

Submitted to Inorganic Chemistry

UCRL-19083
Preprint

cy. 2

CORE-ELECTRON BINDING ENERGIES FOR COMPOUNDS
OF BORON, CARBON AND CHROMIUM

D. N. Henrickson, J. M. Hollander, and W. L. Jolly

September 1969

AEC Contract No. 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. 5545*

LAWRENCE RADIATION LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA BERKELEY

UCRL-19083
cy. 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.

Core-Electron Binding Energies for Compounds
of Boron, Carbon and Chromium

D. N. Hendrickson, J. M. Hollander, and W. L. Jolly

Contribution from the Department of Chemistry of
the University of California and the Inorganic
Materials Research and Nuclear Chemistry
Divisions of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory,
Berkeley, California 94720

ABSTRACT

Boron 1s and chromium 3p binding energies have been measured for 25 boron compounds and 17 chromium compounds. The data correlate linearly with calculated atomic charges. A linear correlation is also demonstrated for CNDO-calculated atomic charges and carbon 1s binding energies determined by other workers.

INTRODUCTION

Core-electron binding energies for several elements in a wide variety of compounds have been determined by X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS).¹

(1) A review of many aspects of XPS can be found in K. Siegbahn, C. Nordling, A. Fahlman, R. Nordberg, K. Hamrin, J. Hedman, G. Johansson, T. Bergmark, S.-E. Karlsson, J. Lindgren and B. Lindberg, "ESCA Atomic Molecular and Solid State Structure Studied by Means of Electron Spectroscopy," Almqvist and Wiksells AB, Stockholm (1967).

These energies have been correlated with atomic charges calculated from molecular orbital eigenfunctions.²⁻⁴ Although it has been pointed⁵ out that, from

(2) For nitrogen compounds see: J. M. Hollander, D. N. Hendrickson, and W. L. Jolly, J. Chem. Phys., 49, 3315 (1968); D. N. Hendrickson, J. M. Hollander, and W. L. Jolly, submitted to Inorg. Chem.

(3) For carbon compounds see: R. Nordberg, U. Gelius, P. F. Hedén, J. Hedman, C. Nordling, K. Siegbahn, and B. J. Lindberg, submitted to Arkiv. för Kemi.

(4) For phosphorus compounds see: M. Pelavin, D. N. Hendrickson, J. M. Hollander, and W. L. Jolly, submitted to J. Phys. Chem.

(5) W. L. Jolly and D. N. Hendrickson, to be published.

theoretical considerations, one cannot expect better than a rough correlation between core-electron binding energy and atomic charge, such rough correlations are fairly easy to make and can give useful information about the bonding and structure of compounds. In this paper we report boron 1s and chromium 3p binding energies and show that they can be roughly correlated with atomic charges calculated by various molecular orbital methods. A CNDO-calculated charge correlation is also demonstrated for some carbon 1s binding energies that were determined in another work.³

EXPERIMENTAL

The experimental aspects of the determination of inner-electron binding energies have been reviewed by Siegbahn et al.¹ MgK_α X-radiation (1253.6 eV) was used in this work. All compounds were solid and were treated as before² except where noted below.

It was necessary to cool the samples of $(\text{CH}_3)_3\text{NBF}_3$, $\text{B}_{10}\text{H}_{14}$ and $\text{Cr}(\text{CO})_6$ to prevent their sublimation in the spectrometer. These samples were loaded into the spectrometer source house under dry nitrogen and cooled to $\sim -60^\circ$ before evacuation.

Photoelectrons originate from sites near the surface,¹ thus it was necessary to continuously clean the surface of a piece of chromium foil in order to see a peak that could be assigned to the unoxidized metal. This was accomplished by heating the chromium foil to $\sim 650^\circ$ in hydrogen at 10^{-2} torr. The disappearance of the oxide layer was monitored by the O 1s line. Chromium hydride formation need not be considered because of the low solubility of hydrogen in chromium metal at 650° .⁶

(6) T. R. P. Gibb, Jr., Progress in Inorganic Chemistry, 315 (1962).

The work function for the spectrometer material (aluminum) was assigned the value 4.0 eV, as in previous work.^{2,4}

Compounds were either purchased or were gifts. Samples of many boron compounds were kindly supplied by Professor M. F. Hawthorne and Dr. S. Trofimenko.

