

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Recent Work

Title

HIGH-RESOLUTION X-RAY PHOTOEMISSION SPECTRA OF PbS, PbSe, AND PbTe VALENCE BANDS

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/50r7d7j4>

Authors

McFeely, F.R.
Kbwalczyk, S.
Ley, L.
et al.

Publication Date

1972-09-01

Submitted to Physical Review

RECEIVED
LAWRENCE
RADIATION LABORATORY

LBL-1253
Preprint c.1

FEB 2 1973

LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTS SECTION

HIGH-RESOLUTION X-RAY PHOTOEMISSION SPECTRA
OF PbS, PbSe, AND PbTe VALENCE BANDS

F. R. McFeely, S. Kowalczyk, L. Ley,
R. A. Pollak, and D. A. Shirley

September 1972

Prepared for the U.S. Atomic Energy
Commission under Contract W-7405-ENG-48

For Reference

Not to be taken from this room



LBL-1253
c.1

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.

HIGH-RESOLUTION X-RAY PHOTOEMISSION SPECTRA OF PbS, PbSe,
AND PbTe VALENCE BANDS *

F. R. McFeely, S. Kowalczyk, L. Ley[†], R. A. Pollak^{††}, and D. A. Shirley

Department of Chemistry and
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

September 1972

ABSTRACT

High-resolution x-ray photoemission valence-band spectra (0 to 45 eV binding energy) of cleaved single crystal PbS, PbSe, and PbTe are reported. The spectra are compared with available band theory results. Relativistic OPW results exhibit the best overall agreement with experiment. EPM results show similar agreement for all but the most tightly bound valence band. The uppermost peak, corresponding to the three least tightly-bound bands, shows detailed structure in good agreement with the EPM predictions. The PbTe valence-band spectrum can be synthesized from the XPS valence-band spectra of Pb and Te.

I. INTRODUCTION

The "lead salts", PbS, PbSe, and PbTe, have in recent years been the object of considerable experimental and theoretical study, due in part to the technological importance of these materials as infrared and visible radiation detectors and in part to interest in their fundamental properties. All three salts crystallize in the rock-salt structure which consists of two interlocking fcc lattices separated by a translation of $(a/2, a/2, a/2)$ where the lattice constant, a , at 300°K is 5.9362 Å for PbS,¹ 6.1243 Å for PbSe,² and 6.4603 Å for PbTe.³ In this work, x-ray photoemission spectroscopy (XPS) has been used to determine the valence-band density of states for each of the lead salts. Derived quantities are compared with several theoretical band structure calculations, which are critically examined in light of these results.

Experimental procedures are described in Sec. II. Results are given in Sec. III and compared with theory in Sec. IV.

II. EXPERIMENTAL

The samples used for these experiments were high-purity single crystals. In order to minimize contamination of the samples by adsorption of hydrocarbons and/or oxygen, the crystals were cleaved under dry nitrogen in a glove bag and placed in a Hewlett-Packard 5950A electron spectrometer at 5×10^{-9} Torr without exposure to the atmosphere. They were then irradiated with monochromatized $\text{AlK}\alpha_{1,2}$ radiation (1486.6 eV), and the ejected photoelectrons were energy-analyzed.

In addition to the valence-band region, spectra were taken over a binding energy range of 0 - 1000 eV in order to detect core level peaks from any impurities which might be present. Experience has shown that even small amounts of impurities can give rise to extraneous peaks in the valence-band region. The only impurities present in detectable quantities were carbon and oxygen, and they were present in sufficiently small amounts so as to preclude any serious effects on the valence-band spectra. The area ratios of the Pb $4f_{7/2}$ line to the oxygen 1s line before and after the scan of each Pb salt valence band are given in Table I. Furthermore, the symmetric shape of the Pb core levels indicate that the oxygen present was in adsorbed molecules on the surface of the sample rather than as oxide. This is further verified by the fact that the intensity of the O 1s line decreased when the crystal was left in vacuum overnight.

Energy conservation gives the photoemission equation

$$h\nu = E_B + E_K + q\phi_{sp}$$

where E_K is the kinetic energy of the photoelectron, ϕ_{sp} is the work function of the spectrometer, and E_B is the binding energy with respect to the Fermi energy.

This equation presumes that the emitting region of the crystal is electrically grounded to the spectrometer. If this were not the case it would be necessary to include an extra additive term to account for charging. Our experience has shown that small band-gap semiconductors, such as the lead salts, show little or no charging.

