METALLIC SUPERLATTICES: STRUCTURAL AND ELASTIC PROPERTIES*
(INVITED)

CONF-9009323--1

M. Grimsditch

DE91 006037

Materials Science Division
Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439 USA

and

L.K. Schuller

Physics Department, B-019
University of California-San Diego, La Jolla, Ca 92093

The submitted manuscript has been authored by a contractor of the U.S. Government under contract No. W-31-109-ENG-38. Accordingly, the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this contribution, or allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes.

INVITED PAPER to be published in the Proceedings of the 6th Latin-American Symposium on Surface Physics, Cusco, Peru, September 3-7, 1990.

jmc

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or 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 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. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

*Work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, BES-Materials Sciences contract #W-31-109-ENG-38 and the Office of Naval Research Grant #N00014-88-K-0210.

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

METALLIC SUPERLATTICES: STRUCTURAL AND ELASTIC PROPERTIES

M. Grimsditch
Materials Science Division, Building 223
Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439 USA

and

Ivan K. Schuller
Physics Department, B-019
University of California-San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093 USA

Abstract. The fabrication and structural characterization of metallic superlattices is discussed. Methods to determine the elastic properties of these materials (which can only be prepared as thin films) are reviewed and the results obtained using various techniques are summarized. Contrary to theoretical expectation, the elastic properties are found to depend on the modulation wavelength.

From the vast literature that exists on thin film growth [1] it may be argued on energy grounds that if (in thermodynamic equilibrium) material A grows as a smooth layer on material B, then B will grow as islands on material A. This conclusion would preclude the possibility of preparing thinly layered superlattices. Experimentally however, it has been found that with modern technologies, like MBE and sputtering, it is indeed possible to fabricate such structures [2] and it must therefore be argued that kinetic effects are also important in determining thin film growth.

That layered structures can be produced is clearly shown in Fig. 1 which shows θ - 2θ x-ray scans for Mo/Ni superlattices [3]. In samples with large modulation wavelengths (Λ) peaks are observed at the Mo[110] and Ni[111] positions: this is expected since materials usually grow normally to the densest planes; (110) for bcc, (111) for fcc and (001) for hcp. As Λ is reduced additional peaks appear indicating the existence of a superstructure. It can be easily shown that peaks are expected at

$$\frac{1}{a} \pm \frac{n}{\Lambda} \quad (1)$$

where $\bar{a}$ is the average lattice constant and n an integer. The intensity of the peaks depends on many factors including the lattice parameters of the constituents, scattering factors, roughness, etc. We shall return to this point later; for the moment it is sufficient to note that from the x-ray spectra and Eq. 1, Λ and $\bar{a}$ may be obtained without resorting to any specific model.

Having produced these novel materials there is of course interest in determining their physical properties. Many of them have been discussed extensively in the literature [2,4], here we will concentrate only on the elastic properties of superlattices. In the continuum limit it is straightforward to calculate the elastic constants (C_{ij}) of a layered system [5-7]. Two main features arise from these calculations: the C_{ij} of the superlattice are an average of those of its constituents, i.e.,

$$C_{ij}(B) < C_{ij} < C_{ij}(A) , \quad (2)$$

Fig. 1. X-ray spectra of Mo/Ni superlattices (Ref. 3).

and they are also independent of Λ . Figure 2 shows the results obtained for the biaxial modulus (Y_B) of Cu/Ni superlattices [8] in clear contradiction with theory. What is even more spectacular (and controversial) is that Y_B for Cu/Ni ($\Lambda = 20 \text{ \AA}$) is larger than Y_B for diamond! The reason for the controversy lies in the severe difficulties encountered in measuring elastic constants of materials which can only be prepared as thin films. There have been a number of techniques developed to deal with this problem [9-16] but most of them require the removal of thin film from the substrate and are consequently open to criticism. Brillouin scattering [11] is one of the few techniques which does not require the removal of the film from the substrate and it has played an important role in the study of metallic superlattices.

