complex or strong H-bonding. Structure of these molecular complexes was confirmed by FTIR spectroscopy (Figure 4). From comparative analysis of the spectra of free IA monomer, virgin DMDA-MMT and IA/DMDA-MMT system, the following changes of the characteristic bands were observed: (1) due to the formation of the interlayer molecular complexes, very broad 1705 cm\(^{-1}\) band (C=O in –COOH) of free IA monomer appeared in the spectra of IA–DMDA-MMT system in the form of a strong narrow band; (2) characteristic CH\(_2\)=C \(<\) band at 1630 cm\(^{-1}\) for IA monomer shifted to 1636 cm\(^{-1}\) region due to the change of the conjugation effect of double bond with carbonyl group after its complex-formation with surface alkyl amine cations; (3) broad band at 3475 cm\(^{-1}\) associated with OH groups of DMDA-MMT disappeared, and a new broad band formed at 3125 cm\(^{-1}\), overlapping with two weak bands for stretching ammonium cation and CH\(_2\)= bands, respectively; (4) appearance of broad band at 4125 cm\(^{-1}\) can be related to complexed OH band in –COOH groups; (5) appearance of new bands at 1565–1470 (w) and 1400 cm\(^{-1}\) (m) related to the C–N deformation and –COO– sym. stretching bands, respectively, in –(CH\(_2\))\(_n\)=N\(^+\)·–OOC– complex.

Similar effect is obtained from comparative analysis of FT-IR spectra of the (co)terpolymers and their nanocomposites which are illustrated in Figure 5. The FT-IR spectra of poly(MA-alt-S-co-BMA), DMDA-MMT and their hybrid nanocomposite indicated the following changes of characteristic bands: (1) very broad absorption band around 1250–1000 cm\(^{-1}\) observed in the Si–O stretching region for virgin DMDA-MMT is transferred to relatively narrow doublet peak after interlamellar copolymerization, (2) appearance of a new band at 1625 cm\(^{-1}\) which is associated with complexed C=O band in –C=O…N\(^+\)– complex as a result of \textit{in situ} interaction between polar anhydride (or ester) unit and alkyl ammonium linkage, (3) presence of 850 and 800 cm\(^{-1}\) bands due to \textit{in situ} esterification reaction of anhydride units of intercalated terpolymer macromolecules with surface silicate Si–OH groups, and (4) disappearance of 1633 cm\(^{-1}\) band.

**Figure 3.** Interlamellar complex-formation via H-bonding in the IA/DMDA-MMT system

**Figure 4.** FTIR spectra of (1) MA monomer, (2) MA…DMDA-MMT complex, (3) IA monomer, (4) IA…DMDA-MMT complex and (5) pristine DMDA-MMT; effect of interlamellar complex-formation complexes (Figure 3; here, well known lattice structural model of Hendricks for MMT was used [44]).
(water OH group) in DMDA-MMT spectra after intercalation/exfoliation due to the possible hydrolysis of anhydride units. These observed changes can serve as a reasonable agreement confirming the delamination of silicate layers due to the intercalation of the polar terpolymer macromolecules through in situ complexing with positive charged tertiary amine groups. On the other hand, hydrolysis and esterification of anhydride units with interlayer water molecules and Si–OH groups, respectively, in the surface of silicate layers during complex-radical interlamellar terpolymerization in situ processing are also possible.

3.2. Nanocomposite structure–thermal behaviour relationship

Studied (co)terpolymers consisting of an alternate sequence of rigid (MA or IA units and phenyl rings) and flexible (n-butylester side-chain and backbound main chain) molecular linkages can exhibit a liquid-crystalline behaviour [45]. Results of DSC analysis of virgin (co)terpolymers and their nanocomposites, illustrated in Figure 6 and summarized in Table 2, can serve as a reasonable agreement for this proposal. In both poly(MA-co-BMA) (C-1) and its nanocomposite (C-1-NC) DSC curves, the characteristic peaks at 59.0 and 63.0°C appeared, which can be related to glass transition ($T_g$) and melting point ($T_m$) temperatures for the amorphous and semi-crystalline copolymer and its nanocomposite, respectively. However, both systems did not exhibit recrystallization behaviour after reverse cooling of polymer samples from