The Fermi level of the Pb salts with respect to that of the spectrometer was determined with a Au reference as follows. A small quantity of Au was evaporated onto the surface of each Pb salt after the valence-band measurement, and the Au $4f_{7/2}$ line position was determined with respect to a core level in each case. The measured binding energy for gold metal of the Au $4f_{7/2}$ level with respect to the Au Fermi energy is 84.00 ± 0.01 . Thus the binding energy of the Pb salt core level with respect to the Au Fermi level is 84.00 ± 0.01 eV minus its separation from the Au $4f_{7/2}$ peak. This binding energy then defines the Fermi level for the Pb salt valence-band spectrum which includes the Pb salt core level. All binding energies quoted in this paper are given with respect to this reference energy. It is assumed that the Fermi level of the deposited Au is equal to the Fermi level of the emitting portion of the sample.

III. RESULTS

The spectra $I(E)$ for each of the three lead salts are shown in Fig. 1. There is striking similarity in the valence-band spectra of the three salts. The positions of the core-like Pb $5d_{5/2}$ peaks for these salts vary within a range of 0.2 eV and the values of the spin-orbit splitting in the Pb 5d peaks are identical to within experimental error (0.02 eV). The spectra show in each case a strong broad peak, which we call peak 1, centered at about 2 - 2.5 eV below E_F , and exhibiting quite prominent structure on the low binding-energy side. This structure is evident only as a shoulder in PbTe, but in progressing through PbSe to PbS it becomes a well-defined extra peak which we label 1'. Between the (1-1') peak and the Pb 5d lines there are two less intense peaks labeled 2 and 3 in Fig. 1. The absolute binding energies of these peaks show no monotonic trend with the atomic number of the group VI element. Peaks 2 and 3 have the highest binding energies in PbSe. However, the energy difference between peaks 2 and 3 increases monotonically in going from the telluride to the sulfide. The 3-2 splitting is 3.5 eV in the telluride, 4.3 eV in the selenide and 4.4 eV in the sulfide.

We have deconvoluted and subtracted from the valence-band spectra $I(E)$ contributions from inelastically scattered electrons and contributions from the low binding energy tail of the Pb 5d peaks. The shape of the inelastic tail was obtained from a near-lying core level and the 5d-tail was approximated by smoothly extending the low binding energy edge of the Pb $5d_{5/2}$ peak. We label the corrected spectra $I'(E)$. The uncertainty of these corrections are included in the quoted errors. The corrected experimental binding energies are summarized in Table II.

IV. DISCUSSION

These IV-VI compounds have a total of ten valence electrons per Pb atom, which must occupy five valence bands. In light of many recent band structure calculations, the (1-1') peak structure of the photoelectron spectra in all three lead salts may be unequivocally identified with three p-like bands. At the Γ point, two of these bands are degenerate and have Γ_8^- symmetry while the third band has Γ_6^- symmetry. Calculations of the band structure by the EPM,^{4,5,6} OPW⁷ and relativistic APW^{8,9} methods give qualitative agreement on this point.

While there is reasonable agreement on the positions of the three p-like bands and the corresponding maxima in the densities of states, agreement among theoretical predictions of the two lower-lying peaks (2 and 3) is much poorer. Clearly these peaks can only represent the two s-like (Γ_6^+) bands arising from the 6s level of Pb and the highest s-level of the group VI atom. Neither peak can be due to impurities since, as stated previously, no core level peaks were observed for any element which would contribute significant intensity to the valence-band region. Nor can peak 3 be an energy loss peak arising from the 1-1' peak, first because the energy difference of ~ 10 eV is too small compared to the ~ 16 eV loss structure observed for the Pb 5d electrons in these salts and secondly because the intensity of peak 1-1' relative to peak 3 is far lower than the corresponding ratio of Pb 5d peak to its energy loss structure. The assignment of the spectra therefore appears to be completely straightforward. The 1-1' complex arises from the top three "p-like" bands and peaks 2 and 3 each arise from an "s-like" band.