Figure 3 shows the surface wave velocity in Mo/Ni superlattices determined by Brillouin scattering [3]. Since the velocity is related to the elastic constants its Λ dependence is also in contradiction with continuum theory [5-7]. Table I contains a summary of all the experimental determinations of elastic constants of superlattices performed to date: it contains the system studied, C_{ij} measured, existence of an anomaly, correlation with a structural change (to be discussed below) and the reference. Although there are some contradictions for some systems (notably Cu/Ni), the inescapable conclusion that can be drawn from Table I is that the elastic constants of superlattices are anomalous in the sense that they do not behave as expected from continuum theory.

Before diving into the possible origins of the effect it is interesting to note that the results given in Table I show no evident correlation with the crystal structure of the constituents

Fig. 2. Biaxial modulus of Cu/Ni superlattices (Ref. 8). The dashed line is the biaxial modulus of diamond.

Fig. 3. Surface wave velocity in Mo/Ni superlattices (Ref. 3).

(viz., bcc, fcc, hcp, etc.) nor with the fabrication method (viz., sputtering or evaporation). From the experimental standpoint however, it has been found that in all cases where the average lattice constant has been determined from x-rays, there is a strong correlation between changes in $\bar{a}$ with respect to the average of the bulk materials and anomalies in the elastic properties.

This correlation is indicated in the fourth column of Table I: In all cases but one, whenever changes in $\bar{a}$ were detected by x-rays, anomalies were also observed in some elastic constant. The exception is a λ independent C_{33} in Mo/Ta where changes in $\bar{a}$ were present; note however that C_{44} does indeed change in this superlattice. Figure 4 shows the experimentally determined $\bar{a}$ for Mo/Ni obtained from the spectra in Fig. 1; it clearly has very similar behavior to the velocity shown in Fig. 3. The correlation between $\bar{a}$ and C_{ij} was explained in Ref. 39, using Molecular Dynamics techniques where it was shown that the elastic softening is a direct consequence of the lattice expansion. These calculations are shown in Fig. 5 together with the experimental results of Fig. 3 plotted as a function of measured lattice expansion. The origin of the expansion remains however unexplained by these calculations.

Table I. Superlattices in which elastic constants have been determined

System	Elastic Constant	Anomaly	Correl. Struc.	Ref.
Cu/Ni	YB	Yes		8
	Y,F	Yes		17
	YB, T, F, C66	No		18
	C44	No		19
Cu/Pd	YB	Yes		9
	YB, Y, F, C66	No		13
	C44	Yes		20
Mo/Ni	C44	Yes	Yes	3
	C33	Yes	Yes	12
Pt/Ni	C33	Yes	Yes	12
Ti/Ni	C33	Yes	Yes	12
Cu/Nb	C44	Yes	Yes	21, 22
	C44, C33	Yes		23
	YB	Yes	Yes	24
	C12	?	?	25
NbN/AlN	C44	No	Yes	26
GaAs/AlAs	C33, C44	Yes	Yes	27
Nb/Si	C44	Yes	Yes	28
Au/Cr	C44	Yes	Yes	29
Ag/Pd	YB	Yes		30
Au/Ni	YB	Yes		9
Cu/Au	YB	No		30
Cu/Al	?	Yes		31
V/Ni	C44	Yes	Yes	15
Fe/Pd	C44, C11?	Yes		32

System	Elastic Constant	Anomaly	Correl. Struc.	Ref.
Co/Ag	C44	Yes	Yes	33,34
Mo/Ta	C44	Yes	Yes	35
	C33	No	No	35
Co/Cu	C44	Yes	Yes	36
Fe/Cu	C44	Yes	Yes	37
ZrN/AlN	C33	Yes		38

There have been a number of models proposed to explain the observed behavior [40-51]. At present it has not been possible to determine which one of the models is correct. This is due to the fact that none of the models are capable of predicting *a priori* the behavior expected for a given system. Furthermore, for those models that have some predictive capabilities there is at least one experimental piece of evidence which contradicts the prediction. Notwithstanding the above comments, the model described in Refs. 44-47 is at present the most likely candidate.

