



Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA RECEIVED

Materials & Molecular Research Division

LAWRENCE
BERKELEY LABORATORY
JUL 21 1983
LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTS SECTION

Submitted to Physical Review B


THE AUGER DECAY MECHANISM IN PHOTON-STIMULATED
DESORPTION FROM SODIUM FLUORIDE

C.C. Parks, Z. Hussain, D.A. Shirley, M.L. Knotek,
G. Loubriel, and R.A. Rosenberg

June 1983

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. 6782.*



LBL-14240
c.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.

LBL-14240

The Auger Decay Mechanism
in Photon-Stimulated Desorption from Sodium Fluoride

C. C. Parks, Z. Hussain,* and D. A. Shirley
Materials and Molecular Research Division
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
and
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

M. L. Knotek and G. Loubriel
Sandia National Laboratory
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87108

R. A. Rosenberg
Michelson Laboratory
Physics Division
Naval Weapons Center
China Lake, California 93555

June 1983

* Present address: Dept. of Physics
University of Petroleum and Minerals
Dhahran, Saudi Arabia

ABSTRACT

Photon-stimulated desorption of Na^+ and F^+ occurs from a $\text{NaF}(100)$ cleaved surface upon $\text{Na}(1s)$ excitation. These measurements represent the first observation of metal cation desorption following metal cation core excitation. In agreement with the Auger decay model of desorption, both sodium and fluorine positive ion yields (versus photon energy) are similar to total electron yield in the vicinity of the Na K-edge, except for a pre-edge peak observed predominantly in Na^+ desorption. Intra-atomic Auger decay of the $\text{Na}(1s)$ core hole followed by charge transfer from adjacent halogens is shown to initiate desorption. The resulting neutral or positively charged halogens provide the driving force for desorption of sodium ions from the surface. Expressions are developed for the maximal energy available to the desorbing Na^+ or F^+ ions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Photon-stimulated desorption (PSD) from ionic materials has been shown to occur by ionization of surface-atom core levels followed by Auger relaxation of the core hole.¹ Charge transfer of two or more electrons from the bonding region accompanies the Auger decay cascade, and a surface anion species may become positively charged. If the repulsive multihole final state is sufficiently long lived,^{2,3} the species may be expelled as a positive ion from the surface. In this paper, we shall develop a description of this mechanism, Auger-stimulated desorption (ASD), to encompass both metal cation and halogen anion species desorbing as positive ions. We shall identify the major channels in the Na(1s) Auger decay cascade resulting in desorption and derive equations for the maximal energy available to the desorbing Na⁺ and F⁺ ions.

Alkali halides have advantages as systems for studying the ASD mechanism. Since the absolute electron energy thresholds⁴ for electron-stimulated desorption (ESD) of ions are high (18 eV for NaCl), ion desorption by secondary electron ESD should be much less important than the direct ASD mechanism. The ionicity⁵ of sodium fluoride and other alkali halides is about 90%, justifying the use of simple bonding concepts. Both anions and cations desorb as positive ions from alkali halides, allowing useful comparisons. Clean samples are prepared easily by cleavage in vacuum.

Alkali halides also have complicating features. Calculations predict surface distortions on the order of 5% of a lattice spacing in

alkali halide and other surfaces.⁶⁻¹¹ The stoichiometry of vacuum-cleaved surfaces may be different from that of the bulk: Gallon et al. cleaved alkali halide crystals and monitored the desorbed species with a mass spectrometer.¹² About one atomic plane of fluorine desorbed from lithium fluoride within 10 seconds after cleavage; lithium also desorbed. Both sodium and fluorine desorb from NaF after cleavage. Exposure to radiation can alter the surface. X-rays produce F-centers and other defects in alkali halides. Neutral halogens desorb upon low energy electron bombardment,^{13,14} enriching the metal content of the surface. At electron and photon energies corresponding to substrate core levels, excited neutral metal atoms desorb with high intensities, yielding atomic line radiation.^{15,16} Since our intent in this work is to develop the Auger decay model for highly ionic systems, we defer discussion of the complex role of defects and hydrogen in ion desorption from alkali halides.

Experimental methods are described in Section II. Results are presented and described, under four subsections - yield spectra, the pre-edge feature, mechanisms, and energetics - in Section III. In Section IV, the major conclusions are summarized.