Band-structure experiments and theory enjoy a symbiotic relationship. This relation is valuable because neither would be very effective alone. However, the closeness of the two requires that in the interpretation of spectra one should clearly differentiate between results that are derived directly from the spectra and results that are inferred by comparing the spectra with calculated band structures. We have already identified the peaks in the lead salts spectra with energy bands, so some interplay of theory and experiment has already taken place. In fact these peaks are sufficiently well-resolved that they could have been assigned to the energy levels of the pure elements without reference to band structure, as we shall show below. We assume throughout this discussion that the one-electron transition model described by Fadley and Shirley¹⁰ can be used for the Pb-salts. We also assume that calculated eigenvalue spectra of band theory represent experimental one-electron binding energy spectra (Koopmans' Theorem).¹¹ It should be emphasized at this point that disagreement between theory and experiment may result from the inapplicability of either of these assumptions.^{10,11} Turning now to a more detailed interpretation of the spectra within this model, we can proceed at two distinct levels of sophistication:

Level 1. The mean peak positions and widths can be extracted directly from the spectra and used to assess the relative accuracies of the band-structure calculations. This is an empirical approach, and therefore less subject to error, but it yields information only about the gross features of the bands.

Level 2. After one or more band structure calculations have been judged to be in good agreement with experiment, these energy bands can be compared in more detail with the shape or at least the width of the peaks

to estimate the energies of the bands at symmetry points in the Brillouin zone. This procedure is somewhat speculative, but it yields information of reasonable reliability about the really interesting features of the band structure.

In the discussion below we shall first discuss each of the available band-structure calculations at Level 1, then go on to Level 2.

Overhof and Rössler¹² calculated the band structures of all three Pb salts using a relativistic Green's function technique. Their calculation is unique among those considered here in that the d electrons are included. Unfortunately their band structures must be viewed in light of our results as being qualitatively wrong. The highest s level is predicted in all three cases to lie so close to the p-like bands so as to give rise to only one broad peak in the density of states rather than one p-peak and a smaller s-peak ~ 6 eV away. Furthermore the lower lying s peak would in all three cases be buried under the core-like Pb 5d peaks. The Pb $5d_{3/2}$ and $5d_{5/2}$ are predicted to lie at ~ 13.5 and 15.5 eV for PbS, ~ 13.3 and 15.4 for PbSe, and ~ 13.6 and 15.5 for PbTe instead of the ($\sim 18.5 - 21$) given for the three salts by our spectra. We have not corrected our XPS spectra for polarization or relaxation about the final state hole and thus the reported binding energies for the Pb 5d electrons--and to a lesser extent peaks 2 and 3--may be smaller than the Koopmans' theorem value of theory. This correction may consist of adding approximately 1 eV to the Pb 5d binding energies.

The Augmented Plane Wave (APW) method was used by Conklin, Johnson, and Pratt⁸ to calculate the band structure of PbTe. The Hamiltonian used for this calculation included a spin-orbit term and Darwin and mass-velocity corrections. The results obtained agree reasonably well with our spectra. The calculation indicates that the highest s-peak should occur near 6 eV while the other

s peak should be at 11 eV, compared with the experimental values 8.2 eV and 11.7 eV obtained here.

Augmented plane wave calculations very similar to those above were undertaken by Rabii⁹ on PbS and PbSe. The upper Γ_6^+ levels were calculated and it appears that they would lead to maxima in the density of states around 7 eV in both PbSe and PbS, with the peak probably lying slightly lower in energy for PbSe. This compares with experimental values for this peak of 8.6 and 8.4 eV respectively. Thus the discrepancy is similar to that in the PbTe case.

A different approach to the problem was taken by Lin and Kleinman⁴ in a pseudopotential calculation of the lead salt band structures. In this calculation there were 5 variable parameters which were adjusted to give the best agreement with reflectivity data.¹³ The charge of Pb and the VI atom are allowed to vary and there was also a spin-orbit parameter. The remaining two parameters were used to adjust an extra repulsive potential term which applies only to s-like levels. The variation of these parameters ultimately produced shifts of up to 17.7 eV in PbS and 7.6 eV in PbTe. A comparison of the predictions of their band structures and experiment is given in Table III. As can be seen the overall agreement is quite good in PbS and PbSe, except that, as with the APW calculations, the predicted binding energy of Peak 2 is too low. In the PbTe calculation, however, the agreement is poor for Peak 3 as well.

Tung and Cohen⁵ and Tsang and Cohen⁶ have calculated the band structures for PbTe and for PbSe and PbS respectively using the Empirical Pseudopotential Method (EPM). In these calculations spin-orbit interaction was included but other relativistic effects were not. In addition to band structures, the resulting densities-of-states curves were calculated.

