Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Recent Work

Title

NORMAL PHOTOELECTRON DIFFRACTION OF THE Se 3d LEVEL IN Se OVERLAYERS ON Ni(100)

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6hw7n9b9>

Author

Kevan, S.D.

Publication Date

1978-09-01

To be Submitted to Physical Review Letters

LBL-8173
Preprint c.2

NORMAL PHOTOELECTRON DIFFRACTION OF THE
Se 3d LEVEL IN Se OVERLAYERS ON Ni(100)

S. D. Kevan, D. H. Rosenblatt, D. Denley,
B.-C. Lu, and D. A. Shirley

RECEIVED
PHYSICS
LABORATORY

OCT 26 1978

September 1978

PHYSICS AND
CHEMISTRY SECTION

Prepared for the U. S. Department of Energy
under Contract W-7405-ENG-48

TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY

This is a Library Circulating Copy
which may be borrowed for two weeks.
For a personal retention copy, call
Tech. Info. Division, Ext. 6782

LBL-8173

c.2

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

LBL-8173

NORMAL PHOTOELECTRON DIFFRACTION OF THE
Se 3d LEVEL IN Se OVERLAYERS ON Ni(100)

S. D. Kevan, D. H. Rosenblatt, D. Denley,*
B.-C. Lu, and D. A. Shirley

Materials and Molecular Research Division
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
and

Department of Chemistry
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

September 1978

ABSTRACT

Modulations of up to a factor of two were observed in the Se 3d photoelectron intensity normal to the surface, for selenium overlayers on Ni(100), as the photon energy was varied from 90 eV to 240 eV. Excellent agreement of peak energies with predictions by Tong and Li was obtained for both the c(2x2) and p(2x2) structures, using the hollow site geometry. Normal photoelectron diffraction appears to have promise as a surface structural method.

*Also with Dept. of Physics, Univ. of California, Berkeley, CA.

Large modulations in the Se 3d photoelectron intensity with photon energy have been observed in normal emission from both c(2x2) and p(2x2) selenium overlayers on a nickel (100) crystal face. The kinetic energies at which the oscillations peak show excellent agreement in each case with calculated predictions^{1,2} for the fourfold "hollow" site geometry of Se adsorbed on Ni, and disagree with predictions for the "atop" geometry. These results provide the first experimental evidence that normal photoelectron diffraction from adsorbate core levels is a large effect,² and indicate that it has promise as a quantitative structural tool for determining adsorbate geometries.

The relationship of the photoemission final state to the time-reversed LEED state has long been recognized.³⁻⁵ Indeed the advantages of using photoelectrons for diffraction studies have been discussed in some detail.^{6,7} Experimentally, both normal and off-normal photoelectron diffraction was observed earlier for the valence levels of CO on Pt(111),³ and recently azimuthal variations of adsorbate core level intensities have been reported,^{9,10} but in neither case was a quantitative interpretation carried out. Tong and Li have emphasized the great advantage of measuring photoelectron intensities of adsorbate core levels normal to the substrate crystal face, while varying the photon energy. The energies of the diffraction peaks produced in this manner can readily be analyzed to give d_1 , the interplanar spacing, rather directly. Quite often d_1 is a crucial parameter in a surface structure determination, as we shall discuss below.

The photoemission experiments were performed during dedicated beam time on the 4° branch of Beam Line I at the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory. A wide range of photon energies is available on this branch, from $h\nu = 32$ eV to $h\nu = 280$ eV. A wide energy range is important for these experiments, which extended to 240 eV. The spectrometer, which will be described elsewhere, employs a 5.40cm mean radius hemispherical analyzer with independent two-circle rotation. The analyzer energy resolution was set at 0.40 eV, while the monochromator resolution increased from 0.07 eV at $h\nu = 90$ eV to 0.50 eV at $h\nu = 240$ eV. Angles were adjusted so that p-polarized radiation was incident on the sample at $\theta = 60^\circ$ from the surface normal in a plane containing the [100] and [001] axes (inset, Fig. 1). Photoelectron spectra were collected in a cone of 3° half angle, normal to the Ni(100) surface. The nickel crystal had been cut and polished to within 1° of the (100) face, etched, and cleaned in situ by cycles of ion bombardment and annealing. Auger analysis showed no surface impurities, nor did the photoelectron spectra up to 240 eV, and sharp LEED patterns indicated an ordered (100) surface. Ordered c(2x2) and p(2x2) selenium overlayers were produced by exposing the clean crystal at 200°C to H_2Se , following Hagström and Becker.¹¹ Complete photoemission spectra were collected, rather than peak intensities only, to facilitate data reduction, including background subtraction and peak area measurement. Normalizations were also made for photon flux and the analyzer efficiency.