II. EXPERIMENTAL

The experiment was performed at beam line III-3 at the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory (SSRL) using photons of energies between 1075 and 1155 eV. The monochromator¹⁷ transmitted a flux of 2×10^9 photons per second with a resolution of about 0.7 eV FWHM at 1100 eV. The sodium fluoride crystals, of optical quality, were cleaved in situ at a pressure of 4×10^{-10} torr. To minimize charging, the sides of the crystals were coated with colloidal graphite. The PSD experiments were conducted with the light in p-polarization at an incident angle of 45° , and employed a time-of-flight mass spectrometer described elsewhere¹ with a modified drift tube designed to avoid saturation of the microchannel plates. This drift tube, biased between -500 and -1500 volts to accelerate the ions, was equipped with two masks and electrostatic deflectors, allowing ions to pass while restricting line-of-sight between sample and microchannel plates. Total electron yield measurements used a positively biased channeltron electron multiplier. The ion- and electron- yield spectra were normalized to incident photon flux as measured by electron yield from a graphite-coated grid.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, yield spectra, the pre-edge structure, mechanisms, and energetics are discussed separately.

A. The Electron and Ion Yield Spectra at the Na K-edge

Ion and electron yields from a cleaved NaF(100) sample are plotted against photon energy in Figs. 1 and 2. Fig. 1 covers a photon energy range of 80 eV, while Fig. 2 displays a 20 eV range near threshold in more detail. The sums of several scans are shown in the pre-threshold region in Fig. 2. The intensity ratio of $\text{Na}^+:\text{F}^+:\text{H}^+$ is about 4:2:7. The electron yield spectra have the same threshold and gross features as the ion desorption curves. In Fig. 1, an absorption spectrum¹⁸ of a 20000Å evaporated NaF film by K. Rule shows qualitative agreement with the other spectra and with another published absorption spectrum.¹⁹ Our monochromator was calibrated by shifting the electron yield peaks and valleys to match these two absorption spectra; an error of ± 0.5 eV was estimated in matching these peaks. The valley at 1083 eV is slightly deeper for electron yield and H^+ yield than for Na^+ and F^+ yield. A sharp structure (~ 1.3 eV full width at half maximum) occurs as a resolved peak in Na^+ about 2.3 eV below the inflection point of the electron yield threshold. The intensity and position of the peak are approximately the same for a freshly cleaved surface as for a surface exposed to the photon beam for many hours. The feature is at least three times as weak, if present at all, in F^+ , and is absent in H^+ and electron yield.

Assuming a photon flux of 2×10^9 photons per second¹⁷ and 20% detector efficiency, about 3×10^{-8} Na^+ ions desorb per photon at the Na^+ yield maximum. Using Ne or Na photoionization cross sections^{20,21} ($\sim 2 \times 10^5$ barns) and arbitrarily considering ionization of only the surface atomic layer, approximately 10^{-4} Na^+ ions desorb per surface ionization. By comparison, yields of excited alkali neutrals desorbing from alkali halides are several orders of magnitude larger than ion yields.¹⁵

In photoabsorption of alkali ions in alkali halides, the ionic environment of the alkali ion produces a barrier in the potential of the photoexcited electron. In the approach of Dehmer and Åberg,²² the barrier partitions the final states into two classes - inner-well (exciton) states and outer-well states. The exciton states have free-ion character and are embedded in the continuum of the outer-well states. For Li(1s) absorption²³⁻²⁵ in LiF, the first prominent structure, assigned to core excitons, lies several electron volts below the conduction band minimum. However, for Na(1s) absorption in NaF, the first large peak at 1077.7 eV may lie near the conduction band¹⁹ edge: in the rigid-band approach, the Na(1s) level to conduction band transition energy is between 1076.4 and 1078.6 eV (depending on the choice²⁶⁻³⁰ of literature values). The rigid band approach has been discussed previously,²⁵ and gives a reasonable estimate of the position of the conduction band^{23,24} minimum for Li(1s) absorption in LiF.