The results of these calculations, shown in Fig. 2 match the experimental results for the p-like peak(s). Particularly striking is the way in which the calculation shows the origin of the l' peak out of the l peak in progressing from PbTe to PbS. The position indicated for the highest s-band (not shown) is also reasonable though not exactly correct.

The major disagreement of this calculation with experiment lies in the predicted energy of the lowest s-peak (not shown in the density of states curve). This level is predicted to lie at 17 eV in PbTe, 24.5 in PbSe, and 27.5 in PbS. This discrepancy is not unexpected, because a local pseudopotential was used. In the case of ZnSe¹⁴ a local pseudopotential was shown to be inadequate for the lowest bands. Thus the nonlocal nature of the pseudopotential should be considered when calculating these bands.

The most successful band structure calculation was undertaken by Herman et al.⁷ In this calculation the OPW method, with relativistic effects included directly in the Hamiltonian, was used to calculate the energy levels at certain symmetry points in the Brillouin zone. A pseudopotential technique was then used to connect the regions between the symmetry points. The resulting band structures were not fitted to any experimental data. The results for PbTe, PbSe, and PbS are shown in Table IV. While the predicted binding energy for Peak 2 in PbS and PbSe is lower than observed (as is the case in all the band structures), the results for PbTe agrees very well with experiment.

Proceeding now to the more sophisticated--and less certain--Level 2 of interpretation, we shall try to derive information about the positions of bands at symmetry points in the Brillouin zone, we treat one salt at a time.

In PbS the 1-1' peak shows well-developed structure that can be identified with the structure of $\rho(E)$ in this region as given by the EPM results. The well-resolved peak in $\rho(E)$ at 1.5 eV below the top of the valence band (which falls at L_6^+) is presumably shoulder 1' in $I'(E)$. We shall use this as a fiducial point. The EPM $\rho(E)$ and the experimental $I'(E)$ are superimposed in Fig. 2 using this fiducial. Thus peak 1' appears, from the EPM results, to arise largely from maxima in the top valence band near symmetry points Δ (1.6 eV below L_6^+) and Σ (0.9 eV below L_6^+). The OPW calculation gives these last two energies as 1.8 and 0.9 eV, respectively. Since the 1' maximum in $I'(E)$ falls 1.25 eV below our measured E_F , it follows that the top of the valence band must lie within 1.25 eV of the 1' energy, if this E_F can be regarded as being intrinsic to PbS. We regard the agreement of this figure 1.25 eV with the EPM result of 1.5 eV to the top of the valence bands as satisfactory.

Proceeding to Peak 1 in PbS, the characteristic shape of this peak in $\rho(E)$ is apparent in $I'(E)$. The peak is rounded on the left side, and steep on the right side, with a well-defined breaking point at the top. This point, which we shall call 1'', falls at $E_F - 2.38$ eV, or 1.13 eV below 1'. The highest intensity point in the EPM $\rho(E)$ for this band falls 3.0 eV below the top of the valence band, or 1.5 eV below the maximum corresponding to 1'. While this value exceeds the experimental result somewhat, we note that in the OPW calculations the relevant bands tend to lie higher. We may roughly relate the 1' - 1'' energy difference to the difference in energy between the maximum in the top band near Δ and the flat regions of the second (and third) bands from the top, along $L - \Gamma - K$. These energy differences are approximately 1.3 (EPM) and 0.7 eV (OPW). This 0.6 eV difference provides room for the 0.4 eV discrepancy between our data and the EPM results. Further strong evidence that the two

maxima in question are too widely separated in the EPM bands is provided by the qualitative appearance of the $l-l'$ peak. If the two points l' and l'' were really 1.5 eV apart, there would be a substantial minimum between them.

The other feature of Peak 1 that can be readily compared with $\rho(E)$ is the position of the half-maximum point on the low kinetic energy side of this peak. On $I'(E)$ this falls in the range 2.8 - 3.0 eV below l' , while in EPM $\rho(E)$ value is 2.9 eV, in excellent agreement. We cannot compare this directly to the OPW results, but the agreement with experiment would almost certainly be worse. This follows because the OPW results have the maximum in the top band near Δ about 3.4 eV above the bottom of the third band (at X_6^-), while the EPM value is 4.0 eV. It is difficult to obtain an experimental value for this quantity from the spectra, but a value of 3.9 ± 0.2 can be estimated by assuming that the peak has a constant slope down to zero intensity, as indicated in the EPM $\rho(E)$.

