

20 September 1996

CHEMICAL PHYSICS LETTERS

Chemical Physics Letters 260 (1996) 82-86

#### An ellipsometric study of the surface freezing of liquid alkanes

#### T. Pfohl<sup>a</sup>, D. Beaglehole<sup>b</sup>, H. Riegler<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Max-Planck-Institut für Kolloid- und Grenzflächenforschung, Rudower Chaussee 5, D-12489 Berlin, Germany <sup>b</sup> Department of Physics, Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand

Received 14 March 1996; in final form 22 May 1996

#### Seok, Sangjun



#### Introduction - ellipsometry at thin films





# Principles of Ellipsometry

#### Fig. 1 Film-Covered Surface



Total Reflective Coefficient :

$$r = r_{12} + t_{12}t_{21}r_{23}e^{-i2\beta} + t_{12}t_{21}r_{21}r_{23}^2e^{-i4\beta} + t_{12}t_{21}r_{21}^2r_{23}^3e^{-i6\beta} + \cdots$$

### Principles of Ellipsometry

$$r = r_{12} + t_{12}t_{21}r_{23}e^{-i2\beta} \left\{ 1 + (r_{21}r_{23}e^{-i2\beta}) + (r_{21}r_{23}e^{-i2\beta})^2 + (r_{21}r_{23}e^{-i2\beta})^3 + \cdots \right\}$$

The sum of the geometric series :

$$r = r_{12} + \frac{t_{12}t_{21}r_{23}e^{-i2\beta}}{1 - r_{21}r_{23}e^{-i2\beta}}$$

In Fresnel's Identities

$$r_{21} = -r_{21}$$
$$t_{21} = \frac{1 - r_{12}^2}{t_{12}}$$

Fresnel equation

$$r_{p} = \frac{E_{rp}}{E_{ip}} = \frac{N_{2}\cos\theta_{1} - N_{1}\cos\theta_{2}}{N_{2}\cos\theta_{1} + N_{1}\cos\theta_{2}}$$

$$r_{s} = \frac{E_{rs}}{E_{is}} = \frac{N_{1}\cos\theta_{1} - N_{2}\cos\theta_{2}}{N_{1}\cos\theta_{1} + N_{2}\cos\theta_{2}}$$

$$t_{p} = \frac{2N_{1}\cos\theta_{1}}{N_{2}\cos\theta_{1} + N_{1}\cos\theta_{2}}$$

$$t_{s} = \frac{2N_{1}\cos\theta_{1}}{N_{1}\cos\theta_{1} + N_{2}\cos\theta_{2}}$$

### Principles of Ellipsometry

$$r = \frac{r_{12} + r_{23}e^{-i2\beta}}{1 + r_{12}r_{23}e^{-i2\beta}}$$

#### Similarly....

$$t = -\frac{t_{12}t_{23}e^{-i2\beta}}{1 + r_{12}r_{23}e^{-i2\beta}}$$

Ellipsometry Parameter  $\Delta, \Psi$  IN THAT PAPER (measured by Im(r) part)  $r_p \equiv \frac{E_{rp}}{E_{ip}} = |r_p| e^{i\delta_p}$   $r_s \equiv \frac{E_{rs}}{E_{is}} = |r_s| e^{i\delta_s}$  Im(r) at Re(r) = 0  $\rho = \frac{r_p}{r_s} = \left|\frac{r_p}{r_s}\right| e^{i(\delta_p - \delta_s)} \equiv \tan \Psi e^{i\Delta} = \operatorname{Re}(r) + \operatorname{Im}(r)$ 

# Principles of Ellipsometry - inhomogeneous dielectric surface

Im(r)= $\rho$  at Re(r)=0  $d / \lambda \gg 1$ 

At perfect interface

$$\eta = \frac{\lambda}{\pi} \frac{(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)}{\sqrt{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2}} \bar{\rho}.$$
 (1)

 $\eta_r$  Surface roughness



 $\eta_a$  Surface anisotropy

η

Can originate from three contributions

The value of  $\eta$  depends upon the particular profile, different profiles can have the same value.