Figure 1 shows a plot of the relative Se 3d intensity versus electron kinetic energy for the c(2x2) overlayer. Four distinct peaks are observed; of these, three are well characterized. The peak near 60 eV suffers from interference due to a nickel Auger line and also from multiple scattering, as discussed below. Nevertheless, it was consistent with our interpretation. The modulation is very large,² up to a factor of two, compared to the smaller variations reported in azimuthal studies.^{9,10} Also shown in Fig. 1 are the peak energies in the Se 3d cross-section as calculated by Tong and Li for the c(2x2) overlayer geometry in both the hollow and atop site registries with the lattice.¹ A time-reversed LEED state was used for the photoelectron final state.³ With the present degree of uncertainty in the scattering potentials, the calculation is not expected to yield accurate peak intensities,^{1,12} but the peak energies should be a reliable measure of d_1 , the Se-Ni interplanar spacing. In fact, we find excellent agreement with theory (using the hard-sphere radii) for the hollow site value of $d_1 = 1.55\text{\AA}$, while the peak positions for the atop site value of $2.34\text{\AA}$ give poor agreement; the separation between the first and third peaks is 16 eV too large, and that between the third and fourth peaks is 17 eV too small, with a valley coming where a peak would be expected. A series of calculations at several values of d_1 indicated that even this closeness of the peak positions for the atop and hollow geometries is coincidental; in other systems, the differences are expected to be greater.¹

In Fig. 2 we show similar results for the p(2x2) overlayer. Again, the best fit is obtained for $d_1 = 1.55\text{\AA}$, corresponding closely to the hollow site. Both of these results agree with recent dynamical LEED calculations.^{13,14} We conclude that this technique shows promise for surface structure determination, and emphasize that these results have been obtained using photoemission from a core state. This simplifies the calculation significantly, and has the added advantage that spectral subtractions are straightforward, as the photoemission peaks are quite sharp. This last point has been especially important near 62 eV kinetic energy in this study, where a broad nickel Auger peak is added to the background.¹⁵

Further insight into this diffraction phenomenon is obtained by comparison with LEED I-V curves. If we separate the photoemission process into an atomic-like excitation followed by scattering off the substrate, the relationship between LEED and photoemission becomes quite clear. For normal emission, any part of the outgoing spherical wave centered on the Se atom that impinges on the substrate with $\vec{k}_{\parallel} = \vec{g}_{\parallel}$ may be scattered into the detector. Hence, the photoemission final state is easily seen to be a coherent superposition of many time-reversed LEED beams. Because the amplitude of the outgoing wave traveling through the substrate is damped as $r^{-1}e^{-ar}$, one might expect only the lowest order beams to be significant.

A comparison of our experimental peak positions, Tong and Li's calculated peak positions for the atop and hollow sites, and the

experimental peak positions from the 00 and 01 LEED I-V curves¹⁶ for both c(2x2) and p(2x2) Se overlayers on Ni(100) is given in Table I. The correspondence is striking; all peaks in the 00 beam have counterparts in our data, shifted by at most 2-3 eV. The peak at 72 eV in the c(2x2) 01 beam data may account for the shoulder on our second peak in Fig. 1, although this conclusion is tenuous because of the Auger interference mentioned previously. It is interesting to note further that our peak intensities tend to match those given by Demuth and Rhodin¹⁶ for the 00 beam much more closely than they do the calculated intensities. These correspondences provide further evidence that photoelectron diffraction has promise as a quantitative structural tool.

One further conclusion may be drawn from our data. The first, third, and fourth peaks in the 00 LEED beam data in Table I correspond to Bragg peaks. The second is purely a multiple scattering peak. The fact that we observed a peak at nearly the same energy is strong evidence for multiple scattering in ARP. It is unlikely that this peak arises from a Bragg peak in another beam, in light of our previous considerations and the good fit to the 00 beam alone. Clearly, any ARP theory which neglects multiple scattering effects is incomplete.

This approach, relating photoemission to LEED, provides insight into why the intensity variations are much larger than those observed in either azimuthal studies,^{9,10} or SEXAFS.¹⁷ In normal photoelectron diffraction the LEED beams are degenerate in groups of four, whereas in azimuthal studies the degeneracy

is significantly reduced. The observed effects should be substantially averaged by this fact alone.¹⁸ In SEXAFS, phase information between the various beams, the major cause of our modulations, is averaged out. Although the nearest-neighbor distance is readily available from SEXAFS, the registry is more difficult to determine. Thus SEXAFS and photoelectron diffraction are complementary.