In summary, our spectrum shows good agreement with the two theories regarding total width of the top band, giving 5.2 ± 0.3 eV vs 5.5 eV (EPM) or 5.2 eV (OPW). In detail there is some disagreement. The position of peak l' appears to be higher than either theory would predict by $\sim 0.2 - 0.4$ eV. Peak l' is closer to l'' than the EPM results (by ~ 0.4 eV), and higher above the bottom of these bands than the OPW prediction (by ~ 0.6 eV).

Peak 2 in PbS has its center 7.0 eV below l' , or about 8.2 eV below E_F and presumably also the top of the valence bands. The FWHM of this peak is 2.5 eV and the total width, based on an uncertain extrapolation to zero intensity, is about 3.5 eV. The centroid in the EPM $\rho(E)$ is 7.1 eV below the top of the bands or 5.6 eV below l' , about 1 eV or more too high. The width that should be compared to the experimental FWHM (in the absence of lifetime broadening) is about 1.2 - 1.4 eV (because of instrumental broadening), and

the total bandwidth is about 2.1 eV; both are thus substantially narrower than experiment. The OPW extrema of this band are 5.8 and 8.1 eV below the top of the valence bands. Thus the OPW bandwidth of 2.3 eV is too small. We estimate that the OPW centroid in $\rho(E)$ would lie about 7.3 eV below the top of the valence band, or about 0.9 eV too high. Use of point 1' as a fiducial point would worsen the agreement, since this point is already too low in the OPW results. In summary, Peak 2 is about 1 eV lower and $\sim 50\%$ wider than predicted by the OPW and EPM theories. Of course the observed binding energy may be affected by relaxation and the linewidth by lifetime broadening.

The centroid of Peak 3 falls at 12.5 eV below E_F , or about 1.6 eV higher than the 14.1 ± 0.2 eV that we can estimate as the distance that the bottom band falls below the top of the valence band in the OPW calculations. The peak width shows a larger discrepancy. The OPW band is only 0.7 to 0.8 eV wide, while Peak 3 is about 2.6 eV FWHM or ~ 4 eV in total width. Thus band-structure broadening may be more pronounced for this band than the calculations indicate.

Turning now to PbSe, there is a considerable amount of partially-resolved structure in Peak 1. The shoulder on the high-energy side (Peak 1') is clearly discernible, although not quite as well-resolved as in PbS. Peak 1' is 1.16 ± 0.10 eV below E_F , in excellent agreement with the highest-energy maximum in the EPM $\rho(E)$, which is also less well resolved from the rest of Peak 1, and is centered 1.18 eV below the top of the valence bands.

The rest of Peak 1 in PbSe is similar to the PbS case, but more structure is evident. The resolution of other features is marginal, but four more features could be reproducibly identified in three samples. They were: 1'', an abrupt change of slope similar to 1'' in PbS; 1_3 , a peak connected to 1' by a gently-sloping line; 1_4 , a peak separated from 1_3 by a distinct minimum, and 1_5 ; another

shoulder on the low energy side of Peak 1. The positions of the last four features relative to l' are given, for all three samples, in Table V. Also given in Table V are the positions of the five most prominent peaks in the EPM $\rho(E)$. The agreement with experiment is very good. Equally impressive (and more important) is the agreement between the general shapes of this peak in $\rho(E)$ and $I'(E)$. Again Peak l' is slightly closer to the rest of Peak 1 and not as well resolved as the EPM results would suggest, but the overall agreement is really extraordinary.

Further comparisons with the EPM $\rho(E)$ give $l' - l_6 = 2.9$ eV (expt) and 2.7 eV (EPM) and $l' - l_7 \cong 4$ eV (expt) and 3.7 eV (EPM), where l_6 is the position of half-maximum height on the low energy side of Peak 1, and l_7 is the bottom of these bands, extrapolated from the slope. Again the agreement is excellent. The experimental $I'(E)$ and the EPM $\rho(E)$ are plotted in Fig. 2.