Table 2. Thermal behaviour of the (co)terpolymers and their nanocomposites with constant amount of the DMDA-MMT (5.0 wt%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nanocomposite</th>
<th>DSC analysis</th>
<th>TGA analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$T_m$ [°C]</td>
<td>$\Delta H$ [J/g]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly(MA-co-BMA)/organo-MMT</td>
<td>63.0a</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly(MA-alt-S-co-BMA)-1/organo-MMT</td>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly(MA-alt-S-co-BMA)-2/organo-MMT</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly(MA-alt-S-co-BMA)-3/organo-MMT</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly(IA-alt-S-co-BMA)-1/organo-MMT</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pristine organo-MMT</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aThis value corresponds to $T_g$  
*bThese values are related to the pure (co)terpolymers with different contents of BMA units (unit contents as in Table 1)
200°C to room temperature in the DSC conditions. These results allow us to imply that these peaks are associated with glass transition or pseudo-melting temperatures due to the side-chain n-butylester linkages which are able to form liquid crystalline structure. The terpolymers with different contents of BMA units exhibit typical Tg behaviour, the values of which essentially decrease with increasing flexible n-butylester units in the terpolymers. Unlike C-1-NC, terpolymer nanocomposites (T-1-NC, T-2-NC and T-3-NC) containing different mol% of BMA units exhibit Tm behaviour with characteristic recrystallization temperatures (Tc) (Figure 6). The Tm values of these nanocomposites significantly depend on the BMA content in terpolymers. As seen from DSC curves (Figure 6) and data in Table 2, the Tm values reduce from 140.1 to 94.8°C for virgin terpolymers and from 168.0 to 78.5°C for terpolymer/DMDA-MMT nanocomposites as a function of the content of flexible BMA linkages in terpolymers which is increased from 38.5 to 71.1 mol%. An increase of flexible hydrophobic n-butylester side-chain groups in terpolymer result with visible changes of enthalpy values (ΔH) of melting phase transition of nanocomposites. Poly(MA-co-BMA) and its nanocomposite exhibit typical glass-transition (Tg) behaviour with ΔH (copolymer) >ΔH (copolymer/DMDA-MMT). As seen from Table 2, terpolymer/nanocomposite (T-1-IA-NC) prepared by interlamellar terpolymerization of IA, S and BMA exhibit relatively higher thermal behaviour than poly(MA-alt-S-BMA)/DMDA-MMT (T-1-NC) although the synthesized nanocomposites have an approximately similar composition and BMA unit content. This observed significant difference can be explained by the above mentioned structural factor, i.e., the formation of interlayer strong H-bonding in the presence of IA monomer and its terpolymer chain.

Nanocomposites and virgin organo-MMT showed a similar melting and re-crystallization behaviour while ΔH melting increased (area of peak decreased) in the case of the formation of nanostructural sections. Unlike virgin (co)terpolymers, the nanocomposites exhibit crystallization behaviour and similar dependence on the content of BMA linkage in terpolymers. The observed broad endo-peak around 65–110°C for virgin DMDA-MMT can be associated with the elimination of water trace. The weak endo- and exo-peaks observed in DSC curve of DMDA-MMT (Figure 6, curve b-3) can be related to the melting and crystallization processes of alkyl ammonium surfactant on the layered silicate surface, intensity (ΔH value) of which significantly increases after interlamellar copolymerization due to the formation of interlayer complexes between functional copolymer and alkyl amine.

TGA-DTG analysis (Figure 7) indicated the multi-step degradation of virgin co(ter)polymers, while their DMDA-MMT nanocomposites showed a single step degradation. This observed effect can be explained by the formation of a more compact and organized structure in synthesized co(ter)copoly-
mer/organo-MMT hybrids. Obtained results related to the thermal behaviour of virgin (co)terpolymers and (co)terpolymers/DMDA-MMT hybrids prepared by complex-radical copolymerization and interlamellar copolymerization, respectively, are summarized in Table 2. The comparative analysis of these results indicate that synthesized nanocomposites have relatively high $T_m$ and thermal stability (degradation temperature and weight loss), and exhibit both the melting phase transition and crystallization behaviour. The improvement in the degradation temperature was significantly due to the homogeneous dispersion of the silicate galleries in the functional copolymer matrix.