In Auger-stimulated desorption, the ion yield is directly proportional to the core-hole creation rate. Electrons from direct

photoexcitation, from Auger and exciton decay, and from electron scattering contribute to the total electron yield. Because of electron-electron scattering and multiplication, secondary electrons resulting from Auger decay may predominate over those resulting from near-threshold photoelectrons. The charge transfer process in ASD occurs over a short range, and the ions are believed to originate exclusively from the surface layer; the photoionized species responsible for total electron yield can be many lattice spacings from the surface.³¹ Both the ion yield and the Auger decay component of total electron yield are strictly proportional to the absorption cross section and can be compared directly, but the ion yield is more surface-sensitive than the electron yield. Assuming that ASD is the primary desorption mechanism, the lack of significant differences (excluding the pre-edge structure) between the PSD and electron yield indicates that the surface sites responsible for PSD are probably similar in electronic structure to those of the bulk.

B. The pre-edge structure in Na^+ desorption

An assignment of the pre-edge structure at 1073.5 ± 0.5 eV must account for both preferential Na^+ desorption and the position and shape of the peak. Several possibilities can be rejected:

(1) The high absolute energy ESD threshold⁴ for Na^+ desorption from NaCl eliminates single ionization of a halogen and other low-energy processes as channels for exclusive Na^+ desorption from NaCl and, by analogy, from NaF.

(2) A step or edge site (i.e. a site with a low surface Madelung potential) is expected^{28,32} to have a greater $\text{Na}^+(3s^{-1}) \rightarrow \text{Na}^{2+}(1s^{-1} 3s^{-1})$ binding energy than a bulk site; ionization of such a surface site cannot account for a pre-edge structure.

(3) Atomic Hartree-Fock calculations with relativistic corrections were performed on Na and Na^+ using the code of Froese-Fischer³³ as modified by Cowan;³⁴ good agreement with the experimental 1s binding energy³⁵ and the 1s \rightarrow 3p Rydberg energy was found (i.e. +0.5 eV) for excitation from the neutral sodium ground state. The calculated $\text{Na}^+(1s^2 2s^2 2p^6) 1S$ to $\text{Na}^+(1s^1 2s^2 2p^6 3p) 1P$ energy difference is 1078.6 eV; a core exciton transition energy may be within a few electron volts of the corresponding free ion transition energy. (In LiF, the Li 2p exciton is 0.3 eV lower²⁵ than the corresponding experimental transition energy of the free ion.) Therefore, the pre-edge peak at 1073.5 eV is unlikely to be derived from a Na^+ 1s \rightarrow 3p Rydberg transition.

The dipole-forbidden transition to the $\text{Na}(1s^1 2s^2 2p^6 3s)$ state, estimated to have a transition energy of 1072.54 eV in an unrestricted Hartree-Fock calculation³⁶ of the NaF_6^{5-} cluster, is a candidate assignment for the pre-edge structure. A dipole-forbidden Li 1s \rightarrow 2s exciton is observed in LiF, allowed²⁴ by coupling to odd-parity phonons. For preferential Na^+ desorption to result, however, the transition would have to occur exclusively on surface sodium ions; it is unknown whether this would be the case.

Defects might give rise to absorption below the main edge. A standard bulk defect is a halogen vacancy. Excitation of a $\text{Na}(1s)$

electron to produce an F-center in such a site, however, may have a low cross section and may not result in preferential Na^+ desorption. Sample cleavage may result in a non-stoichiometric surface in which sodium atoms are present; electron bombardment can reduce Li in certain lithium salts.^{37,38} Sodium metal itself¹⁸ has a low-energy absorption edge (1071.7 eV) and a broad structure after threshold unlike any features in the NaF spectrum. However, if the sodium atoms are isolated on the NaF host lattice, their absorption spectra may more closely resemble the spectrum³⁵ of atomic Na, which has a sharp, dominant Na $1s \rightarrow 3p$ Rydberg peak at 1074.9 ± 0.3 eV followed by weaker structures. For the Na^+ pre-edge peak to correspond to this atomic transition, a shift of about -1.4 eV would be required. The Hartree-Fock 3p Rydberg rms orbital radius in $\text{Na}(1s^1 2s^2 2p^6 3s 3p)$ is 2.6 \AA , while the NaF lattice nearest-neighbor distance³⁹ is 2.317 \AA ; we speculate that the transition may therefore only appear in the surface layer, and be perturbed in the bulk. A pre-edge Rydberg-like structure has also been observed⁴⁰ in D^+ desorption from D_2O ice. For this Na $1s \rightarrow 3p$ Rydberg-like assignment to be plausible, subsequent decay of the core hole must occur such that Na^+ is produced in a repulsive state on the surface; it is not known whether such a repulsive state will be produced.

