MASTER

C00-623-153

SOLID STATE PHYSICS PROGRAM

**LOW FREQUENCY DIELECTRIC CONSTANTS
OF *LiF*, *NaF*, *NaCl*, *NaBr*, *KCl*, *KBr*
BY THE METHOD OF SUBSTITUTION**

CARL ANDEEN, JOHN FONTANELLA, AND
DONALD SCHUELE

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 66
CONTRACT NO. AT (11-1)-623

OCTOBER, 1970

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY CIRCLE

CLEVELAND, OHIO 44106

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

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.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

THE LOW FREQUENCY DIELECTRIC CONSTANTS OF LiF, NaF, NaCl,
NaBr, KCl, and KBr BY THE METHOD OF SUBSTITUTION

John Fontanella, Carl Andeen, and Donald Schuele

Case Western Reserve University

Cleveland, Ohio 44106

ABSTRACT

The 1000 Hz 300°K dielectric constants of some alkali halides were measured to an accuracy of 0.01% by the method of substitution. Reproducibly different values for various crystals of the same type were obtained which varied beyond the experimental error. The ranges of results for various crystals of each type measured are: LiF, 9.0355-9.0360; NaF, 5.0719-5.0722; NaCl, 5.8940-5.8956; NaBr, 6.3957-6.3974; KCl, 4.8112-4.8182; and KBr, 4.8735-4.8762. The spread for each type of crystal is thought to be attributable to random trace impurities. The numbers are discussed in the light of past values.

LEGAL NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or 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.

INTRODUCTION

The need for correct values of the static dielectric constant of ionic crystals has increased greatly in recent years. Some of the most interested workers are the shell model theorists who utilize ϵ_s as a fitting parameter to determine the characteristic parameters of their models. They then predict frequency-wave number relations, $\omega(q)$, which are compared with the results from the scattering of thermal neutrons. The reverse process, "best fitting" of the thermal neutron data, also gives results which are best discussed in conjunction with the static dielectric constant.

Further inferences regarding electronic structure and interionic forces can be drawn from values of the Sziget effective charge¹ and the Sziget compressibility² each of which requires the value of ϵ_s for its evaluation.

Focus on the static dielectric constant, itself, has been brought about by first principles quantum mechanical calculations such as those of Yamashita³ and Levin and Offenbacher⁴ through their work on LiF. Though Yamashita had few experimental values of ϵ_s to choose from, it must have been disturbing to Levin and Offenbacher to see new values for LiF 3%⁵ and 4%⁶ lower than that referenced by Yamashita. Further confusion yet has been

added by a value 9%⁷ lower.

Unfortunately, the same sort of scatter exists for most ionic crystals. Several workers have applied themselves to eliminating the discrepancies, but, for the most part, have only succeeded in adding to the confusion.

We believe that we have finally shed some light on existing inconsistencies through an extremely precise and accurate determination of the static dielectric constant of some alkali halides by the method of substitution.⁸

THEORY

The method, briefly stated, is as follows. If a fixed-electrode, parallel plate capacitor of area A and plate separation d is used to measure the five capacitances:

$$C_1 = \frac{\epsilon_S^1 A}{d} \quad (1a)$$

: Fluid of static dielectric constant ϵ_S^1

$$C_2 = \frac{\epsilon_S^1 \epsilon_S^S A}{\epsilon_S^S d + (\epsilon_S^1 - \epsilon_S^S) t} \quad (1b)$$

: Fluid 1 and sample of thickness t and static dielectric constant ϵ_S^S

$$C_3 = \frac{\epsilon_S^2 A}{d} \quad (1c)$$

: Fluid of static dielectric constant ϵ_S^2

$$C_4 = \frac{\epsilon_S^2 \epsilon_S^S A}{\epsilon_S^S d + (\epsilon_S^2 - \epsilon_S^S) t} \quad (1d)$$

: Fluid 2 and sample

$$C_5 = \frac{A}{d} \quad (1e)$$

: Vacuum,

a little algebra leads to the following equation:

$$\epsilon_s = \frac{C_1(1 + C_3/C_2 - C_3/C_1 - C_3/C_4)}{C_5(C_1/C_2 - C_3/C_4)} \quad (2)$$

The value of the static dielectric constant of the sample, then, is determined only from ratios of capacitances, the values of which can be known extremely well via three-terminal methods.