CALCULATIONS

CNDO molecular orbital eigenfunctions⁷ were obtained for some of the carbon and boron compounds. Simple extended Hückel calculations⁸ were also made for some of the boron compounds. In the extended

(7) J. A. Pople, D. P. Santry, and G. A. Segal, J. Chem. Phys., 43, S129, S136 (1965). A modified CNDO/1 version involving empirically evaluated repulsion integrals was used, as per P. M. Kuznesof and D. F. Shriver, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 90, 1683 (1968). Computational details can be found in this latter reference.

Hückel method, Coulomb integrals, H_{ii} , were approximated by the valence state ionization potentials (vsip) calculated by Hinze and Jaffé.⁹

The off-diagonal elements were assigned as

$$H_{ij} = 1.75 S_{ij} (H_{ii} + H_{jj}) / 2$$

where S_{ij} is the overlap integral between the i th and j th atomic orbitals. Slater's rules¹⁰ were used to calculate orbital exponents for atomic orbitals. Boron nitride was treated in an approximate manner.²

(8) R. Hoffmann, J. Chem. Phys., 39, 1397 (1963).

(9) J. Hinze and H. H. Jaffé, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 84, 540 (1962).

(10) J. C. Slater, Phys. Rev., 36, 57 (1930).

Simple iterative extended Huckel molecular orbital calculations¹¹ were completed for a few chromium compounds. Coulomb integrals for ligand orbitals were set equal to the negative of the appropriate neutral atom ψ_{ip} 's⁹ corrected in each cycle for net atomic charge q_i .

$$H_{ii} = H_{ii}^{\circ} - (2.0 \text{ eV/charge})q_i \quad (1)$$

(11) Method was essentially that used for phosphorus compounds by P. C. Van der Voorn and R. S. Drago, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 88, 3255 (1966).

Chromium coulomb integrals (except where noted) were calculated for a neutral atom in a d^5p configuration;¹² charge correction of these values was made using equation (1) on each iterative cycle. Both the metal

-
- (12) H. Basch, A. Viste, and H. B. Gray, Theoret. Chim. Acta (Berl.)
3, 458 (1965).
-

and ligand orbital exponents were taken as neutral atom orbital values, μ_i^0 , (assigned by Slater's rules¹⁰) corrected for charge

$$\mu_i = \mu_i^0 + 0.35 q_i / n^*$$

Here n^* is the effective principal quantum number. The off-diagonal Hamiltonian elements were assigned by Cusachs' approximation¹³

$$H_{ij} = S_{ij} (H_{ii} + H_{jj}) (2 - |S_{ij}|) / 2$$

-
- (13) L. Cusachs, J. Chem. Phys., 44, 835 (1966).
-

Atomic charges q_i were obtained in each cycle by an application of Mulliken's population analysis.¹⁴ Iterations were made on the chromium

-
- (14) R. S. Mulliken, J. Chem. Phys., 23, 1833, 1841, 2338, 2343 (1955).
-

compounds until the atomic charges were self-consistent to at least 0.05.

Program PROXYZ¹⁵ was used to obtain cartesian coordinates when necessary; the molecular parameters were obtained from crystal structure determinations¹⁶ or from estimates.

(15) P. M. Kuznesof, Quantum Chemistry Program Exchange (Indiana University) QCPE 94 (1966).

(16) "Table of Interatomic Distances," L. E. Sutton ed., Special Publication No. 11, The Chemical Society, Burlington House London, 1958 and No. 18, Supplement, 1965.

Core-electron binding energies (the differences in energy between the Fermi level and the atomic level for the solids) were calculated from the relation¹

$$E_B = E_{h\nu} - E_{kin} - \phi_{sp}$$

Here $E_{h\nu}$ is the X-ray energy, E_{kin} is the kinetic energy of the photoelectron in the spectrometer and ϕ_{sp} is the work function of the spectrometer material.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Boron Compounds. Boron $1s$ electron binding energies were measured for some 25 compounds and are listed in Tables I and II. The range of boron $1s$ shifts is 8.4 eV, which is comparable to the observed phosphorus $2p$ shift range (~ 8.5 eV).⁴ Larger shift ranges have been observed for nitrogen (~ 10.8 eV),² carbon (~ 15.9 eV),³ and sulfur (~ 15 eV).¹

Simple extended Hückel molecular orbital (EHMO) calculations were completed for 12 of the boron compounds. A fair linear correlation between measured boron $1s$ electron binding energy and boron atom charge from the EHMO eigenfunctions is shown in Figure 1. The tetramethylammonium salt of the octahydrotriborate ion ($B_3H_8^-$) with two geometrically-different borons gave a single broad boron $1s$ peak with no structure, and therefore only a single point represents this ion in Figure 1. The boron atom charges (via the EHMO method) range from near neutrality in the borohydrides to almost +2.4 in BF_4^- .