C. The Auger Decay Mechanism


Auger-stimulated desorption^{41,42} accounts for anions being converted to positive ions and then desorbing, with thresholds at both anion and cation core levels. Following halogen ion photoabsorption in

an alkali halide, the halogen decays by the Auger process, becoming positively charged. This positively charged species then experiences a repulsive Madelung potential, and desorbs with a few electron volts kinetic energy. Following metal ion photoabsorption, the core hole decays with an interatomic charge transfer step, producing a positively charged halogen, which desorbs as before. Although the Auger effect itself is usually regarded as intra-atomic in nature, this latter interatomic decay process has often been represented as interatomic Auger decay. The decay mechanism has been considered previously only in general terms, and has been limited to understanding anions desorbing as positive ions. In the discussion below we shall describe a model for the desorption of both Na^+ and F^+ ions following an interatomic process of $\text{Na}(1s)$ hole decay in which the initial Auger step itself is intra-atomic.


Experimental evidence for interatomic Auger decay from core levels is limited. Linewidth broadening originally attributed to interatomic decay was later assigned⁴³ to phonon broadening. Interatomic Auger decay energies for several ionic systems⁴⁴ were estimated and compared to experimental spectra; several weak features were assigned to interatomic Auger decay in NaF . A rough comparison shows the area of the $\text{Na}(K)\text{Na}(L_{23})\text{F}(L_{23})$ structure of ref. 44 to be about 1% that of the intra-atomic $\text{Na}(KL_{23}L_{23})^1D$ structure. Transition rates for Auger decay have been calculated:⁴⁵ for solid CH_4 and CF_4 , the intra-atomic rates are a factor of 10^4 larger than the interatomic rates; only for systems such as Na/O or Mg/O are the calculated inter-

and intra-atomic rates comparable. Clearly, interatomic Auger decay can be considered as a major decay channel only when the normal intra-atomic decay cannot take place.


In NaF, the Na(1s) hole produced by photoionization can decay, with a low probability, via a Na(K)F(L)F(L) or Na(K)Na(L)F(L) process, or with much higher probability by an ordinary Na(KLL) intra-atomic decay. If we consider the latter channel, Na³⁺ is produced within 10⁻¹⁵ seconds (the initial state being Na⁺). Charge transfer from surrounding fluorine ions must then occur, by the process



exothermic by 53 eV, followed by either



or



which are exothermic by 14 eV and 28 eV, respectively, as estimated using point-charge lattice corrections to free ion energies. The energy released in the charge transfer steps may result largely in fluorescence or in expulsion of electrons from the valence band. The latter process has the net result of an interatomic Auger event; its probability is determined by the extent of polarization about the multihole sodium ion. The quasi-interatomic Auger decay Na(L₃)F(L₃)F(L₃) is endothermic.

The experimentally observed⁴⁴ quasi-interatomic Auger decay $\text{Na}(L_3)\text{F}(L_3)\text{F}'(L_3)$, where F and F' are different fluorines, is exothermic by ~ 7 eV.

These processes, eq. (1)-(3), should proceed on a very fast time scale, leaving the sodium ion that had lost a 1s electron back in its original charge state, as Na^+ , with at most a little excitation energy in the outer shell. The net result, after about 10^{-12} seconds (a vibrational period) is either that two of the nearest-neighbor fluorine atoms will be neutral F^0 , or that one will be unipositive F^+ . In either case the total electrostatic environment of the Na^+ ion in question can be repulsive, leading to desorption of the Na^+ ion (or of course the F^+ ion could desorb).

The real issue to be resolved in discussing this mechanism is therefore not whether the Na^+ ion can desorb by $\text{Na}(1s)$ photoionization at the Na K-edge, but the subtler question of whether the electrostatic environment can remain repulsive long enough for this desorption to occur, i.e. for 10^{-12} seconds or longer. Electronic polarization of the lattice will occur within about 10^{-15} seconds, and will partially screen the repulsive terms in the potential. The effectiveness of this screening depends on the extent of the polarization. Diffusion of the two excess positive charges (on two F^0 atoms or one F^+) away from one other will be much slower; in a completely ionic material it could occur only by electron hopping, while faster charge transfer through bonds is feasible in a more covalent material. Thus the polarizability and

ionicity can both be critical in establishing the feasibility of positive-ion desorption in ionic lattices such as alkali halides.