In order to understand at a microscopic level the elastic anomalies in superlattices two avenues of research appear to be necessary: the theoretical models must be enhanced so that they acquire predictive capabilities and, more experimental work is required to determine the detailed atomic structure at interfaces. The latter should be aimed at obtaining structural information parallel to the layers as well as roughness, interdiffusion, etc. Figure 6 shows an x-ray spectrum from a Mo/Ni superlattice and two model fits: the upper fit was obtained using the bulk properties of Mo and Ni and "perfect" interfaces, the lower portion is a fit containing 7 fitting parameters (individual lattice constants of the constituents, nonuniform lattice expansion, roughness, etc. etc.) [52]. Although excellent fits can be obtained enormous care must be taken before the fit parameters can be assigned a reliable physical meaning.

This work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, BES-Materials Sciences, under contract #W-31-109-ENG-38 and the Office of Naval Research under grant #N00014-88K-0210.

Fig. 4. Average lattice spacing perpendicular to the layering of Mo/Ni superlattices (Ref. 3).

Fig. 5. Molecular dynamics calculations (Ref. 39) of a shear sound velocity as a function of strain in a Ni crystal.

Fig. 6. Experimental x-ray spectrum from a Mo/Ni superlattice (dots) and fits to the data (full line). The light line is obtained using bulk values for the relevant parameters, the heavy line is a fit with 7 fitting parameters.

References

1. See for instance Epitaxial Growth, J. W. Matthews ed., Academic Press Inc., NY (1975).
2. For an early review see Synthetically Modulated Structures, L. L. Chang and B. C. Giessen eds., Academic Press, New York 1985.
3. R. Khan, C. S. L. Chun, G. P. Felcher, M. Grimsditch, A. Kueny, C. M. Falco, and I. K. Schuller, Phys. Rev. B. 27, 7186 (1983).
4. See for instance Physics, Fabrication and Applications of Multilayered Structures, P. Dhez and C. Weisbuch eds., Plenum Publishing Co., NY (1988).
5. S. M. Rytov, Akust. Zh. 2 71 (1956) [Sov. Phys.-Acoust. 2 68 (1965)]
6. J. Sapriel, B. Djafari-Rouhani and L. Dobrzynski, Surf. Sci. 126, 197 (1983)
7. M. Grimsditch, Phys. Rev. B 31, 6818 (1985) and M. Grimsditch and F. Nizzoli, Phys. Rev. B 33, 5891 (1986)
8. T. Tsakalakos and J. E. Hilliard, J. Appl. Phys. 54, 734 (1982)
9. W. M. C. Yang, T. Tsakalakos and J. E. Hillard, J. Appl. Phys. 48, 876 (1977)
10. M. Barmatz, L. R. Testardi and F. J. DiSalvo, Phys. Rev. B. 12, 4367 (1975) and B. S. Berry and W. C. Pritchett, IBM J. Res. Develop. 19, 334 (1975).
11. J. Sandercock in "Topics in Applied Physics" Vol. 51 "Light Scattering in Solids III" eds. M. Cardona and G. Guntherodt, (Springer, N.Y., 1982)
12. B. Clemens and G. Eesley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 2356 (1988).