#### Principles of Ellipsometry - inhomogeneous dielectric surface



Approximating the integrals by the layer thickness d

$$\eta_{\rm d} = d[(\epsilon_z - \epsilon_1)(\epsilon_z - \epsilon_2)/\epsilon_z], \qquad (3)$$
  
$$\eta_{\rm a} = d(\epsilon_x - \epsilon_z). \qquad (4)$$

#### Result



# Interface profile proposed by X-ray study



X-ray studies have proposed



# Interface profile proposed by X-ray study

 $\eta$  is due to only to surface roughness. (above  $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ms}}$  )

 $\epsilon_1$  = 1.00 (air) and  $\epsilon_2$ =2.05 (typical of an isotropic liquid alkane phase) and measured value  $\rho = 1 \times 10^{-3}$ 

(1)

We obtained with eq. (1) and (2) :  $\eta_d = -0.12nm$   $t \approx 0.70nm$ 

X-ray data is 0.43 nm

$$\eta = \eta_{r} + \eta_{d} + \eta_{a}$$

$$= \underbrace{\frac{t}{4.394} (\epsilon_{1} - \epsilon_{2}) \ln\left(\frac{\epsilon_{2}}{\epsilon_{1}}\right)}_{+ \int dz} \underbrace{\left[\epsilon_{z}(z) - \epsilon_{1}\right] \left[\epsilon_{z}(z) - \epsilon_{2}\right]}_{\epsilon_{z}(z)}_{+ \int dz \left[\epsilon_{x}(z) - \epsilon_{z}(z)\right]}.$$
(2)

## Interface profile proposed by X-ray study

below  $T_{\!_{\rm ms}}$ 

X-ray data is increased in the electron density in the surface layer of about 20%

Using the Clausius-Mossotti relationship 
$$\gamma_{mol} = \frac{3}{N} \left( \frac{\varepsilon / \varepsilon_0 - 1}{\varepsilon / \varepsilon_0 + 2} \right)$$
  
Density increase obtain  $\varepsilon_z (T < T_{ms}) = 2.35$ 

 $\eta~$  is due to only to density increase (below  $T_{\rm ms}$  ) and layer thickness 2.5 nm

西江大墨

Using eq.3 
$$\eta_d = 0.43nm$$
  
BUT  
According to eq. (1)  $\rho = -6.4 \times 10^{-3}$   $\Longrightarrow \Delta \rho \approx 6.4 \times 10^{-3}$ 

### Compensation of layering by roughness

The postulated density change due to the surface layer results in a layering contribution of  $\eta_d = +0.43$ nm. In principle, this can be compensated by an increase in the roughness with  $\eta_r = -0.43$  nm. This corresponds to a 10–90 thickness of  $t \approx 2.5$  nm (including the effect of increased density upon the roughness contribution). Compared to the liquid interface ( $t \approx 0.70$  nm) the roughness has to increase by a factor of 4.5 to 3.2 nm upon surface freezing. This is more than the length of a molecule. In terms of roughness on a lateral molecular scale this must therefore be discarded. Roughness on a larger lateral scale, like domains of frozen alkane floating on a liquid alkane surface would result in the desired ellipsometric contribution of a "rough" interface as long as the lateral domain dimensions are smaller than the wavelength. However, such a topology is unlikely and it should change with temperature. For instance, between  $T_{\rm ms}$  and  $T_{\rm b}$  an increase of the solid domain fraction on lowering the temperature could be expected. This is not observed with ellipsometry although it would definitely be detectable.



## Compensation of layering by anisotropy

According to Eq. (4) and with a layer thickness of 2.5 nm a layering contribution  $\eta_d = +0.43$  nm can be compensated by an anisotropy value  $\eta_a$  with  $\epsilon_x - \epsilon_z = -0.17$ . This agrees with the molecular picture of alkanes oriented normal to the interface, i.e.  $\epsilon_z > \epsilon_x$ . To our knowledge the anisotropic dielectric constants of alkanes have not been published. However, their anisotropy may be compared to that of densely packed fatty acid molecules aligned in a smectic-A-like phase in Langmuir monolayers with  $\epsilon_z = 2.46$  and  $\epsilon_x = 2.32$  [6]. These numbers show that anisotropy may in fact be sufficient to compensate for the surface layering.



#### Alternative interface structure model



g. 2. Two possible electron density profiles (a) and their correonding similar X-ray reflectivities (b) for surface frozen sane/air interfaces. The full lines exemplify the model of a ystalline surface monolayer with an increased electron density at e interface. The dotted lines represent the model of a smectic-like onolayer ordering with identical electron densities in the surface yer and in the bulk. In this case the X-ray interferences originate om a density gap between the monolayer and the bulk.