D. Ion Desorption Energetics

In the limit of complete ionicity, we can readily derive the energies available to both the metal and halogen atoms desorbing as positive ions. Following the approach of Mott and Littleton,^{46,47} for an ionic lattice in which one anion site is made neutral or positively charged, we combine electrostatic attraction and repulsion, Born repulsion, and polarization relaxation to determine the net repulsion energy. This total repulsion energy can be transferred either to the lattice or to a desorbing ion or both. It thus represents the maximal energy available to a desorbing ion. Unfortunately, a comparison of the repulsion energy to experimental kinetic energies⁴ is obviated by the presence of surface charging. The approach taken below may thus be especially valuable in predicting ionic species that cannot desorb by a given process.

Consider Na^+ desorbing from a sodium chloride lattice site, in which z electrons have been removed from a neighboring halogen ion. We choose NaCl, although the energetics of NaF are very similar. The net energy E^+ available for desorption of Na^+ is the difference between the repulsive energy U^+ resulting from an effective charge z on the neighboring halogen and the cohesion energy W^+ of the Na^+ ion to the lattice. All quantities are defined as positive in sign. The repulsion energy U^+ is

$$U^+ \sim \frac{z e^2}{r k_{\text{eff}}}, \quad (4)$$

where e is the electron charge, r is the distance between the Na^+ and the halogen under consideration, and k_{eff} is the effective dielectric constant. For a maximal estimate of repulsive energy, we set k_{eff} equal to 1. For a nearest neighbor, with³⁹ $r = 2.820\text{\AA}$, we find U^+ to be about 5.1 z , in electron volt units, for NaCl. The cohesive energy W^+ to remove a Na^+ ion from the surface is

$$W^+ = \alpha E_M^+ - E_{\text{BR}}^+ - 0.5 e \phi^+ - E_S^+, \quad (5)$$

where α is the surface correction to the bulk Madelung energy E_M^+ . For Na^+ in a perfect (100) surface lattice site⁴⁸ $\alpha = 0.96$ and $E_M^+ = 8.92$ eV. The second term E_{BR}^+ is the Born repulsion energy, about 1 eV for NaCl. The polarization potential⁴⁶ ϕ^+ in a rigidly held lattice is about 1.5 eV for NaCl; if the removal is on a time scale such that the lattice can relax, the polarization term is about 3.5 eV. For desorption, the time scale is intermediate but closer to the relaxed lattice case. If we ignore the surface correction E_S^+ to the Born repulsion and polarization terms, then W^+ is about 4.3 eV. The net energy $E^+ = U^+ - W^+$ for desorption of a Na^+ ion is

$$E^+ = U^+ - \alpha E_M^+ + E_{\text{BR}}^+ + 0.5 e \phi^+ + E_S^+. \quad (6)$$

Production of a positive halogen ion, corresponding to $z = 2$, is clearly sufficient to expel a Na^+ ion from the surface. We see that U^+ and W^+ are comparable, if we maximize the contribution of U^+ by setting the dielectric constant equal to 1, for single ionization of a halogen ion. If this latter process could lead to metal cation desorption, Na^+ would have a low energy threshold, at the halogen np binding energy. However, the ESD absolute threshold energy⁴ at 18 eV for Na^+ desorption from NaCl is too high, eliminating this possibility for NaCl .

The energy E^- available to a desorbing positive halogen ion is

$$E^- = \alpha E_M^- + E_{BR}^- - 0.5 e \phi^- - E_S^- \quad (7)$$

For alkali halides, the bulk Madelung energy E_M^- and surface correction α have the same values as those of the cation. The Born repulsion term E_{BR}^- for the positive halogen ion has a smaller value than that of the cation. The polarization term ϕ^- has two contributions: 1) when the halogen atom X is ionized to X^+ , the lattice relaxes, stabilizing the halogen in the lattice and 2) as the halogen is removed, polarization stabilizes the vacancy, facilitating removal of the halogen. If the first term is more important, ϕ^- will be positive in sign. E_S^- is the surface Born repulsion and polarization correction term.