APPARATUS

A cross section of the substitution cell is shown in Figure 1. The dimensions shown there assure a uniform field for one inch diameter samples in that the condition for the fringing field effects to be insignificant,

$$\frac{\text{Effective Guard Ring Width}}{\text{Gap Width}} > 3 \quad (3)$$

is more than satisfied. The electronics used was basically the General Radio Type 1620-A capacitance measuring assembly. Many details of the equipment are given in our previous article.⁸ Further aspects, yet, of the system are as follows.

The General Radio Type 1615-A capacitance bridge was rewired such that all operations could be performed with the mode switch in the 3-TERM position. The most important ramifications of this procedure are that both calibration and zero adjustment can be done with the bridge in the same wiring configuration as that used for data taking. The rest of the calibration procedure is as outlined by General Radio in the manual accompanying the bridge. The reference capacitor is a General Radio Type 1404-B.

After calibration, the capacitance selection switches were set to zero, and a null achieved by means of an auxiliary trimming capacitor. The largest zero correction necessary was on the order of 10^{-5} picofarads. Next, the zero of the total system was investigated. First, the low terminal

was connected to the cell in the regular manner with the high side of the substitution cell grounded. No zero offset was observed. The second test was to connect the cell to the bridge in the regular manner and insert a grounded aluminum sheet at the midplane of the cell. The zero was observed first with the ground made at the bridge, then at the substitution cell. The zero remained true in both cases. This extra care was taken with the zero in that the final expression for the static dielectric constant, equation 2, requires capacitance ratios which would be particularly sensitive to a zero offset.

During the period of modification, the accuracy of the bridge itself was monitored by measuring the ratios of several capacitors the capacitances of which were on the order of five picofarads, and comparing the values to those obtained using another transformer ratio bridge which was constructed in our laboratory. The results from the two bridges always agreed to within one part per million.

Ambiguities related to thermal effects were eliminated in that the temperature of the substitution cell was kept constant to within 0.003°C during the course of a run. This was made possible by means of a tiny glass-encapsulated thermistor mounted on the end of a section of teflon tubing which was used to probe the cell gaps. The resistance was monitored by a precision 27 Hz ac bridge which also was constructed in our laboratory.

SAMPLES

All samples were obtained in the form of one inch diameter disks. Cleaved samples of 0.16 in. thick LiF, NaF, NaCl, and NaBr were obtained from the Harshaw Chemical Co. in addition to standardized lab packs of nominally 0.225 in. thick NaCl, KCl, and KBr. Samples of all crystals except NaBr were also obtained from Optovac, Inc. These were about 0.1 in. thick. Similar samples of KCl had been purchased from Optovac about three years prior to this experiment, and were stored in a desiccator during the interim.

Most of the sawn samples were oriented using the back-reflection Laue technique, and the orientations are listed in the tables along with the measured static dielectric constants. The orientations of the lab pack NaCl crystals are indicated in Figure 2 on a unit triangle.

The initial step in sample preparation was to cement the samples into steel lapping blocks using phenyl salicylate (salol) and grind them to 0.09 in. using successive grades of Nos. 320, 400, 500, and 600 Carborundum silicon carbide Fastcut waterproof paper.

Fine grinding was done on a planetary lapping machine in which five samples per batch were ground using 14.5 micron aluminum oxide oil-based lapping

compound. The resultant crystals were 0.062 in. thick.

A satisfactory polish was achieved using a slurry of five micron diamond dust and Simplex projector oil on Pellon paper attached to the plates of the planetary lapping machine. The sample thickness was uniform to within 0.0001 in. over the region sampled by the substitution cell.

PROCEDURE

The procedure is different from that outlined in our previous paper⁸ in that no quantitative air measurements were done. Replacing the air-oil sequence, two liquids, only, were used, Baker's (U.S.P.) castor oil, which was previously heated to 100°C with silica gel desiccant for several hours, and Simplex projector oil. This was done in order to eliminate problems associated with sample-air interaction due to the hygroscopic nature of the crystals. Extensive testing of the method showed this to be justified.

The approach, then, was to measure the capacitance combinations given in the "Theory" section using both aluminum and brass cells each of which contains two separate three-terminal electrode geometries. In addition, the sample was measured in two configurations, the second rotated 180 deg about an axis perpendicular to the face along with a 180 deg rotation about the vertical axis. The 180 deg rotation about the perpendicular to the face was motivated by the fact that the samples are sometimes slightly wedge-shaped, and that the diameter of the cavity in the sample insertion tool is in most cases slightly larger than the sample. Thus, it was possible that a different area and thickness of the specimen could have

been sampled by the cell for the two oils if only a single measurement were done each time. An order of magnitude for this effect is shown in Figure 3 where the capacitance for a Harshaw crystal of KBr with air as the surrounding medium is plotted versus angle of rotation of the crystal about an axis perpendicular to the sample face. It should be kept in mind that an air measurement is an almost direct indication of crystal thickness, and such large effects are not observed with oils. The maximum spread in the dielectric constant that could occur from this effect without rotation is given there to be on the order of one part in 20,000, but it should be noted that two averaged values 180 deg apart reduces this uncertainty drastically. The other 180 deg rotation was for the purpose of averaging any effects due to crystal and electrode surface irregularities.