No $\rho(E)$ is available from the OPW calculations, but it is clear that the OPW and EPM results for Peak 1 in PbSe agree very well, as point-by-point comparison of the energy bands will show. The OPW results give the maximum in the top band near Δ as 1.1 eV below the top of the valence bands at L_6^+ . If this may be taken as a measure of the position of l' , the agreement is excellent. The next two bands have flat regions along $\Gamma - L$, at ~ 2.0 and 2.4 eV below L_6^+ (OPW), or 2.1 and 2.5 eV (EPM). These two bands probably contribute significantly to the features l'' and l_3 in $I'(E)$, at ~ 1.85 eV and 2.3 eV below E_F . It would be very plausible simply to interpret these features as determining the positions of L_{45}^+ and L_6^+ , but such an interpretation is not unique. Finally, the total width of these top three bands is 4.9 eV (OPW), in good agreement with 4.9 eV (EPM) and ≈ 5 eV (expt.).

Peak 2 in PbSe shows no appreciable structure. Its position at 7.1 eV below l' , or 8.3 eV below E_F , is about 1.5 lower than the corresponding peak in the EPM $\rho(E)$, at 6.8 eV, and its width (FWHM = 1.8 eV) is about twice that of the EPM peak (FWHM = 0.9 eV). In the OPW results this band appears to be about the same width as in the EPM case, although comparison is difficult because X_6^+ lies below Γ_6^+ in OPW and above it in EPM. We estimate the centroid of this band to lie about 6.6 eV below l' in the OPW case, in better agreement with experiment, but still slightly high.

Peak 3 in PbSe is centered 11.7 eV below l' or 12.9 eV below E_F , about 1 eV higher than the lowest OPW band, which would give a peak at an estimated 12.8 eV below l' or 13.9 eV below the top of the valence bands. Again the peak is wider (1.9 eV FWHM, or ≈ 3.5 eV total) than the OPW band (0.8 eV total), though not as wide as Peak 3 in PbS.

In PbTe, Peak 1 has a rather different structure from the same peak in PbS and PbSe. First, the shoulder attributed to Peak l' is not evident. This is in very good agreement with the EPM $\rho(E)$, which does not show the well-separated peak found in the other salts. This is a consequence of the general tendency for the top three bands to be compressed upward in PbTe relative to PbSe and PbS. Table VI contains the positions of several symmetry points relative to the top of the valence bands (L_6^+), from the OPW and EPM calculations. The compression of these bands in PbTe is especially pronounced for features near the top of the band.

Since there is no Peak l' in PbTe, another fiducial point is needed. We shall use the energy of the leading edge at half height, denoted l_H . Its value is 17.99 eV above $E(5d_{5/2})$, or 0.34 ± 0.05 eV below E_F . This agrees very well

with the value 0.4 ± 0.1 eV estimated from the EPM $\rho(E)$ as the energy of this feature below the top of the valence bands (at L_6^+). The error in this estimate follows from uncertainties in converting $\rho(E)$ to $I'(E)$.

Peak 1 in the PbTe $I'(E)$ can be characterized as "blunt". This agrees well with the EPM $\rho(E)$ after due allowance for experimental resolution has been made. At slightly higher resolution considerably more structure should be discernible. The peak is somewhat wider than the theoretical results would indicate. The trailing edge at half height falls at $E_F - (3.84 \pm 0.2)$ eV, compared with $E_F - 3.2$ eV for this feature from the EPM $\rho(E)$. Rough extrapolation gives the total bandwidth as ~ 5 eV, compared to 4.3 eV (OPW) and 3.7 eV (EPM).

The positions and widths of Peaks 2 and 3 in PbTe are set out in Table VII. Peak 2 is about 1 eV lower than the OPW result and nearly 2 eV below the EPM value. The OPW peak positions for Peak 3 is in very good agreement with experiment. Again both of these peaks are wider than the band structure $\rho(E)$ would predict.

We have identified the peaks in the XPS $I'(E)$ spectrum with peaks of corresponding energy in $\rho(E)$ of band theory. The same assignments can be obtained empirically by comparing the XPS valence-band spectra of the lead salts with those of the pure elements comprising them. For example there is a one-to-one relationship between the peaks in $I'(E)$ of PbTe and the sum of peaks in the $I'(E)$ spectra of single crystal Pb¹⁵ and single crystal Te.¹⁶ The binding energies of these peaks are listed in Table VII. It can be seen that the difference between any two corresponding peaks, one from the salt and one from the element, is at most ~ 0.6 eV. These differences are consistent with the ionic character of the salt which is demonstrated by comparing the separation in binding energy of the Pb $5d_{5/2}$ and Te $4d_{5/2}$ peaks in PbTe (20.01 eV) with the separation between