Comparative DSC and TGA analyses of prepared (co)terpolymers and their nanocomposites showed that (1) the terpolymers exhibit relatively higher values of $T_g$ and thermal stability as compared with copolymer due to the presence of the styrene units in the terpolymers and their high molecular weights (intrinsic viscosity values presented in Table 1), (2) unlike the copolymer composites, the terpolymer nanocomposites exhibit melting transition and crystallization behaviour, as well as higher thermal stability due to the formation of more compact structures, (3) terpolymer nanocomposite containing IA unit shows higher thermal behaviour as compared with MA containing nanocomposite due to the effect of strong H-bonding (Figure 3) in the interlamellar terpolymerization, and (4) the change in the content of BMA flexible linkages in terpolymer/DMDA-MMT nanocomposites significantly influence the thermal behaviour of the nanocomposites, and can be described as a function for the correlation of these important properties through in situ self-plasticization in the formation of nanosstructure with given thermal parameters.
3.3. Dynamic mechanical behaviour as a function of nanostructure formation

Dynamic mechanical analysis (DMA) method allows us to determine the loss tangent, the storage modulus ($G'$) and the loss modulus ($G''$) as a function of temperature (Figure 8). The loss tangent is equal to the ratio of $G''/G'$, which exhibits a higher response to the chemical and physical structural changes and phase transitions of polymer system; the storage modulus $G'$ is associated with the elastic modulus of the polymer or its composite; the loss modulus $G''$ is related to the energy loss (damping factor) as a result of the friction of polymer chain movement. It is known that the decrease of $G'$ is less dependent on the temperature changes, and this process proceeds very slowly as a function of temperature in the polymer system due to increased polymer chain mobility and flexibility [46]. As seen from DMA curves, this process continues until the glass transition region is approached, and then, $G'$ decreases rapidly. In this isothermal condition, both the loss modulus $G''$ and loss tangent increase and go via a maximum. The glass transition temperature ($T_g$) is determined as the temperature at which a maximum of loss tangent is observed. This is well known and is a more exact method for determination of $T_g$ values of polymers and their composites [47]. The glass transition region of polymeric materials can be broadened and shifted through various chemical and physical means [48].

Masenelli-Varlot et al. [49] proposed an interpretation of the DMA spectra, according which the intensity of the interfacial adhesion strength directly influences the intensity of the reinforcement above the $T_g$. This principle can also be used to characterize the microstructure of functional (co)terpolymer/DMDA-MMT nanocomposite in terms of interfacial adhesion strength. Comparative DMA analysis of pure poly(MA-co-BMA) and poly(MA-co-BMA)/DMDA-MMT nanocomposites (Figure 8a) indicates the following changes of DMA curves when copolymer is intercalated between organo-silicate layers by interlamellar radical copolymerization: (1) increase of the elastic modulus by more than 7.1%, i.e., increase of the relaxation temperature from 58.3 up to 62.8°C, (2) increase of the glass transition behavior from 60.1 to 74.2°C, (3) unlike the pure copolymer, which has two peaks for the flexible BMA segments at 59.3°C and rigid MA units at 80.9°C, respectively, copolymer nanocomposite exhibits a single broad peak of higher intensity at 67.9°C; the significant increase in intensity of this peak indicates that relaxations of the flexible BMA segments decrease due to the increase of interfacial adhesion strength, i.e., the highest interaction occurs between anhydride units and organo-MMT. Plots of dynamic force (DF) and complex modulus (CM) vs. temperature are illustrated in Figure 8b. Observed significant difference ($\Delta$) between these parameters [$\Delta = DF$ (nanocomposite)–$DF$ (copolymer)] or [$\Delta = CM$ (nanocomposite)–$CM$ (copolymer)] above $T_g$, related to the copolymer and its nanocomposite, can be described as a function of the formation of nano-structural architecture in poly(MA-co-BMA)/DMDA-MMT system. It can be proposed that $\Delta$ value is also associated with interfacial adhesion strength depending on the flex-

Figure 8. DMA curves of copolymer and its nanocomposite: (a) plots of (1 and 4) loss modulus ($G''$), (2 and 5) storage modulus ($G'$) and (3 and 6) tan$\delta$ ($G''/G'$), and (b) (1 and 2) complex modulus and (3 and 4) dynamic force vs. temperature for poly(MA-co-BMA) (---) and poly(MA-co-BMA)/DMDA-MMT nanocomposite (—)
ibility and hydrophobic/hydrophilic balance of the functional polymer chains and their ability to form interfacial complexes. The maximum values of $\Delta$ were observed around 85–95°C corresponding to the lower values of DF and CM parameters.