In our nitrogen studies² we found that the EHMO method tended to overemphasize charge separations in molecules. The CNDO nitrogen atom charge range was 4 - 5 times smaller than that obtained by the EHMO method for a series of nitrogen compounds. CNDO calculations were made for some of the boron compounds treated by the EHMO method. The results are given in Table I. Again the CNDO-calculated atom charge range is about 4 times smaller than that obtained using EHMO eigenfunctions. The greater charge separations obtained using the simple EHMO method are probably the result of using charge-independent Coulomb integrals.

A fairly good correlation exists between the measured boron 1s binding energies and the CNDO-calculated boron charges, as can be seen in Figure 2. Using this CNDO correlation line and the boron binding energy for BN, we infer a boron charge of $\sim +0.29$. The measured nitrogen 1s binding energy for BN^2 correlates with a nitrogen charge of -0.25 . This result is a good indication of internal consistency; the sum of the charges should equal zero. Unfortunately, the number of boron compounds was insufficient to permit the distinguishing of two lines (one characteristic of anions and the other of neutral molecules), as observed in our nitrogen work.² However it is perhaps significant that the points for the three neutral molecules (2,3, and 6) fall below the line in Figure 2.

For all of the compounds listed in Table II it was possible to detect only a single relatively sharp boron peak. The carboranes (compounds 16-20) have geometrically-different boron atoms, but in an unsubstituted carborane (as in compound 20 where two 1,2-dicarbollide ions are bound to a single cobalt atom) delocalization of charge would be expected to make the charges on the boron atoms similar. It can be seen that as we substitute one S atom for a H atom on the 1,2-dicarbollide ion (as in compound 17) the boron 1s binding energy is increased appreciably. Substitution of three bromines for three hydrogens on this same cage increases the boron binding energy even more, but still only one sharp peak can be seen. Presumably delocalization of charge occurs in this 1,2-dicarbollide cage.

Carbon Compounds. Nordberg et al³ have recently reported carbon 1s binding energies. They found that the carbon binding energies roughly correlate with carbon fractional atomic charges calculated by a modification of Pauling's method and with carbon atom charges calculated from simple EHMO eigenfunctions. The results of our CNDO calculations for some of the compounds treated by Nordberg et al³ are given in Table III. The carbon 1s binding energies for these compounds are plotted vs. the CNDO-calculated carbon charges in Figure 3. In the cases of CF_4 and CHF_3 , the binding energies obtained by Professor D. Thomas (measured both vs. Ne as well as CH_4) were found to fit the correlation better and were used instead of the values given by Nordberg et al. We draw two conclusions. First, the CNDO carbon charges seem more realistic (i.e. not as large) than those obtained by the EHMO method. Second, a somewhat improved straight-line correlation is obtained in the CNDO plot. Only two points fall off the line (i.e. not within experimental uncertainty), the points for KCN and Na_2CO_3 .

Chromium Compounds. Chromium 3p electron binding energies are given in Table IV. Qualitatively the chromium 3p binding energies increase with increasing oxidation state, the exception being $\text{Cr}(\text{CO})_6$. Chromium 3p binding energies are somewhat more difficult to obtain than nitrogen, carbon, phosphorus or boron core-electron binding energies, because the lower energies associated with ionization of a chromium 3p electron give a lower photoionization cross section when using the same X-radiation.¹ Equally troublesome is the asymmetric background due probably to bremsstrahlung (inelastically scattered electrons).

Some preliminary iterative extended Hückel calculations, (see calculation section) were completed for a few of the chromium compounds; the results are given in Table V. In all cases the configuration of the chromium atom was assumed, and the calculations were iterated until all atom charges in the molecule were self-consistent to within 0.05. Two modifications of the metal input parameters were considered--one using Slater orbital exponents¹⁰ coupled with neutral atom chromium valence orbital ionization potentials for d^5p configuration¹², and the other where essentially the metal orbital exponents were changed. In both cases (see Figure 4) only a very rough correlation between chromium $3p$ binding energy and calculated chromium atom charge was found.