Better statistics, yet, were obtained by measuring each sample twice during the course of a run. These values were also averaged. The raw data from a typical data run is given in Table I. The results listed in Tables II-VI are an arithmetical average of the four semi-independent values of the static dielectric constant.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

It is thought that the numbers quoted represent the 1000 Hz 300°K dielectric constant of an individual crystal to better than 0.01%. The ranges of results for various crystals of the types measured are: LiF, 9.0355-9.0360; NaF, 5.0719-5.0722; NaCl, 5.8940-5.8956; NaBr, 6.3957-6.3974; KCl, 4.8112-4.8182; and KBr, 4.8735-4.8762, which show spreads of greater than 0.01% in most cases. A detailed analysis of the results shows that impurities are probably responsible for the scatter.

As a test of reproducibility, samples IV and V of Table II were remeasured. The second values agree with the originals to within one part in 30,000. In addition, several checks were made to see if the sample surfaces were contaminated from handling procedures. Samples II of Table II and I of Table IV were heated at 250°C in a vacuum of 10^{-6} Torr for sixty hours and sample VII of Table II was pumped on at the same pressure for the same length of time. Samples I and III of Table II, II of Table IV, and NaBr sample I of Table V were repolished for ten minutes using the diamond dust technique mentioned above. In all cases agreement on the order of one part in 20,000 was observed. In addition,

the results of two hand-polished crystals, samples VII of Table III and V of Table IV fit into the spread of values for their respective types. Also, the dielectric constant of a NaCl crystal polished by Harshaw, sample VI of Table II, was indistinguishable from the rest. Finally, a general investigation of the columns in the Tables which enumerate the polishing batches shows no consistent batch dependence.

That there are no sample thickness effects was shown in our previous paper,⁸ and the only crystal in this work with a significantly different thickness, the 0.053 in. KCl sample II of Table III confirms this.

Aberrations due to the loss in the fluids or samples are negligible in that the dissipation factors for Simplex oil, castor oil, and all samples were on the order of 20, 200, and 60 parts per million respectively.

In addition, the capacitance was found to be independent of the applied voltage in that when the bridge operating conditions were changed from thirty volts, at which value all of the data was taken, to ten volts, no capacitance change was observed.

The most important clues to the spread of static dielectric constants for a given type of crystal are found in Table III where the results of the "old" and "new" Optovac KCl samples are listed. Note the decrease from 4.818, obtained for the four "old" samples, at least two of which are (100) orientation, to 4.813, obtained for

the "new KCl, at least one of which is (100). This gives a handle on the random trace impurity effects on the static dielectric constant. Note that the Harshaw crystals are slightly lower yet.

In this light, then, we can discuss Table IV where two numbers for Harshaw KBr are seen. The (432) orientation crystals show a value of 4.874 while the (100) orientation samples have a value of 4.876. These were probably from different boules, or, at least from different parts of the same boule in that the (432) crystals were sawn while the (100) crystals were cleaved. On the basis of the KCl results, then, this is probably due to impurities rather than an orientation phenomenon. The spread in the static dielectric constant seen in Table II for the (100) Harshaw NaCl crystals further substantiates this conclusion.

Tables II, IV, and V show that the crystals of LiF, NaF, NaCl, and KBr from the two sources are indistinguishable. The results for the crystals of NaBr which are also listed in Table V show a spread which is on the order of that to be expected from trace impurity effects.

Table VI lists the results for the lab pack NaCl samples the orientations of which are indicated in Figure 2. All crystals show a dielectric constant within one part in 20,000. Thus, there is no anisotropy in the static dielectric constant on the level suggested as a possibility by Robinson and Hollis Hallett.⁹

The most commonly quoted values for the static

dielectric constant are listed in Table VII. Let us make some general comments regarding the accuracy of these numbers. First, capacitance values were not reliable prior to the end of the 1950's when three-terminal methods were introduced. Thus, not much confidence can be placed in the early numbers most of which were obtained by mixed-liquid methods.