Surface Madelung energies ($\propto E_M$) of many step sites are between 50% and 70% of the bulk values, and energies of other sites are even lower.⁴⁸ The Madelung energy term provides the driving force to desorb the halogen ion, making desorption of halogens from majority (high surface Madelung energy) sites favored energetically. For metal cations, which are repelled from a neighboring ionized halogen, yet bound to the lattice by the Madelung interaction, desorption from minority (step, edge, and other) sites is favored.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Auger-stimulated desorption accounts for Na^+ and F^+ desorption from NaF. Following photoabsorption of the Na K-shell, the sodium ion decays via the KLL Auger process. Relaxation of the Na^{3+} species to the original charge state, Na^+ , occurs primarily by charge transfer from surrounding fluorines. The net result after about 10^{-12} seconds is that either two of the nearest-neighbor fluorine atoms will be F^0 , or that one will be F^+ . The electrostatic environment of the F^+ ion and the neighboring Na^+ ions can be repulsive, leading to desorption. The leading term for energies available to the desorbing ions are the surface Madelung energy ($\propto E_M$) and the electrostatic repulsion U , respectively. In particular, desorption of the halogen is preferred energetically from majority surface sites, while metal cation desorption is preferred energetically from minority sites. In order for desorption to occur, the electrostatic environment must remain repulsive for a characteristic time: this time will be controlled by the diffusion rate of the two holes (on two F^0 or one F^+) away from each other. In fact, the efficiency of the desorption process, about 10^{-4} Na^+ ions desorbing per surface ionization, is small. The ASD model predicts the observed ESD absolute thresholds (the Cl(3s) edge at 18 eV for Na^+ desorption⁴ from NaCl, and the F(2s) edge at 32 eV for F^+ desorption⁴⁹ from LiF), the observation of halogen and metal species desorbing as positive ions, and the general agreement of the ion desorption spectra to the total electron yield in NaF. In a future publication we shall address the limitations of this model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge useful discussions with D. R. Jennison. The work was supported by the Naval Weapons Center Independent Research Fund, the U.S. Office of Naval Research, and the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Chemical Sciences Division of the U. S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098. Sandia National Laboratories is supported by the U.S. Dept. of Energy under contract number DE-AC04-76-DP00789. Experiments were conducted at the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory, supported by the NSF through the Division of Materials Research.

REFERENCES


1. M. L. Knotek, V. O. Jones, and V. Rehn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 43, 300 (1979).
2. P. J. Feibelman, Surf. Sci. 102, L51 (1981).
3. D. E. Ramaker, C. T. White, and J. S. Murday, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. 18, 748 (1981).
4. T. R. Pian, Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1982 (unpublished).
5. J. A. Van Vechten, Phys. Rev. 182, 891 (1969).
6. S. Sawada and K. Nakamura, J. Phys. C, 12, 1183 (1979).
7. M. A. Van Hove and P. M. Echenique, Surf. Sci. 88, L11 (1979).
8. M. A. Van Hove and P. M. Echenique, Surf. Sci. 82, L298 (1979).
9. Y. W. Tsang and L. M. Falicov, Phys. Rev. B 12, 2441 (1975).
10. G. C. Benson and T. A. Claxton, J. Chem. Phys. 48, 1356 (1968).
11. G. C. Benson, P. Balk, and P. White, J. Chem. Phys. 31, 109 (1959).
12. T. E. Gallon, I. G. Higginbotham, M. Prutton, and H. Tokutaka, Surf. Sci. 21, 224 (1970).
13. P. D. Townsend, R. Browning, D. J. Garland, J. C. Kelley, A. Mahjoobi, A. J. Michael, and M. Saidoh, Rad. Eff. 30, 55 (1976).
14. H. Overeijnder, M. Szymoński, A. Haring, A. E. de Vries, Rad. Eff. 36, 63 (1978).
15. N. H. Tolk, M. M. Traum, J. S. Kraus, T. R. Pian, W. E. Collins, N. G. Stoffel, and G. Margaritondo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 812 (1982).
16. T. R. Pian, N. Tolk, J. Kraus, M. M. Traum, J. Tully, and W. E. Collins, J. Vac. Sci. Tech. 20, 555 (1982).