Photoelectron diffraction has some potential advantages over LEED. First, photoemission is nondestructive, facilitating applications to molecular adsorbate systems. Second, photoelectron diffraction does not require long range order in adsorbate overlayers, and may be used to study low coverage systems. Finally, photoelectron diffraction is phase-sensitive: all the photoelectrons originate from a particular adsorbate level at the same distance from the surface in almost all cases. This facilitates the measurement of d_1 for adsorbate atoms. Hence photoelectron diffraction, unlike LEED, should be quite sensitive to the bond axis orientation in molecular adsorbates.

In conclusion, we have observed substantial photoelectron diffraction effects in normal photoemission from the 3d core levels of Se adsorbed on a Ni(100) substrate. Comparison with Tong's calculations has established the sensitivity of normal photoelectron diffraction in determining adsorbate registries. Finally, comparison with LEED I-V curves has indicated the existence of multiple scattering phenomena in ARP.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to acknowledge S. Y. Tong and C. H. Li for generously providing us with their unpublished calculations; R. F. Davis for his assistance in carrying out the measurements, and Mrs. Winifred Heppler for the preparation of the nickel crystal.

This work was performed at the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory, which is supported by the NSF Grant No. DMR 73-07692 A02, in cooperation with the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center and was done with support from the Division of Chemical Sciences, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, U. S. Department of Energy.

TABLE I. Kinetic energies of observed and calculated peaks (eV).

	Peak	Calc. (Atop)	Calc. (Hollow)	Expt.	Expt. LEED 00 Beam	Expt. LEED 01 Beam
(a) c(2x2)Se + Ni(100)	1	37	44	43	42	—
	2	63	62	58 ¹⁵	58	72
	3	98	88	88	91	95
	4	131	139	138	137	—
(b) p(2x2)Se + Ni(100)	1	40	39	38	37	—
	2	64	(51,62)	58 ¹⁵	58	65
	3	99	91	92	93	92
	4	130	139	138	138	136

REFERENCES

1. C. H. Li and S. Y. Tong, submitted to Phys. Rev. B; S. Y. Tong and C. H. Li, Bull. Amer. Phys. Soc. 23, 417 (1978).
2. S. Y. Tong and N. Stoner, J. Phys. C 11, 3511 (1978). This reference gives a detailed analysis of the physical origin of the type of cross-sectional variation reported here.
3. C. H. Li, A. R. Lubinsky, and S. Y. Tong, Phys. Rev. B17, 3128 (1978).
4. I. Adawi, Phys. Rev. 134, A788 (1964).
5. P. J. Feibelman and D. E. Eastman, Phys. Rev. B10, 4932 (1974).
6. A. Liebsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 32, 1203 (1974); Phys. Rev. B13, 544 (1976).
7. S. Y. Tong and M. A. Van Hove, Solid State Commun. 19, 543 (1976), and references therein.
8. D. A. Shirley, J. Stöhr, P. S. Wehner, R. S. Williams, and G. Apai, Physica Scripta 16, 398 (1977).
9. S. Kono, C. S. Fadley, N.F.T. Hall, and Z. Hussain, Phys. Rev. Lett. 41, 117 (1978).
10. N. V. Smith, P. K. Larsen, and S. Chiang, Phys. Rev. B16, 2699 (1977).
11. H. D. Hagström and G. E. Becker, J. Chem. Phys. 54, 1015 (1971).
12. Because of the additional complexity of the photoemission process as compared to LEED, one would expect even more difficulty in calculating intensities for this experiment than in the LEED case.

13. M. Van Hove and S. Y. Tong, J. Vac. Sci. Tech. 12, 230 (1975).
14. S. Anderson, J. B. Pendry, B. Kasemo, and M. Van Hove, Phys. Rev. Lett. 31, 595 (1973).
15. Our second peak is the least reliable due to Auger interference.
16. J. E. Demuth and T. N. Rhodin, Surface Sci. 45, 249 (1974).
17. P. H. Citrin, P. Eisenberger, and R. C. Hewitt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 41, 309 (1978); J. Stöhr, D. Denley, and P. Perfetti, Phys. Rev. B18, XXX (1979).
18. A. Liebsch, in Electron and Ion Spectroscopy of Solids, ed. by L. Fiermans, J. Vennik, and W. Dekeyser (Plenum Press, New York 1978), Vol. B32, p. 93.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Plot of the relative Se 3d intensity versus electron kinetic energy for the c(2x2)Se + Ni(100) system, and calculated peak energies for the atop and hollow site registries (arrows). The experimental geometry is shown in the inset.

Figure 2. Plot of the relative Se 3d intensity versus electron kinetic energy for the p(2x2)Se + Ni(100) system, and calculated peak energies for the atop and hollow site registries (arrows).

Figure 1

XBL 788-2665A

XBL789-1784

Figure 2

This report was done with support from the Department of Energy. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the Department of Energy.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720