With the advent of three-terminal methods, there was a switch to geometrical methods. In the geometrical methods, metal electrodes are attached to the crystal by one of several techniques to form a three-terminal capacitor. The first ambiguities are associated with the length measurements necessary to obtain α , the area, and δ , the thickness in order to extract ϵ_s from the governing equation:

$$C = \frac{\epsilon_s \alpha}{\delta} \quad (4)$$

For reasonable size samples, one inch in diameter, elimination of the fringing field effects and minimization of total error require that the radius of the guarded electrode be on the order of 0.25 in. and that the thickness be about 0.1 in. It is extremely difficult to obtain a confidence level in these measurements beyond 0.1%, and, there is an additional ambiguity associated

with α in that it must be ascertained from the outside diameter of the guarded electrode and inside diameter of the guard ring. In addition, it has recently been pointed out¹⁰ that in certain cases electrode-crystal interactions can lead to capacitance enhancement. Additional problems are introduced if there are minute air gaps between the electrodes and the crystal.¹¹ Thus, there are many pitfalls associated with geometrical methods, and great care must be taken to obtain 0.5% numbers. It appears that Lowndes and Martin¹² have taken that care in that their results agree with ours within their experimental uncertainty in each case except for a slight discrepancy in the case of NaBr. The values of Haussuhl⁶ also agree with ours within his quoted experimental error, the exception in his work being LiF.

Thus, we believe that we have shed some light on existing data and finally established accurate values for the static dielectric constant of some widely studied ionic crystals. The temperature and pressure variation of the static dielectric constant of these crystals are currently being investigated to a high level of accuracy, and promise to yield further information on intrinsic electronic and associated impurity effects of ionic crystals.

Table I: Raw Data for sample I of Table VI. The capacitances are in picofarads. Fluid 1 is Simplex oil, and fluid 2 is castor oil.

Quantity	BRASS CELL		ALUMINUM CELL	
	Normal	Reverse	Normal	Reverse
C_1	.890956	.892490	.887650	.898405
	.890962	.892496	.887654	.898407
C_2 (flip) (flip)	1.966705	1.970022	1.951005	1.974471
	1.966632	1.970175	1.950866	1.974593
	1.966648	1.970192	1.950878	1.974598
	1.966764	1.970078	1.950984	1.974465
C_3	1.890956	1.894212	1.884546	1.907371
	1.891252	1.894509	1.884842	1.907671
C_4 (flip) (flip)	2.335950	2.340021	2.325397	2.353601
	2.335909	2.339905	2.325442	2.353555
	2.336016	2.340017	2.325458	2.353612
	2.336005	2.340069	2.325486	2.353674
C_5	.4114849	.4121925	.4099567	.4149261
ϵ_s	5.89409	5.89411	5.89404	5.89400

Table II: The 1000 Hz 300°K dielectric constants of some (100) NaCl crystals.

Sample	Source and Comments	Polishing Batch	Measuring Group	ϵ_s^s
I	H Repolished	4	4	5.8943
		-	7	5.8945
II	H Pumped on and Heated	4	2(c)	5.8952
		4	7	5.8954
III	H Repolished	4	2(b)	5.8952
		-	7	5.8953
IV	H H	4	2(a)	5.8952
		4	4	5.8952
V	H H	2	1	5.8942
		2	4	5.8940
VI	Polished by H	-	-	5.8943
VII	O Pumped on	11	6	5.8956
		11	7	5.8956
VIII	O	7	5	5.8954
IX	O	11	6(b)	5.8952

Table III: The 1000 Hz 300°K dielectric constants of various crystals of KCl.

Sample	Orientation	Source and Comments	Polishing Batch	Measuring Group	ϵ_s^s
I	$\approx(421)$	H(old)	0	1	4.8112
II	$\approx(421)$	H(old) (.053")	00	2	4.8113
III	$\approx(421)$	H(old)	15	11	4.8113
IV	$\approx(421)$	H(new)	19	9	4.8115
V		O(old)	3	3	4.8181
VI		O(old)	3	4	4.8179
VII	(100)	O(old)	3	4	4.8182
VIII	(100)	O(old)	Hand	RSI Article	4.8182
IX	(100)	O(new)	7	5	4.8128
X		O(new)	7	5	4.8127
XI		O(new)	18	9	4.8126

Table IV: The 1000 Hz 300°K dielectric constants of some KBr crystals.