The chromium $3p$ binding energies of $K_3[Cr(CN)_6]$ and $K_3[Cr(CN)_5NO]$ are identical and therefore one might conclude that the latter compound is a Cr(III) compound, contrary to its usual formulation as a Cr(I) compound.¹⁷ The assignment of the +3 oxidation state to chromium

(17) This conclusion has also been reached by R. D. Feltham on the basis of bond lengths, etc. (private communication).

corresponds to a formal NO^- group. This conclusion is consistent with our nitrogen $1s$ work, where we found the charge on the NO-nitrogen in $K_3[Cr(CN)_5NO]$ to be more negative than expected for an NO^+ group.²

Acknowledgment. This work was supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission. Our gratitude is due Professor M. F. Hawthorne for gifts of many interesting boron compounds.

Table I

Boron $1s$ Binding Energies and Calculated Charges

Compound Number	Compound	Binding Energy, eV.	Calculated Boron Atom Charge	
			CNDO	Extended Hückel
1	NaBF_4	195.1	+0.754	+2.361
2	$(\text{CH}_3)_3\text{NBF}_3$	193.8	+0.756	+2.161
3	$\text{B}(\text{OH})_3$	193.2	+0.651	+2.122
4	$\text{NaBH}(\text{OCH}_3)_3$	192.3	+0.404	+1.724
5	$\text{Na}_3\text{B}_3\text{O}_6$	192.2	+0.321	+2.098
6	$p\text{-F-C}_6\text{H}_4\text{B}(\text{OH})_2$	191.9	+0.498	+1.715
7	$p\text{-Cl-C}_6\text{H}_4\text{B}(\text{OH})_2$	191.9		+1.713
8	$[\text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{B}(\text{N-N})_3\text{-BC}_2\text{H}_5]\text{PF}_6$	191.9		+1.228
9	BN	190.2		+1.48
10	$\text{K}_2\text{BH}_3\text{CO}_2$	187.5	-0.024	+1.604
11	$(\text{CH}_3)_4\text{NB}_3\text{H}_8$	187.4	+0.165 ^a	+0.518 ^a
			-0.007	+0.078
12	NaBH_4	187.4	0.000	+0.138
13	B_{amor}	187.5	$\equiv 0$	$\equiv 0$

^a There are two structurally-different B atoms in the B_3H_8^- ion; the first boron charge refers to the unique boron. For purposes of plotting a weighted average was used.

Table II

Boron 1s Binding Energies

Compound Number	Compound	Binding Energy, eV.
14	$\text{Na}_2\text{B}_4\text{O}_7 \cdot 10\text{H}_2\text{O}$	192.8
15	$\text{N-N-B} \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{N} \\ \text{N} \end{array} \right)_3 - \text{W}(\text{CO})_2(\text{NO})$	191.9
16	$(\text{CH}_3)_4\text{N}[(8,9,12\text{-Br}_3\text{-}1,2\text{-B}_9\text{C}_2\text{H}_8)_2\text{Co}]$	189.5
17	$\text{Cs}[\text{Co}(1,2\text{-B}_9\text{C}_2\text{H}_{10}\text{-}8\text{-S})_2]$	188.9
18	$\text{Rb}[\text{Co}(1,2\text{-B}_9\text{C}_2\text{H}_{11})(\text{B}_8\text{C}_2\text{H}_{10})]$	188.4
19	$\text{C}_2\text{B}_9\text{H}_{11} \cdot \text{C}_5\text{H}_5\text{N}$	188.4
20	$\text{Cs}[(1,2\text{-B}_9\text{C}_2\text{H}_{11})_2\text{Co}]$	188.2
21	$\text{B}_{10}\text{H}_{14}$	188.0
22	$\text{Na}_2\text{B}_{12}\text{H}_{12} \cdot x\text{H}_2\text{O}$	187.7
23	$\text{NaB}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_5)_4$	187.7
24	$\text{Cs}_2\text{B}_{10}\text{H}_{10}$	187.6
25	B_4C	186.7