these peaks in pure Pb and pure Te (21.48 eV). The difference of separations is 1.47 eV. The observed peak widths (FWHM) of the Pb 6s and the Te 5s in the pure elements are approximately a factor of two wider than peaks 2 and 3 in PbTe possibly indicating a larger crystal field interaction for these bands in Pb and Te than in the partially ionic PbTe.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented the high-resolution XPS spectra of PbS, PbSe, and PbTe valence bands, assigned the peaks to bands in available calculated band structures, and compared the structure of each peak with theory. The agreement observed between theory and experiment is encouraging. Nevertheless there are questions which remain to be answered before the full value of XPS valence-band spectra can be realized. We have assumed the one-electron transition model where the measured binding energy is equated to the one-electron orbital energy. This implies that all other one-electron orbitals remain frozen during photoemission. We have also assumed that the density of states $\rho(E)$ generated from band structure calculations corresponds to the one-electron orbital energy spectrum. The existence of possible deviations from the above model are recognized; however they have to be defined and quantified before a more sophisticated model can be applied. Only by further experimental and theoretical study can the magnitude of the final state and relaxation effects in the photoemission process and the sensitivity of the theoretical band structure to an approximate exchange potential be taken into account.

One of us (L.L.) greatly appreciates a grant from the Max-Kade Foundation. We thank Professor G. Somorjai for giving us single crystal PbS, PbSe, and PbTe.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

* Work performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

† On leave from University of Bonn, Germany.

†† In partial fulfillment of Ph.D.

1. H. E. Swanson and R. K. Fuyat, National Bureau of Standards Circular No. 539, Vol. 2, p. 18 (1955).
2. H. E. Swanson, N. T. Gilfrich, and G. M. Ugrinie, National Bureau of Standards Circular, Vol. 5, p. 39 (1955).
3. N. R. Short, Brit. J. Appl. Phys. 1, 129 (1968).
4. Pay June Lin and Leonard Kleinman, Phys. Rev. 142, 478 (1966).
5. Y. W. Tung and Marvin L. Cohen, Phys. Rev. 180, 823 (1969).
6. Y. W. Tsang and Marvin L. Cohen, to be published.
7. F. Herman, R. L. Kortum, I. B. Outenburger, and J. P. Van Dyke, J. de Physique 29, C4-62 (1968).
8. J. B. Conklin, Jr., L. E. Johnson, and G. W. Pratt, Jr., Phys. Rev. 137, 478 (1966).
9. S. Rabii, Phys. Rev. 167, 801 (1968); 173, 918 (1968).
10. C. S. Fadley and D. A. Shirley, in Electronic Density of States, National Bureau of Standards special publication No. 323, 163 (1971).
11. F. Herman, I. B. Outenburger, and J. P. Van Dyke, Intern. J. Quantum Chem. III S, 82 (1963).
12. H. Overhof and U. Rössler, Phys. Stut. Solidi 37, 691 (1970).
13. M. Cardona and D. L. Greenaway, Phys. Rev. 113, A1658 (1964).
14. R. A. Pollak, L. Ley, S. Kowalczyk, D. A. Shirley, J. D. Joannopoulos, D. J. Chadi, and Marvin L. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Letters 29, 1103 (1972).

15. L. Ley, R. A. Pollak, S. Kowalczyk, and D. A. Shirley, Phys. Letters 41A, 429 (1972).
16. R. A. Pollak, S. Kowalczyk, L. Ley, and D. A. Shirley, Phys. Rev. Letters 29, 274 (1972).

Table I. Ratio of Pb $4f_{7/2}$ to O 1s peak areas

	PbS	PbSe	PbTe
Before VB Run	30:1	> 50:1	10:1
After VB Run	44:1	> 50:1	33:1

Table II. Pb salt VB binding energies (eV)

	Pb 5d _{3/2}	Pb 5d _{5/2}	3	2	1	1'
PbTe	20.94±0.05 ^a	18.33±0.05	11.7±0.2	8.20±0.1	2.30±0.1	--
PbSe	20.99±0.05	18.38±0.05	12.92±0.15	8.64±0.1	2.19±0.1	1.21±0.15
PbS	21.10±0.05	18.52±0.05	12.81±0.15	8.43±0.1	2.53±0.1	1.20±0.1

^aThe quoted errors do not include uncertainties in the determination of the Fermi level.