Sample	Orientation	Source and Comments	Polishing Batch	Measuring Group	ϵ_s^s
I	$\approx(432)$	H	0	1	4.8736
	$\approx(432)$	Pumped on and Heated	0	7	4.8739
II	$\approx(432)$	H	0	2	4.8737
	$\approx(432)$	Repolished	-	7	4.8741
III	$\approx(432)$	H	0	8	4.8739
IV	$\approx(432)$	H	5	3	4.8735
V	(100)	H	Hand	4	4.8761
VI	(100)	H	20	11	4.8755
VII		0	7	5	4.8762
VIII		0	7	5	4.8758
IX	(100)	0	11	6	4.8762

Table V: The 1000 Hz 300° dielectric constants of crystals of NaF, LiF, and NaBr.

Type	Sample	Orientation	Source and Comments	Polishing Batch	Measuring Group	ϵ_s^s
NaF	I	(100)	H	2	1	5.0722
	II	(100)	H	2	2	5.0722
	III	(100)	H	1	3	5.0720
	IV	(100)	O	8	5	5.0719
	V	(100)	O	8	6	5.0719
LiF	I	(100)	H	2	1	9.0357
	II	(100)	H	1	3	9.0357
	III	(100)	H	1	3	9.0355
	IV	$\approx (531)$	O	8	5	9.0357
	V	$\approx (531)$	O	8	6	9.0360
NaBr	I	(100)	H	4	1	6.3971
		(100)	Repolished	-	7	6.3974
	II	(100)	H	5	3	6.3957
	III	(100)	H	5	3	6.3966

Table VI: The 1000 Hz 300°K dielectric constants of Harshaw lab packs of NaCl the orientations of which are given in Figure 2.

Sample	Measuring Group	ϵ_s^s
I	9	5.8941
II	9	5.8943
III	9	5.8942
IV	9	5.8942
V	9	5.8941
VI	10	5.8944
VII	10	5.8944
VIII	10	5.8944
IX	10	5.8944
X	10	5.8943
XI	10	5.8943
XII	10	5.8943

Table VII: Some Commonly Quoted Values of the Static Dielectric Constants for the Alkali Halides Measured in this Work.

	This Work	Lowndes and Martin(1969) ^a	B.W. Jones (1967) ^b	Hausshul (1957) ^c	Hojendahl (1930-1935) ^d
Experimental Error	0.01%	0.5%	1%	1%	
Technique	Method of Substitution	Geometrical	Geometrical	Mixed Liquid	Mixed Liquid
Temperature	300°K	290°K	298°K		
NaCl	5.89 ⁴⁰ ₅₆	5.90	5.72- 5.94	5.87	5.62
NaF	5.07 ¹⁹ ₂₂	5.08	4.88	5.10	6.0
LiF	9.03 ⁵⁴ ₆₀	9.00	8.42	8.90	9.27
KBr	4.87 ³⁵ ₆₂	4.90	4.73- 4.79	4.89	4.78
KCl	4.81 ¹² ₈₂	4.84	4.68- 4.77	4.85	4.68
NaBr	6.39 ⁵⁷ ₇₄	6.27	6.44	6.38	5.99

Figure 1. Cross section of the substitution cell.

Figure 3. The capacitance of a Harshaw KBr sample with air as the surrounding medium is plotted against the angle of rotation of the sample about a perpendicular to the face of the crystal. The units are picofarads.

Figure 3. The capacitance of a Harshaw KBr sample with air as the surrounding medium is plotted against the angle of rotation of the sample about a perpendicular to the face of the crystal. The units are picofarads.

REFERENCES

1. B. Sziget, Trans. Faraday Soc. 45, 155 (1949).
2. B. Sziget, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A204, 51 (1950).
3. J. Yamashita, Prog. Theoret. Phys. (Kyoto) 8, 280 (1952).
4. E. R. Levin and E. L. Offenbacher, Phys. Rev. 118, 1142 (1960).
5. A. von Hippel (Ed.), Dielectric Materials and Applications, (The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1954), p. 301.
6. S. Haussuhl, Z. Naturforsch. 12A, 445 (1957).
7. B. W. Jones, Phil. Mag. 16, 1085 (1967).
8. C. Andeen, J. Fontanella, and D. Schuele, Rev. Sci. Instr., in the press.
9. M. C. Robinson and A. C. Hollis Hallett, Can. J. Phys. 44, 2211 (1969).
10. D. F. Gibbs and B. W. Jones, J. Phys. C, (Solid St. Phys.) 2, 1392 (1969).
11. D. Miliotis, and D. N. Yoon, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 30, 1241 (1969).
12. R. P. Lowndes and D. H. Martin, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A308, 473 (1969).

-
- a. Reference 12
 - b. Reference 7
 - c. Reference 6
 - d. K. Hojendahl, Kgl. Danske Videnskab. Selskab., Mat.-
Fys. Medd. 16, 59 (1938).