13. A. Moreau, J. B. Ketterson, and B. D. Davis, J. Appl. Phys., to be published.
14. A. Fartash, I. K. Schuller, and M. Grimsditch, Appl. Phys. Lett. 55, 2614 (1990)
15. R. Danner, R. P. Huebener, C. S. L. Chun, M. Grimsditch, and I. K. Schuller, Phys. Rev. B. 33, 3696 (1986)
16. R. J. Bower, Appl. Phys. Lett. 23, 99 (1973) and C. Y. Ting and B. L. Crowder, J. Electrochem. Soc. 129, 2590 (1982)
17. L. R. Testardi, R. M. Willens, J. T. Krause, D. B. McWhan, and S. Nakahara, J. Appl. Phys. 52, 510 (1981)
18. A. Moreau, J. B. Ketterson, and J. Mattson, J. Appl. Phys. Lett., to be published.
19. J. Mattson, R. Bhadra, J. B. Ketterson, M. B. Brodsky, and M. Grimsditch, J. Appl. Phys., 67, 2973 (1990).
20. J. R. Dutcher, S. Lee, J. Kim, G. Stetgeman, and C. M. Falco, Proc. Mater. Res. Soc. 160, (in press), J. Mater. Sci. Eng. A. 127 (in press) and J. Mater. Sci. Eng. B. 5, (in press)
21. A. Kueny, M. Grimsditch, K. Miyano, I. Banerjee, C. M. Falco, and I. K. Schuller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 166 (1982).
22. I. K. Schuller and M. Grimsditch, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B4, 1444 (1986).
23. J. A. Bell, W. R. Bennett, R. Zanoni, G. I. Stegeman, C. M. Falco and C. T. Seaton, Sol. St. Comm. 64, 1339 (1987).
24. A. Fartash, I. K. Schuller, and M. Grimsditch (to be published)
25. J. A. Bell, R. J. Zanoni, C. T. Seaton, G. I. Stegeman, and C. M. Falco, Appl. Phys. Lett. 51, 652 (1987).
26. R. Bhadra, M. Grimsditch, J. Murduck, and I. K. Schuller, Appl. Phys. Lett. 54, 1409 (1989).
27. M. Grimsditch, R. Bhadra, I. K. Schuller, F. Chambers, and G. Devane, Phys. Rev. B. 42, (1990).
28. E. Fullerton, I. K. Schuller, and M. Grimsditch, (to be published).
29. P. Bisanti, M. B. Brodsky, G. P. Felcher, M. Grimsditch, and L. R. Sill, Phys. Rev. B. 35, 7813 (1987).
30. G. E. Henein and J. E. Hilliard, J. Appl. Phys. 54, 728 (1983).
31. V. S. Kopan and A. V. Lysenko, Fiz. Metal. Metalloved. 29, 183 (1970).
32. P. Baumgart, B. Hillebrands, R. Mock, and G. Guntherodt, Phys. Rev. B. 34, 9004 (1986).
33. S. M. Hues, R. Bhadra, M. Grimsditch, E. Fullerton, and I. K. Schuller, Phys. Rev. B. 39, 12966 (1989).
34. E. Fullerton, S. Hues, M. Grimsditch, and I. K. Schuller (to be published).
35. J. A. Bell, W. R. Bennett, R. Zanoni, G. I. Stegeman, C. M. Falco, and F. Nizzoli, Phys. Rev. B 35, 4127 (1987).
36. J. R. Dutcher, S. M. Lee, C. D. England, G. I. Stegeman, and C. M. Falco, Jour. Mater. Scie. Eng. A126, 13 (1990).
37. E. Fullerton, R. Bhadra, I. K. Schuller, and M. Grimsditch, (to be published).
38. W. J. Meng, G. L. Eesley and K. A. Svinarich (to be published).
39. I. K. Schuller and A. Rahman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50, 1377 (1983).
40. T. B. Wu, J. Appl. Phys. 53, 5265 (1982).
41. W. E. Pickett, J. Phys. F. 12, 2195 (1982).
42. A. F. Jankowski and T. Tsakalakos, J. Phys. F. 15, 1279 (1985).
43. A. F. Jankowski, J. Phys. F. 18, 413 (1988).
44. D. Wolf and J. F. Lutsko, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 1170 (1988).
45. D. Wolf and J. F. Lutsko, J. Appl. Phys. 66, 1961 (1989).
46. D. Wolf and J. F. Lutsko, J. Mater. Res. 4, 1427 (1989).
47. D. Wolf, Surf. Sci. 225, 117 (1990).
48. M. L. Huebnerman and M. Grimsditch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 1403 (1989).
49. R. C. Cammarata and K. Sieradzki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 2005 (1989).
50. A. Banerjee and J. R. Smith, Phys. Rev. B. 35, 5413 (1987).

51. B. W. Dodson, Phys. Rev. B. 37, 727 (1988).
52. E. Fullerton, I. K. Schuller, H. Vanderstraeten, and y. Bruynseraede (to be published).

END

DATE FILMED

02 / 04 / 91