### 3.4. Nanostructure–XRD parameters relationship

The basal spacing ($d_{001}$) of copolymer, organo-MMT and nanocomposites were determined from XRD measurements. XRD patterns of studied systems are illustrated in Figures 9 and 10, and the obtained XRD parameters are summarized in Table 3. It is well known that organo-silicates exhibit an effective nucleation behaviour in the crystallization process and morphology formation of polymer nanocomposites [50, 51]; nanofillers can also change the crystallinity degree and crystallization rate, as well as provide the formation of thermodynamically stable crystalline phase in the polymer matrix [52, 53]. As seen from Figure 9, (co)terpolymers exhibit predominantly amorphous structure while their nanocomposites show characteristic semi-crystalline structure. IA-containing terpolymer nanocomposites (T-IA-NC) exhibit relatively higher crystallinity equal to 51% (Table 3). The position of the diffraction peaks, related to virgin amorphous (co)terpolymers, is not changed in the spectra of the (co)terpolymer/DMDA-MMT nanocomposites (Figure 10, Table 3). XRD patterns for the virgin DMDA-MMT clearly showed

![Figure 9. XRD patterns of (a) copolymer, (b) terpolymer-2, (c) pristine DMDA-MMT, (d) copolymer/DMDA-MMT, (e) terpolymer-2/DMDA-MMT, (f) terpolymer-IA/DMDA-MMT](image-url)

### Table 3. XRD parameters and crystallinity of the copolymer (C), terpolymers (T) and their nanocomposites (NCs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C(T) and NCs</th>
<th>$2\theta$ [°]</th>
<th>d-spacing [Å]</th>
<th>$\Delta d$ [Å]</th>
<th>Intensity (counts)</th>
<th>EDa [%]</th>
<th>Peak area (S)</th>
<th>$\chi^b$ [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26208</td>
<td>4866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1-NC</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>35.68</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>11250</td>
<td>2760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20642</td>
<td>2137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1-NC</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>30.87</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>16123</td>
<td>5092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-2</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30517</td>
<td>4625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-2-NC</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>16606</td>
<td>6173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-3</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32817</td>
<td>3737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-3-NC</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>33.20</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>9279</td>
<td>4447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-IA-NC</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>44.14</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6712</td>
<td>6986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pristine organo-MMT</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2769</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7217</td>
<td>10047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pristine organo-MMT</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7217</td>
<td>10047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pristine organo-MMT</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7217</td>
<td>10047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aED (% exfoliation degree) values were calculated using the Equation (4)  
*bThis peak disappears in the spectra of all the nanocomposites due to complete exfoliation.
two broad diffraction peaks at 2.78° (d-spacing 31.75 Å) and 4.92° (d-spacing 17.95 Å) due to the d(001) basal reflections, which disappear or significantly shift to lower 2θ regions in nanocomposites. The weak peak for the basal spacing (d(001)) at 7.38° (11.97 Å) in DMDA-MMT pattern can be related to non-modified silicate plates. Usually this peak for pure MMT appears at 7.0° (d-spacing 12.4 Å) [54]. Figure 10 shows the XRD patterns of organo-MMT itself and (co)polymer/DMDA-MMT nanocomposites containing 5 wt% of organo-MMT. The intense peak at 2θ = 2.78° (d = 31.75 Å), relatively broad peak 2θ = 4.92° (d = 17.95 Å) and peak with low intensity at 2θ = 7.38° (d = 10.97 Å) in the pattern of DMDA-MMT, are associated with basal spacing for modified and small amount of non-modified silicate layers (2θ = 7.38°), respectively. According to Mermut [55] and Önal [56], d(001) values scattered around 12–14, 14–18 Å and >18 Å are due to the monolayer, bilayer and pseudotrilayer alkyl ammonium configurations, respectively, in the 2:1 layers of organo-MMTs including Viscobent SB-1 [56]. In the case of nanocomposites (patterns 2–4), the original organo-MMT peaks at 2θ = 7.38° disappear, and peaks at 2.78 and 4.92° shift to lower 2θ regions (for the co- and terpolymer nanocomposites, patterns 2, 4 and 6). As seen from Figure 10 and Table 3, these observed changes clearly indicate the significant increase of interlamellar distance (∆d = dnc – do > 15 Å) due to in situ processing through complex formation or H-bonding between anhydride/acid groups and surface alklammonium cations. This can also produce a driving force necessary for the effective intercalation/exfoliation. The interlamellar complex-formation and (co)polymerization reactions easily proceed onto alkyl amine modified silicate layers, after ending of which can also proceed onto non-modified silicate layers. In the latter case, anhydride (or carboxylic group which occurs by the hydrolysis of the MA unit) and acid (IA) monomers and their (co)polymers can also form interlamellar complexes with the non-modified silicate layers containing oxygen atoms and hydroxyl groups through strong H-bonding [8].