Table III. Calculations of Lin and Kleinman⁴ compared to experiment

	PbS		PbSe		PbTe	
	L&K	Expt	L&K	Expt	L&K	Expt
Peak 1	1.8	2.5	1.7	2.2	2.5	2.3
Peak 2	6.3	8.4	5.8	8.6	5.4	8.2
Peak 3	12.2	12.8	11.8	12.9	8.7	11.7

Table IV. Calculations of Herman et al.⁷ compared to experiment

	PbS		PbSe		PbTe	
	OPW	Expt	OPW	Expt	OPW	Expt
Peak 1	2.6	2.5	~ 2.6	2.2	~ 2.0	2.3
Peak 2	6.6	8.4	7.4	8.6	7.4	8.4
Peak 3	14.0	12.8	14.0	12.9	11.5	11.7

Table V. Features in Peak 1 of PbSe (Energies in eV)

Sample	1'	1''	1 ₃	1 ₄	1 ₅
I	(0)	0.7 ^a	1.0 ₅	1.5 ₅	2.2 ₅
II	(0)	0.7 ₁	1.2 ₅	1.7 ₅	2.4 ₈
III	(0)	0.6 ₅	1.1	1.6 ₅	2.3 ₅
Theory(EPM)	(0)	0.9	1.35	1.8	2.2

^aThese positions are known to ± 0.1 eV relative to one another.

Table VI. Characteristic energies in Pb salts (eV)

Description	PbTe		PbSe		PbS	
	OPW ^a	EPM ^b	OPW ^a	EPM ^b	OPW ^a	EPM ^b
L_6^+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Δ_6	0.7	0.6	1.1	1.1	1.8	1.6
$L_{4,5}^+$	1.0	0.9	1.9	2.2	2.3	2.8
X_6^-	4.3	3.7	4.9	4.9	5.2	5.5

^aTaken from references 5 and 6.

^bTaken from reference 7.

Table VII. Comparison of PbTe results with those for Pb and Te.
Binding energies are relative to the measured Fermi levels.


	PbTe	Pb ^a	Te ^b
Binding energy Te 4d _{3/2} (eV)	40.95(7)	--	41.80(9)
Binding energy Te 4d _{5/2} (eV)	39.49(7)	--	40.31(9)
FWHM 4d _{3/2} = FWHM 4d _{5/2}	1.50(2)	--	0.94(2)
4d splitting (eV)	1.46(2)	--	1.51(1)
Binding energy Pb 5d _{3/2} (eV)	20.94(7)	20.32(5)	--
Binding energy Pb 5d _{5/2} (eV)	18.33(7)	17.70(5)	--
FWHM 5d _{3/2} = FWHM 5d _{5/2}	1.20(5)	0.94(5)	--
5d splitting	2.61(2)	2.62(2)	--
Binding energy Te 5s, PbTe "3" (eV)	11.7(2)	--	11.5(2)
FWHM Te 5s, PbTe "3" (eV)	2.5(3)	--	4.8(5)
Binding energy Pb 6s, PbTe "2" (eV)	8.20(11)	7.68(20)	--
FWHM Pb 6s, PbTe "2" (eV)	2.3(2)	2.7(2)	--
Binding energy Pb 6p, Te 5p, PbTe "1"	2.30(11)	{ 2.33(8) 0.53(5)	{ 4.0(2) 1.13(5)
FWHM Pb 6p, Te 5p, PbTe "1"	3.5(2)	3.1(2)	5.0(2)

^aRef. 15.

^bRef. 16.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

- Fig. 1. Raw valence band spectra of the lead salts; the strong double peaks at ~ 20 eV are the lead $5d_{3/2}$ and $5d_{5/2}$ levels; the tellurium 4d are at about 40 eV binding energy.
- Fig. 2. EPM densities of states^{5,6} compared with the shape of the (1-1') peaks in the valence bands of the lead salts (relative energy scale).
- Fig. 3. Band structures of the lead salts calculated by the Empirical Pseudopotential Method;^{5,6} a) PbS; b) PbSe; c) PbTe.
- Fig. 4. Band structures of the lead salts calculated by the OPW method.⁷



xBL7210-4157

Fig. 1






Fig. 2

Fig. 3a



XBL 7211-5846

FIG. 3b









FIG. 3c

XBL 7211-5847

Fig. 4



557, 7-10-17-0

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.

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