Table III

Carbon $1s$ Binding Energies and Calculated Charges

Compound Number	Compound	Binding Energy, eV. ^a	CNDO-Calculated Carbon Atom Charge
1	CF ₄	300.7 (296.1 ^b)	+0.831
2	CF ₂ O	294.1	+0.720
3	CF ₃ H	295.1 (293.5 ^b)	+0.656
4	CF ₃ COCH ₃	292.8	+0.637
5	CO ₂	292.5	+0.576
6	CF ₃ CO ₂ N ₂	292.3	+0.569
7	NaHCO ₃	290.2	+0.409
8	Na ₂ CO ₃	289.7	+0.226
9	CH ₃ CO ₂ Na	289.1	+0.437
6	CF ₃ CO ₂ Na	289.1	+0.401
10	CH ₃ CO ₂ Na	288.8	+0.320
4	CF ₃ COCH ₃	288.7	+0.363
11	NH ₄ HCO ₂	288.6	+0.318
12	CH ₃ COCH ₃	288.0	+0.302
13	CH ₂ O	287.9	+0.329
10	CH ₃ CO ₂ Na	285.0	+0.072
14	CH ₄	285.0	+0.098
15	KCN	285.0	-0.482
12	CH ₃ COCH ₃	284.9	+0.098
9	CH ₃ CO ₂ H	284.8	+0.125

Table III (continued)

^a Binding energies taken from reference 3 except where noted.

^b D. Thomas, unpublished work.

Table IV

Chromium 3p Binding Energies

Compound	Binding Energy, eV.
$K_2Cr_2O_7$	48.7
CrO_3	48.2
$Na_2CrO_4 \cdot 4H_2O$	47.9
$Cr_2(SO_4)_3 \cdot xH_2O$	46.9
$Cr(CO)_6$	45.8
$[Cr(H_2O)_6](NO_3)_3 \cdot 3H_2O$	45.4
$CrCl_3 \cdot 6H_2O$	45.4
$[Cr(H_2O)_5Cl]Cl_2$	45.2
$K_3[Cr(CN)_6]$	44.8
$K_3[Cr(CN)_5NO]$	44.8
$Cr(NH_3)_6Cl_3$	44.7
$Cr_2O_3 \cdot xH_2O$	44.6
$trans-[Cr(H_2O)_4Cl_2]Cl$	44.5
$Cr_2(CH_3CO_2)_4(H_2O)$	44.5
Cr foil(unreduced)	43.9
Cr_2O_3	43.5
CrN	43.2
Cr foil(reduced)	43.2


Table V

Iterative Extended Hückel-Calculated
Chromium Atom Charges

Molecule	Calculated Chromium Atom Charges	
	$\underline{d}^5 \underline{p}$ Configuration ^a	modified $\underline{d}^5 \underline{p}$ Configuration ^b
$\text{Cr}_2\text{O}_7^{2-}$	2.526	2.741
CrO_4^{2-}	2.430	2.618
$\text{Cr}(\text{CN})_6^{3-}$	2.055	1.598
$\text{Cr}(\text{CO})_6$	1.500	1.400


^a Slater exponents used,⁹ H_{ii} for metal: 3d(-8.40 eV), 4s(-8.01 eV), and 4p(-3.52 eV) as per reference 12 for neutral-atom $\underline{d}^5 \underline{p}$ configuration.

^b Metal orbital exponents: 3d(2.22), 4s and 4p(0.733). H_{ii} for metal: 3d(-8.40 eV), 4s(-9.27 eV), and 4p(-3.52 eV).




XBL 697-3245

Figure 1. Plot of boron 1s binding Energy vs. Extended Hückel-calculated charges on boron atoms.




XBL 697-3247

Figure 2. Plot of boron 1s binding energy vs. CNDO-calculated charges on boron atoms.



XBL697-3246

Figure 3. Plot of carbon 1s binding energies vs. CNDO-calculated charges on carbon atoms.



XBL 697-3248

Figure 4. Plot of chromium 3p binding energies vs. iterative Extended Hückel-calculated charges on chromium atoms. The symbols ● and ○ refer to two different sets of input data as given in footnotes a and b, respectively, in Table V.

LEGAL NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission:

- A. Makes any warranty or representation, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or*
- B. Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.*

As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Commission" includes any employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission, or his employment with such contractor.

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