17. Z. Hussain, E. Umbach, D. A. Shirley, J. Stöhr, and J. Feldhaus, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. 195, 115 (1982).
18. K. C. Rule, Phys. Rev. 66, 199 (1944).
19. A. A. Maiste and R. E. Ruus, Opt. Spectrosc. (USSR) 46, 109 (1979).
20. I. M. Band, Yu. I. Kharitonov, and M. B. Trzhaskovskaya, Atom. Data. and Nucl. Data. Tables 23, 443 (1979).
21. G. V. Marr and J. B. West, Atom. Data and Nucl. Data Tables 18, 497 (1976).
22. T. Åberg and J. L. Dehmer, J. Phys. C 7, L278 (1974).
23. A. Zunger and A. J. Freeman, Phys. Rev. B 16, 2901 (1977).
24. M. Piacentini and J. Anderegg, Sol. State. Commun. 38 191 (1981).
25. S. T. Pantelides, Phys. Rev. B 11, 2391 (1975).
26. S. P. Kowalczyk, L. Ley, F. R. McFeely, R. A. Pollak, and D. A. Shirley, Phys. Rev. B 9, 381 (1974).
27. S. P. Kowalczyk, L. Ley, F. R. McFeely, R. A. Pollak, and D. A. Shirley, Phys. Rev. B 8, 3583 (1973).
28. P. H. Citrin and T. D. Thomas, J. Chem. Phys. 57, 4446 (1972).
29. W. H. Strehlow and E. L. Cook, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 2, 163 (1973).
30. R. T. Poole, J. G. Jenkin, J. Liesegang, and R. C. G. Leckey, Phys. Rev. B 11, 5179 (1975).
31. W. Gudat and C. Kunz, Phys. Rev. Lett 29, 169 (1972).
32. C. S. Fadley, S. B. M. Hagstrom, M. P. Klein, and D. A. Shirley, J. Chem. Phys. 48, 3779 (1968).
33. C. Froese-Fischer, Comp. Phys. Commun. 1, 151 (1969).

34. R. D. Cowan and J. B. Mann, Jr., *J. Comput. Phys.* 16, 160 (1974).
35. M. H. Tuilier, D. Laporte, and J. M. Esteva, *Phys. Rev. A* 26, 372 (1982).
36. A. B. Kunz, J. C. Boisvert, and T. O. Woodruff, *J. Phys. C* 15, 5037 (1982).
37. T. Sasaki, R. S. Williams, J. S. Wong, and D. A. Shirley, *J. Chem. Phys.* 69, 4374 (1978).
38. L. S. Cota Araiza and B. D. Powell, *Surf. Sci.* 51, 504 (1975).
39. M. P. Tosi in *Solid State Physics*, vol. 16, edited by F. Seitz and D. Turnbull, (Academic Press 1964).
40. R. A. Rosenberg, P. R. LaRoe, V. Rehn, J. Stöhr, R. Jaeger, and C. C. Parks, to be published.
41. P. J. Feibelman and M. L. Knotek, *Phys. Rev. B* 18, 6531 (1978).
42. M. L. Knotek and P. J. Feibelman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 40, 964 (1978).
43. P. H. Citrin, P. Eisenberger, and D. R. Hamann, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 33, 965 (1974).
44. P. H. Citrin, J. E. Rowe, and S. B. Christman, *Phys. Rev. B* 14, 2642 (1976).
45. J. A. D. Matthew and Y. Komninos, *Surf. Sci.* 53, 716 (1975).
46. N. F. Mott and M. J. Littleton, *Trans. Faraday Soc.* 34, 485 (1938).
47. N. F. Mott and R. W. Gurney, *Electronic Processes in Ionic Crystals*, (Oxford University Press, 1946).
48. L. Piela and J. Andzelm, *Surf. Sci.* 84, 179 (1979).
49. J. A. Schultz, P. T. Murray, R. Kumar, Hsin-Kuei Hu, and J. W. Rabalais in: *Proceedings of the First International Workshop on Desorption Induced by Electronic Transitions* (Williamsburg, VA, 1982), Ed. N. H. Tolk, M. M. Traum, J. C. Tully, and T. E. Madey.


FIGURE CAPTIONS

- Fig. 1 A comparison of Na^+ , F^+ , H^+ , and electron yield to the absorption spectrum of K. Rule.¹⁸ Curves are drawn through the data as a visual aid.
- Fig. 2 A comparison of total electron yield to Na^+ , F^+ and H^+ desorption. The sums of several scans are shown in the pre-threshold region of the ion desorption spectra. Curves are drawn through the data as a visual aid.



XBL 836-10082

Figure 1



XBL 836-10083

Figure 2

This report was done with support from the Department of Energy. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the Department of Energy.

Reference to a company or product name does not imply approval or recommendation of the product by the University of California or the U.S. Department of Energy to the exclusion of others that may be suitable.

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