It was observed that the exfoliation degree (ED) depends on the type of alkyl amine configuration, i.e., on the degree of intensity change of basal d-spacing peaks. Taking into consideration the three basal peak intensities for the organo-MMT before (I0) and after interlamellar (co)polymerizations (Ie), the values of intercalation/exfoliation degree (ED %) were calculated, and obtained results were presented in Table 3. The peak with weak intensity at 7.38° (d-spacing 11.97 Å for non-modified 2:1 layers) disappears in the XRD spectra for all the nanocomposites (Figure 8) due to the complete exfoliation process. This observed fact confirms the above mentioned proposed mechanism. It was also observed that the crystallinity of the (co)polymers/DMDA-MMT nanocomposites depends on the degree of exfoliation. Relatively high crystalline copolymer-NC and terpolymer-IA-NC exhibit higher values of ED (Table 3). A visible increase in ED for terpolymer-MA-NC nanocomposites increases the crystallinity of these NCs. This phenomenon may be explained by the effect of complex formation between functional

Figure 10. XRD patterns of nanocomposites:
(1) poly(MA-co-BMA)/DMDA-MMT,
(2) poly(MA-alt-S-co-BMA)-1/DMDA-MMT,
(3) poly(MA-alt-S-co-BMA)-2/DMDA-MMT,
(4) poly(MA-alt-S-co-BMA)-3/DMDA-MMT,
(5) poly(lA-alt-S-co-BMA)-1/DMDA-MMT and (6) pristine DMDA-MMT
polymer chains and organo-silicate layers on the local chain folding and crystallization process in the (co)terpolymer matrix. The ED values visibly increase with increasing content of the flexible BMA linkages in terpolymer-MA-NCs, in spite of the decreasing content of the complex-forming anhydride/acid units. This fact can be explained by self-plasticization effect of side-chain $n$-butylester groups in terpolymers that increases the dispersion of the organo-MMT into matrix.

3.5. Surface morphology of nanocomposites
Figure 11 shows the SEM image of the terpolymers containing different amounts of BMA units and their nanocomposites prepared by interlamellar copolymerization. SEM images of this hybrid composites inferred that the size of the particles significantly depends on the content of flexible BMA linkages and type of interfacial interaction. The increase of BMA content in terpolymers provides the facile exfoliation of polymer chains into

![Figure 11. SEM patterns of (a) terpolymer-2, (b) terpolymer-2/DMDA-MMT, (c) terpolymer-3, (d) terpolymer-3/DMDA-MMT and (e) terpolymer-IA/DMDA-MMT](image-url)
DMDA-MMT galleries and formation of relatively high dispersed particles. In the case of poly(IA-co-S-BMA)/DMDA-MMT nanocomposite (e), the formation of well dispersed particles was observed due to the strong H-bonding between free carboxylic acid of IA monomer or terpolymer chain and alkyl amine on the silicate layers.

4. Conclusions

This work has attempted to develop novel polymer layered silicate nanocomposites by complex-radical interlamellar (co)terpolymerization of intercalated MA...DMDA-MMT and IA...DMDA-MMT monomer complexes with S and BMA. It was shown that the intercalation/exfoliation behaviour of functional (co)terpolymers, and therefore, the formation of nano-structure in the studied systems depend on the hydrophilic/hydrophobic balance in amphiphilic terpolymers, amount of flexible BMA linkages and interlayer complex-formation between anhydride/acid units and surface alkylammonium fragments (Figure 1). The comparative analysis of structure–composition–property relationship of the virgin (co)terpolymers and their nanocomposites showed significant increase in the thermal and dynamic mechanical behaviour and crystallinity of synthesized nanocomposites due to the homogeneous dispersion of the silicate nano-galleries in the functional (co)terpolymer matrix. Unlike amorphous virgin (co)terpolymers the nanocomposites exhibit crystallization behaviour and considerably improved thermal properties depending on the structure (presence of anhydride or acid moieties) and composition of terpolymers, especially on the content of flexible side-chain n-butylester linkages. The significant increase in d-spacing (intergallery distance) and degree of exfoliation indicates the formation of nano-structure in the studied (co)terpolymer/DMDA-MMT systems. Obtained results show that the formation of nanoarchitectures in the studied (co)terpolymer/DMDA-MMT systems predominantly proceeds through interlamellar complex-formation and in situ intercalation/exfoliation processing.

Synthesized polymer hybrids may be also used as reactive compatibilizer-nanofillers for the thermoplastic polymer blends, especially for the acrylic and styrene polymer-based systems, and to prepare the various nanomaterials in melt by reactive extrusion in situ processing. This will be a subject of our future investigations.

Acknowledgements

This study was carried out in according to the Polymer Science and Engineering Program of the Chemical Engineering Department, Hacettepe University (HU). The support of the TÜBİTAK (Turkish National Scientific and Technical Research Council) through TBAG-HD/249-107T238 project is gratefully acknowledged.

References


